eration of the motion of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution No. 9, a resolution to amend rule XXII of the standing rules of the Senate with respect to limitation of debate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer, the able Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON).

RECESS UNTIL 11:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until 11:30 a.m., tomorrow, January 28, 1971.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27 (legislative day of January 26), 1971:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

John R. Quarles, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; new position.

U.S. NAVY

The following named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John H. Pedersen
Graham Tahler
Richard Freundlich
George V. Fliflet
Edwin M. Wilson, Jr.
Eddie H. Ball

MEDICAL CORPS

Ben Eiseman

SUPPLY CORPS

Jack F. Pearse
Robert H. Spiro, Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

George J. Coleman

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INDIANAPOLIS EXPLORER SCOUT TROOP 522 CREDIT TO COMMUNITY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing at all wrong with the youth of America when their natural enthusiasm and energy challenged and channeled into productive, worthwhile pursuits.

The Monsignor Downey Council of the Knights of Columbus, Indianapolis, Ind., sponsors the unit, one of only three in the entire country, which is part of a pilot project scout program to determine having something along the lines of Sea Scouts, but with Army orientation.

I have had the high privilege and pleasure of meeting and talking with this group personally and I have worked with their leaders in every way possible. They are a credit to their community, city, State and country, and I am proud to include the two following articles about them and their projects:

[From the Criterion, Dec. 11, 1970]

EXPLORER SCOUTS SAMPLE RUGGED RANGER TRAINING

(By Mike Keller)

FORT BENNING, GA.—Fort Benning's rugged Ranger course is no "Boy Scout jamboree," but this did not deter 23 Explorer scouts from undergoing various types of Ranger training here recently.

During their short visit, the scouts, who are members of Explorer Post 522 in Indianapolis and sponsored by Msgr. Downey Council Knights of Columbus, received instruction and practical work in basic rappelling and map and compass reading from instructors in the Infantry School's Ranger Department. The young men also viewed a live parachute jump, took part in rappelling exercises on cliffs of Providence Canyon and participated in camping activities.

For these scouts, the experience was particularly meaningful since their post is one of the few in the United States that is practically "all Army" in its organizational structure.

"There are only three others like us in the country," Daniel F. O'Riley, chairman of Post 522, said of his scout "outfit." This is part of a pilot military-oriented scout program to study the workability of having an Army scout unit along the lines of the Sea Scouts."

The Post, which numbers 35 members, has four officers—one captain (corresponding to the president of a club) and three lieutenants—an executive officer (vice-president), a finance officer (treasurer) and an adjutant (secretary). There are also numerous "non-commissioned officer" (NCO) squad leaders and one "senior drill sergeant."

"However, all our scouts start as privates and work their way up," stated O'Riley, who served in the Army himself from 1954 to 1956.

Many of the scouts are not new to Fort Benning, several having been here this summer to participate in similar training with the Rangers.

After their last visit to Fort Benning, Post 522 made it no secret that they enjoyed the trip. The scouts "spread the word" in Indianapolis about their experiences by sending photographs they took during the event to Rotary clubs and other organizations in the city.

One scout who felt that his "second tour" at Fort Benning was worthwhile was Paul Bloom. The first time he was here, Bloom was a bit hesitant to ascend the Ranger's formidable 50-foot rappelling tower—an exercise certain to induce "butterflies" in the stomach of even experienced personnel. On this occasion, however, the young man was eager to go up. Explained the scout "Now, I'm confident I'm not going to fall."

Bloom, who is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Bloom of St. Mark's parish, Indianapolis, had praise for the training he received. "This is the best thing I've done since I've been in scouting," he declared. Bloom attends Southport High School.

Another young man who could find the knowledge he gained here valuable in the future is Steve Treadwell, a senior at Southport. Treadwell, a two-year Explorer veteran, is seriously thinking of enlisting in the Army for Ranger School upon graduation from high school.

"I like it a lot," he said of the training. "It prepares you to go in." Young Treadwell is the son of Mr. and Mrs. H. H. Treadwell of St. Barnabas parish, Indianapolis.

Accompanying O'Riley, an Indianapolis funeral director, to Fort Benning, were Virgil A. Lawson, an industrial engineer with Penn Central Railroad; Armand J. Blanchard, a civil engineer with the Indiana Highway Department; and Air Force Sgt. Michael B. Delaney. All are officials with the Explorer Post.

[From the Indianapolis News, Nov. 26, 1970]

SCOUTS GET RANGER TRAINING

FORT BENNING, GA.—Fort Benning's rugged Ranger course is no "Boy Scout jamboree," but that did not stop 23 Explorer Scouts from undergoing Ranger training here recently.

During their short visit, the Scouts, members of Indianapolis Post 522, received instruction and practical work in basic rappeling, map and compass reading from instructors in the Infantry School's Ranger Department. The young men also viewed a live parachute jump, took part in rappeling exercises on cliffs of Providence Canyon and participated in camping activities.

For these Scouts, the experience was particularly meaningful since their post is one of the few in the United States that is practically "all Army" in its organizational structure.

"There are only three others like us in the country," Daniel F. O'Riley, chairman of Post 522, said of his Scout outfit. "We were selected by the Boy Scouts of America to help establish military-orientated Scout posts. This is part of a pilot program to study the workability of having an Army Scout unit along the lines of the Sea Scouts."

Like military personnel, these "soldier-scouts" wear insignia of rank, which—in their case—ranges from private to captain. And "enlisted" scouts are expected to render the proper courtesies—including the salute—to their "officer" counterparts.

The Post, which has 35 members, has four officers—one captain (corresponding to the president of a club) and three lieutenants—an executive officer (vice-president), a finance officer (treasurer) and an adjutant (secretary). There are also numerous "non-commissioned officers" (NCO) squad leaders and one "senior drill sergeant."

Officers are selected every six months from among the organization's squad leaders.

"However, all our Scouts start as privates and work their way up," said O'Riley, who served in the Army from 1954 to 1956.

The leaders of the post not only insist the boys uphold the goals and ideals of scouting but also act in a proper military manner. "That's 'yes, sergeant!'" a post committeeman barked at an Explorer who failed to address a Ranger NCO by his rank.

Many of the Scouts are not new to Fort Benning, several having been here last summer to participate in similar training with the Rangers. "For them to come back for 'seconds,' they had to be satisfied," Lt. Col.

James L. Anderson, chairman of the Ranger Department's Patrolling Committee, said.

Anderson said the Scouts "performed beyond our expectations. They may have come in 'cold,' but after a few practice runs, they compared favorably to some of our older soldiers."

Working with the Explorers also was beneficial for the Ranger cadre, the colonel maintained. "They learned a lot from the boys," he said. "When these Scouts first arrived, most of them knew almost nothing about our activities. Thus, our instructors had the opportunity to teach these young men 'from scratch' and watch them develop under their tutorship. They don't get that same feeling of accomplishment with an average class."

OUR MORAL OBLIGATION TO OPPOSE COMMUNISM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an article by Fr. Cletus Healy, S.J., entitled "Our Moral Obligation to Oppose Communism," which first appeared in the Tidings, published by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles, on October 6, 1961, is as timely, sound, and relevant today as the day it was written. I recommend a careful reading of the following extensive excerpt from this article especially to our newly elected colleagues, who now face the duty and responsibility which history has imposed on all of us, to preserve this Republic and the people we represent from the greatest tyranny and the most comprehensive and ruthless pattern of systematic aggression the world has ever known.

The article follows:

OUR MORAL OBLIGATION TO OPPOSE COMMUNISM

THREAT SERIOUS

The measure of our obligation to oppose Communism is determined, in large part, by the seriousness of the threat and the malice of the evil that threatens.

Writing in late 1958, William Henry Chamberlain, expressing his educated alarm over the Communist threat, noted:

"Now whether we like it or not, we are in the front line. We are in the finals of a match in which the penalty for losing will be our disappearance as a free and sovereign nation."—Human Events, 12/29/58.

Today his warning is becoming increasingly plausible.

In his "Masters of Deceit," J. Edgar Hoover wrote: "Communism is the major menace of our time. Today, it threatens the very existence of our Western civilization." (p. vi.)

If there is question of Western civilization being at stake, surely failure to make intelligent inquiry into the threat is gross irresponsibility. One does not have to be a moral theologian to see that.

EVIL IS UNPARALLELED

But one does not have to have some appreciation of the political heritage of twenty centuries of our Judaeo-Christian civilization. And still more does one need to understand the profound barbarity of Communist tyranny.

The unique degradation of Communist tyranny was well described by Senator Thomas Dodd in an address of May 14, 1960. He said in part:

"If the Communists sought only to rule the world, then the danger could be judged in the same light as that of previous aggressive tyrannies. But they want more than to rule the world. They want to destroy it and remake it in the image of their insane dogma.

"To the Communist, everything that we hold to be true is false. Our ideals, values, customs, loyalties are to him parts of an ugly system he is determined to destroy. Our concepts of God, the individual, the family, truth, love, freedom, justice are to him objects of hatred and derision . . .

"Every aspect of our lives from the sublime to the ridiculous, would be swept away and in its place erected the insane, irrational, anti-human regimentation of every phase of life, which requires not merely submission to evil but active participation in it. . . .

"For the existence that we have known, Communist rule would mean a death as final as the grave. And our despair would be magnified by the sight of our children and grandchildren born into and growing up in a world alien to everything once cherished—a world of darkness, a world without faith, a world dead in either temporal or eternal realities."—Cath. Mind, Sept.-Oct, '60

To squander what we have inherited, and to expose our posterity to such a living death is a moral irresponsibility we dare not incur.

But to date that is the fault on the soul of this prodigal generation.

Our appalling apathy to the Communist threat has already exposed 20 Christian centuries of political advancement to forfeiture.

The time in which we can reverse this backward grind of history is rapidly running out. And yet fallacious arguments designed to perpetuate our political paralysis abound.

We shall endeavor to expose the fallacies in some of these arguments.

THE DON'T-BE-NEGATIVE ARGUMENT

We have today what amounts to a sophisticated fetish against being "negative." Admittedly, negativism can be overdone; there are few things that can't. But from this it does not follow that being "negative" is wrong.

A policeman is negative when he arrests a robber; a doctor is negative when he performs an appendectomy; a fireman is negative when he puts out a fire; God is negative when He gives us eight of His ten Commandments.

Just as it is not wrong to be against disease, injustice, or fires, neither is it wrong to be against Communism. There is nothing wrong with being against evil. And Communism is evil—with a vengeance.

Its cure for poverty is to increase it.

Its cure for oppression is to universalize it.

Its cure for injustice is to legalize it.

Its cure for evil is to systematize it.

The Communists' solution to the ills of our capitalist society is to resurrect the mammoth Slave State of the Pharaohs. Like the Pharaohs, they build their pyramids by rolling stones into place over live men's bones.

Ignore the Communists' methods if you will, but do not do so in the name of Christianity.

Admire their achievements if you will, but do not do so in the name of Progress—certainly not civilized progress.

Join in the Communist-inspired crusade against the anti-Communists if you will, but do not do so in the name of Reason.

One does not have to know the anwsers to all our problems before he is justified in being against Communism.

All he needs to know is that Communism is not the answer to any problem.

And those intent on solving our other social problems should remember this. Communism is not something we can try and see if it works.

The universal experience of nations that have "tried" Communism is that Communism was their last experiment!

BE-POSITIVE ARGUMENT

Generally speaking, the people who are against the anti-Communists are "for" many other good things which they contend will cause Communism to vanish.

Usually they are of the strong conviction that poverty, injustice, racial hatreds, disease, malnutrition, etc., cause Communism.

Their focus of attention is on these evils. They are firmly convinced that if they eliminate these evils, and only if they eliminate them, will Communism disappear.

It is their boast, therefore, that they are the only respectable and really effectual anti-Communists. They consider the anti-Communists guilty of criminal neglect of duty for failing to concern themselves with other social evils.

They consider the anti-Communists irrational in their approach to the Communist problem, for they seek to eliminate an effect, ignoring its cause.

MY CRITICISM

I do not quarrel with these social crusaders for their concern about other social problems. (And I use the term "crusader" for want of a better term; no derogatory implications are intended.) Their interest in other problems, if it is genuine and intelligent, is to be encouraged, not discouraged.

However, I vigorously object to their perennial tendency to take time out from their very busy business solving all the other social problems to excoriate and ridicule their fellow citizens who are working on the Communist problem.

In the first place, they do not take time out to berate their other fellow citizens who are doing nothing to solve any of our problems; why must they single out for condemnation the anti-Communists?

Why are they so intensely unconcerned about the Communist problem?

Secondly, their success in stopping Communism during the last decade-and-a-half by solving all the other social problems of the world does not warrant the confidence they have in their "solution."

DIAGNOSIS INADEQUATE

In fact, on both empirical and theoretical grounds, their solution to the Communist problem is manifestly and grossly inadequate.

The prescription of our social crusaders is inadequate because it is based on a faulty diagnosis of the disease. Only if they have discovered the adequate cause of Communism, is their exclusive concern for other social problems warranted.

But the assumption that poverty, malnutrition, disease, etc., are the adequate causes of Communism is not well supported by history.

The human race has been afflicted with poverty and other social problems since the day Adam and Eve left Eden. It has been afflicted with Communism only since 1917.

We have, therefore, thousands of centuries of human impoverishment bearing witness to the fact that there is no necessary connection between "other social problems" and Communism.

This does not mean that we should ignore these problems; independently of the Communist problem, they deserve our attention. Neither does proving that bad social conditions are not the adequate cause of Communism prove that they have no causal influence.

PROPAGANDA CATALYST

It merely means the diagnosis of our social crusaders is faulty and, therefore their unbounded confidence in their solution to the problem is unwarranted. And it suggests the possibility of another approach to the Communist problem.

Bad social conditions can generate discontent.

And discontent, not of itself but under catalytic influence of clever propaganda can lead to Communism.

But the role of propaganda in making a country Communist is blandly overlooked by our crusaders. This oversight is all the more serious when one realizes that such is the diabolical efficiency of the Communist propaganda machine, that it can not only lure the discontented into a Communist trap, it can generate discontent out of its own myths and inflame it with its own passions.

A chlorera epidemic in Korea can be made the brutal consequence of American germ warfare.

A famine in China caused by mammoth mismanagement can be blamed on Western Imperialism.

The murder of 25,000 Hungarians can be made to look no worse than Little Rock.

HOW COMMUNISTS TAKE OVER

Inability to give adequate protection to remote villages of Vietnam from (Communist) terrorists can be made to look like the result of lack of concern or mismanagement by the legitimate government.

Whether the Communists base their propaganda on partial fact or on total fiction, is for them a matter of minor inconvenience. Any diagnosis of Communism which ignores its ability to create discontent and to misplace blame is seriously defective.

The House Committee on Communist Aggression, after taking the testimony of 335 witnesses most of whom were eyewitnesses of the Communist takeover of Eastern European countries, concluded:

"No nation, including the Russian Socialist, Federation Soviet Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted Communism . . . In no case did the Committee find evidence that any Communist controlled state has ever come into being by purely voluntary and considered action of its people."—Summary Report, pp. 3, 12.

If it were true that Communism is the effect of poverty, disease, malnutrition, etc., history should read: "As a result of oppressive social conditions, the people of the Iron Curtain countries chose Communism."

But history so reads only in the fertile imagination of those who have not bothered to find out just how Communists do take over a country.

What the House Committee did find was that "Communism was able to fix its rule upon the people of the captive nations only when it was . . . preceded by subversion which was politically, technically, and financially engineered by the Kremlin."—Second Interim Report, p. 5.

INTELLECTUAL IMPOVERISHMENT

Any solution to the Communist threat that ignores this political subversion is bound to disappoint—and the disappointment will be tragic!

Marxian claims notwithstanding, the poor have always taken to Communism very reluctantly. It is not in the city slums but on the university campuses that Communism has been received most cordially.

This is not because Communism appeals to the intellectual; it appeals to the intellectually lost! Its appeal is not where the poverty is material, but where it is intellectual.

It is in some of our institutions of higher learning, in the halls of cultivated skepticism, that many of our youth lose the simple faith of their childhood.

Browsing through the contradictory philosophies of confused intellectual giants in search of truth, they merely establish their own confusion.

Having lost their philosophical anchorage and being deprived of theological orientation, they are ripe for Communist conversion. They seek a faith to live by and a cause to give purpose and meaning to life. Communism answers their need.

It gives them a dogma to live by, the "scientifically proved" dogma of Dialectical Materialism. It gives them a cause to live for: the conquest of the world. For what more could they ask?

But this is not the poverty our social crusaders are trying to eliminate.

SOLUTION IMPRACTICAL

Even if the diagnosis of the crusaders were correct, their solution is impractical.

How long will it take to eliminate poverty in the Congo?

How long will it take in New York?

Obviously it is going to take somewhat longer to tame the Congo jungle.

Will the Communists wait?

Besides improving economic conditions, could we not also help the "backward" people in the Congo (and in the U.N.) escape the illusion that the Belgians are the cause of their distress and that Communism is the solution to their problems?

Moreover, in view of the world-wide anti-American propaganda barrage, we are in urgent need of a counter-propaganda offensive to help backward minds in the East and West see that "American imperialism" is not really the cause of all the world's problems.

And to retard Communism we had better help them realize that Communist imperialism is the solution to none of those problems. In other words, we had better be anti-Communist!

Under the present circumstances, there is no other foreign aid more genuinely beneficial than such an "educational" program. Putting out the fire does not repair the house, but it makes repair possible. Failure to make this contribution is today America's greatest disservice!

Since poverty, poor housing, malnutrition, etc., are not the adequate cause of Communism, it is clear that the exlusive concern of the social crusader for these problems has lost its justification.

DIRECT ACTION NEEDED

If criticism is due anyone for ignoring social problems, it is due to those who ignore the Communist problem—to say nothing of those who insist on everyone else ignoring it!

It may be that the screens need fixing, the porch needs repairing, the kitchen faucet leaks, but if the roof is on fire, where should the focus of our attention be? Are those who insist on distracting us with the leaky faucet really performing the greater service?

THE TAKE-CARE-OF-YOURSELF-ARGUMENT

Another argument used by many good, well-meaning people is this: If everyone lives a good life, observes the Commandments, and fulfills his obligations to his Church, all will be well.

Accompanying this conviction is the opinion that, having so performed his private duty, one is permitted to be a mere spectator of public affairs—even in this life and death struggle against Communism.

The merit of this position is that it recognize the importance of moral goodness in this contest. But its defect is serious.

MAIN DEFECT

The main defect of the take-care-of-yourself argument is that it seriously underplays the social obligations imposed upon us by the Natural Law.

It assumes that it is sufficient to live a good private life. But a privately good life is not a virtuous life; for to live a life of virtue we must observe all the commandments, not all the commandments but one!

And the privateers who neglect their civic responsibilities are neglecting the virtue of Legal or General Justice, the virtue which obliges them to seek the Common Good. And the virtue they neglect is what St. Thomas and Aristotle both call "the greatest of all the moral virtues."

Father James Keller has complained that too frequently we find that the good people take care of themselves, and they let the bad people take care of the rest of the world."

Can the good people continue to be good and allow this? The fact is that it is not their privilege to tolerate without vigorous opposition the mammoth injustice inflicted upon the world by Communism.

The Natural Law obliges one whether he recognizes the obligation or not. Although ignorance might excuse from moral fault, it will not immunize one from the natural consequences of violating right order.

NATURAL LAW PENALTY

This applies to the political order. If we elect to office politicians when we need statesmen, we will have to live with the natural consequences of our folly. Professor Thomas Neill in his book Weapons for Peace, written during the World War II, notes well:

"The observation that the people get about the kind of government they deserve is nowhere truer than in a democracy. Until the mass of voters, upon whom the ulitmate control of our peace arrangements rests, deserve something better than another bungled Versailles, that is what they will get."

After the Second World War, we easily outdid Versailles.

The additional 700,000,000 victims surrendered to a militant, ruthless, atheistic aggressor "to preserve peace" are our responsibility. Communism, as we see it today, is a Frankenstein of our own selfish fabrication.

It is not demonstrably the result of defective private virtue. But it is demonstrably the result of gross neglect of our obligations to other nations.

Other men's freedom was not ours to surrender—not even for Stalin's friendship.

PEACE PRAYER ARGUMENT

Many conscientious religious-minded people are convinced that the way to achieve peace in the world is to pray for it. And, having prayed, they feel they have fulfilled their responsibilities toward the international community.

The great merit in their position is that they recognize and emphasize the need of Divine assistance. This is good.

Our contest is unmistakably against the Father of Lies, the Prince of This World, and his minions. Nothing could be more imperative than Divine assistance.

But from this it does not follow that prayer or even prayer and sacrifices alone are sufficient.

Just as you cannot "pray" bread on the table for the family, neither can you "pray" effectively for world peace if you neglect your civic responsibilities in pursuing the conditions necessary for peace.

HUMAN EFFORTS NEEDED

You cannot discipline your children by merely praying for them. When a stick is called for, the prayers must be interrupted;

duty sometimes obliges us to employ less delicate measures to achieve results.

One's responsibilities cannot be fulfilled by either natural or by supernatural means alone. We have to employ both—and this by Divine Design.

Divine Providence has determined to use us as secondary instruments; it is our privilege to cooperate with God in working out our salvation and that of others.

But it is not our privilege to abdicate that responsibility. Just as a parent might squander the riches he has inherited, so can we squander the rich Christian heritage of our posterity. But we cannot do so without serious fault.

TEMPTING GOD NO VIRTUE

To attempt to achieve by supernatural means objectives God obliges us to achieve by human endeavors is to repudiate our responsibilities.

It is not an act of virtue but a vice. It is not a legitimate exercise of confidence in God but a subtle endeavor to tempt God, to force God to do what He obliges us to do.

Not even Christ could cast Himself down from the high pinnacle of prayer and expect His Father to rescue Him. Still less may we, through willful neglect of duty, put ourselves in a position where God alone can save us.

God will not be tempted. Surely willful neglect of our Natural Law responsibilities is a very poor basis on which to expect an answer to prayer.

NEEDED: PRAYER OF VIRTUE

The experience of more prayerful nations than ours would strongly suggest that God has no intention of averting by miracle disasters democratic peoples bring upon themselves by the neglect of their civic responsibilities. Prayer and sacrifice are most urgently needed.

But the prayer most needed is the prayer of a holy life, of a citizenry that practices all the virtues, especially that "most excellent of all the moral virtues," legal justice. And the sacrifice most appropriate is the sacrifice involved in fulfilling all our responsibilities.

Only when we have done all we can to save ourselves may we legitimately anticipate extraordinary Divine intervention.

However, no one can tell God when He can work His miracles. If God does intend to work a miracle to save Western Civilization, my suspicion is that the miracle will consist in awakening the people of the Free World to their Natural Law responsibilities and in inspiring them to live up to those obligations.

The miracle most urgently needed in America is a widespread popular determination to fulfill our obligations, first to the peoples we have already surrendered to Communism and then to our own posterity whose political heritage is being lightly exposed to forfeiture.

This is the miracle for which we should diligently work and earnestly pray; for in doing so, we are doing our best to make ourselves worthy of extraordinary Divine assistance.

Only the responsible deserve to be free. If this awakening to our responsibilities does not come, we are not worth saving.

SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, necessary improvements in our social security system were stalled for another year when the 91st Congress failed to complete action on the Social Security Amendments of 1970. In the meantime, spiraling inflation continues to hit hardest those senior citizens living on fixed incomes. The cost of living has skyrocketed since the last social security increase, while social security benefits have remained the same. Many of our elderly are forced to do without some of those items which you and I and our colleagues consider necessary to sustain life.

Since a large percentage of our senior citizens are residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, I am acutely aware of the urgent need for social security reform legislation to become a top-priority issue during the 92d Congress. For this reason, I have introduced legislation which will increase and improve the benefits of social security recipients. The major provisions of my bill, H.R. 1734, are to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits, to increase the outside earnings permitted without loss of benefits to $2,400, to provide for cost-of-living increases in benefits, and to pay benefits despite marriage or remarriage if it occurs after age 55.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to quit playing politics with our senior citizens and expeditiously enact a bill which will provide them with the drastically needed relief.

THE REAL MEANING OF GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 1969, President Nixon first unveiled to the American people his welfare reform or family assistance plan, the main feature of which was a guaranteed annual income for all—the first time this had ever been included in major Federal legislation.

Carried on the crest of a wave of rhetoric about how it would simplify welfare paperwork and compel deadbeats to work, the administration's welfare bill passed the House last year. But in a rare reversal of the usual pattern of congressional action today, the more liberal Senate defeated this measure which would normally have been to their liking, after the more conservative House had approved it.

The defeat of this bill—one of the few solid victories for the beleaguered taxpayer in the session of Congress just completed—was due to belated but vigorous efforts by groups such as the American Conservative Union and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and particularly to the dedicated and untiring research and committee work of Senator John Williams of Delaware, now most unfortunately retired, by his own choice.

However, President Nixon has indicated his intention to have a similar bill reintroduced early in the new session of Congress. It is very much to be hoped that he will give heed to better advice than he received in drawing up his earlier family assistance plan.

To quote from the excellent summary of that plan prepared by the American Conservative Union:

> Each family of four on welfare is to be guaranteed an income of $1600, plus additional services like food stamps. (Professional welfare organizations are demanding a minimum of $5500) . . .
>
> The proposal will add 12 million persons in addition to the 10 million already on welfare rolls. In all, 22 million people would be receiving monthly checks from the Federal government.
>
> The program will cost over $10 billion the first year, or $275 in taxes for the average taxpayer . . . There would be absolutely *no check* to determine if a person needed the guaranteed annual income. One would simply sign up at the local welfare office and the Federal government would mail his monthly check to him.

The whole of our past experience with welfare and other government programs shows that we cannot expect old programs to be eliminated when a new one is added. The guaranteed annual income would simply be piled on top of most, if not all, existing benefits. In many cases, it would go to persons not now receiving benefits. That same past experience shows us that we can be virtually certain that the $1,600 figure will steadily rise, once the concept of a guaranteed annual income has been adopted. The time to take a stand is when a vast new program such as this is about to be established; after it comes into being, it is all but impossible to remove.

Welfare and relief programs are in crying need of real reform today because of the number of persons capable of self-support, or already having sufficient economic resources for self-support, who nevertheless receive public assistance. Yet the name of welfare reform is here given to a proposal which would simply institutionalize the problem by removing need as a criterion for aid.

The one great safeguard in this proposal is supposed to be its "workfare" requirement, according to which the government can compel welfare recipients to take jobs. Most critics of the plan dismiss this by saying that it would not actually be enforced, as similar provisions in existing public assistance programs have not been enforced. They may well be right, in which case obviously there is no safeguard. But if, on the other hand, the compulsory work requirement were to be enforced, a different kind of threat would arise. When a man needs public assistance and asks for it, there is no reason not to require him to work for it. But if anyone could receive a guaranteed annual income regardless of need, and if the poor were encouraged to become dependent upon it, then the power of government to control their labor would hold a potential for something uncomfortably close to slavery.

As Henry Hazlitt points out in his

recent book Man Versus the Welfare State. "The only real cure for poverty is production." The free man, freely employed by his own choice, is the very cornerstone of America. Only when a careful investigation verifies that he genuinely cannot maintain himself, should he receive public assistance. Any other arrangement is a prescription for dependence, which always means loss of freedom.

THE INADEQUACY OF THE FEDERAL RAIL PLAN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, an integral necessity in our present and future culture is the availability of modern comprehensive transportation systems to facilitate our society's unprecedented demand for mobility.

The Federal Government has wisely chosen to perpetuate a medium of transportation, thought obsolete by many—the passenger train. Its leisurely pace and scenic routes afford the passenger a welcome and deserved relief from the pace of jet travel and the discomfort of long-distance auto journeys, as well as providing the opportunity for a most unique appreciation of our land's natural splendor and, unhappily, close exposure to our urban centers' ugliness.

The Department of Transportation has submitted for consideration a report offering directions for the future development of our passenger rail system.

I submit in the RECORD the following statement regarding the proposal:

I find the rail service proposal severely deficient in several categories.

The neglect of the West Coast corridor by not establishing a north-south line connecting Seattle and San Diego and major points between is most alarming. Certainly, this area of rapid population growth merits rail service becoming its present and future needs.

The failure of the report to itemize the points between which the trains shall operate and not just the terminal cities is disturbing.

I am concerned that the Department of Transportation's routes will isolate various population centers of the country from rail service. It should be noted that such areas, notably sections of Florida and the Southwest, have substantial groups of elder citizens, who are traditionally desirous of rail service.

I would urge the Department of Transportation to include in their rail system adequate service for all high density corridors. In addition to providing service, such strategy would preserve a greater percentage of trains and employment opportunities.

I would also urge explanation of essential passenger services not detailed in the report, and rectification of the above-mentioned deficiencies.

AN ACT OF VALOR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, on October 25, 1970, a vehicle occupied by a group of young girls returning from an outing collided with another vehicle on the Martinez-Benicia Bridge in California. The camper truck in which the girls were riding burst into flames upon impact. The driver and his wife, parents of two of the six girls, died immediately as did the driver of the other car.

The girls were trapped in the camper and were spared death only by the valiant efforts of three brave persons, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Ellis of Martinez, Calif., and Mr. Charles Barksdale of Vallejo, Calif.

These three people braved the searing heat and flames and pulled out the six girls. Four of the young ladies were critically injured. It is almost certain that all would have perished without the heroic rescue efforts of Mr. and Mrs. Ellis and Mr. Barksdale.

Mr. Speaker, I believe such individual acts of heroism deserve the commendation of the Congress, and I am pleased to bring their accomplishments to your attention:

CONCORD, CALIF.,
December 5, 1970.

Hon. Congressman JEROME WALDIE,
U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALDIE: Although you no doubt are aware of the terrible accident that took place on the Benicia-Martinez Bridge on October 25th, I am taking the liberty of enclosing letter and data on condition of children who were injured in this accident to acquaint you with the situation.

My purpose in writing you Mr. Waldie, is to ask if you could not do something to honor the people who rescued these children as I do not believe their action should go unrecognized. To say that these people were heroic would be putting it too mildly and I sincerely hope that someone will do something to express the appreciation of the people of this country to these wonderful people. God grant that there are many more like them!

For your information, my wife and I were returning home from a trip to Napa at the time this accident happened and were on the bridge shortly after it happened. As you probably know, the man and wife in the camper were killed as well as the driver of the station wagon who crashed into their camper. In all our lives, we never witnessed a more horrible accident as both the camper and station wagon were practically burnt to cinders.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. SPELLACY.

MEDICAL FUND FOR SIX LITTLE GIRLS,
Martinez, Calif., November 25, 1970.

Mr. JOHN R. SPELLACY,
Concord, Calif.

DEAR MR. SPELLACY: Thank you very much for your generous contribution to the Medical Fund. We are sure you will be pleased to know that more than $7,000 has been contributed to date.

Knowing of your interest, we are enclosing an information sheet describing the current physical condition of the girls. As you can see several of them are in very serious condition and face a long period of convalescence.

We greatly appreciate your concern.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT ELLIS.
PEGGY ELLIS.
CHARLES BARKSDALE.

MEDICAL FUND FOR SIX LITTLE GIRLS

(838 Escobar Street, Martinez, Calif., 94553)

Medical condition as of November 23, 1970.

Contact: Paul Hughey (415) 228-0800.

Six girls injured in accident on Benicia-Martinez Bridge on October 25, 1970:

Trudy Harrington, age 10[1]: orphaned; right hand amputated; severe fracture, right leg in traction; severe burns; and concern about vision in left eye.

Lisa Harrington, age 12: Orphaned; lacerations and burns; released from hospital; and should return to school shortly.

Susan Cashman, age 12[2]: Severe head injuries, brain surgery; lost left eye; fractures nose and face; burns, hands and face.

Julie Kongshoy, age 13 on November 2: Lacerations and burns; released from hospital; and should return to school shortly.

Kirsten Stewart, age 12[2]: Severe concussion, brain surgery; lacerations and burns; periodic periods of consciousness; lower jaw broken in two places; right leg badly broken; and severe burns arm and shoulders.

Dawn Harland, age 12[2]: Lost left hand thumb and parts of fingers on both hands; 3rd degree burns waist to head; severe fracture right arm; right foot broken; spleen removed, internal bleeding; eyelids burned away, do not know if Dawn has vision—she can discern light and dark—we are hopeful.

Adults who rescued girls from flaming wreckage: Robert and Peggy Ellis, Martinez, and Charles Barksdale, Vallejo.

Addresses:

[1] Good Samaritan Hospital, 15825 Samaritan Drive, Campbell, California 95008.

[2] O'Connor Hospital, 2105 Forest Avenue, San Jose, California 95128.

Send donations to: Medical Fund, Wells-Fargo Bank, P.O. Box 511, Martinez, California 94553.

(NOTE.—All materials, postage, and services donated.)

SURVIVOR BENEFITS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is time that a new look be taken into the present benefits available to survivors of our military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I represent an area largely populated by military retirees, and over the years I have become painfully aware of the woefully inadequate benefits survivors of retired military personnel have been receiving. It is for this reason that I have introduced H.R. 1199, proposed legislation which will improve our present survivor benefits program.

Essentially, my bill will improve the existing survivor benefits program by building a new and more far-reaching program based on social security. This proposal will enhance the social security benefits for widows at age 62 to assure a percentage of the serviceman's retired pay which represents a fair income replacement, provide a percentage of husband's retired pay during so-called gap years when the widow is under age 62 and receiving no social security, and provide the survivors a percentage of retired pay on top of social security benefits for widows still raising a family.

The main objectives, briefly outlined here, are intended to give those survivors of retired military personnel a fair shake in a world of spiraling costs. Many current widows of career military retirees, including widows of officers and enlisted men of long and outstanding service, are living in conditions of great economic deprivation because of the lack of adequate survivor benefits coverage in the past. Often, they are forced to exist on a grossly inadequate income.

Our Nation owes much to the unselfish service that our military men have given us and to their families whose sacrifices can only be understood by those who actually share the same experiences. It is my hope that this legislation will be of great benefit and comfort to the survivors of our military personnel.

AVOID ANOTHER VIETNAM

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Monday's Cleveland Press carried a very sound and reasoned editorial. As the editorial points out, we must not become involved in another "endless" Vietnam war through accident, misdirected policy, or by the "sliding" course of events.

The President and his administration has been directed by Congress and has voluntarily committed itself to avoiding involvement in Cambodia. The actions of the past few weeks in flying treetop level support missions, and talking about communications and medical support as well as American trainers is developing a credibility gap that threatens to create a "feeling of betrayal and dangerous division in this country." The internal health and progress of this Nation is at stake in the way that the administration handles the Cambodian problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the Cleveland Press editorial of January 25, 1971, at this point in the RECORD:

AVOID ANOTHER VIETNAM

The Viet Cong commando raid that destroyed the tiny Cambodian air force and panicked Phnom Penh can bring pressure on President Nixon to intervene more forcibly to save Cambodia.

Nixon would be well advised to resist that pressure.

Putting legalism aside, the President has struck a bargain with Congress, the public and the antiwar movement. He has been given time for an orderly withdrawal from Indochina. In return, he is expected to wind down the war and, above all, not to slide into "another Vietnam" in Cambodia.

Despite assurances that Nixon will carry out his end of the bargain, many Americans are worried by this country's deepening military involvement in Cambodia and the dubious explanations emanating from Washington.

Part of the trouble comes from the Administration's bad habit of making sweeping, ill-considered statements. Then, when the situation changes, it has to claim that it didn't mean what people heard it say, and the result is close to a Johnson-size credibility gap.

Last June 30, in announcing the success of the Cambodian incursion, the President said the United States would not furnish "air or logistics support" for South Vietnamese forces operating in Cambodia. This country since has provided both.

Nixon's national security adviser, Henry Kissinger, said U.S. aircraft would not give "close air support." They are now flying support missions at tree-top level.

Defense Secretary Laird has tried to dismiss these contradictions as mere "semantics." The issue is far more important than that. It bears on whether the public will believe and follow the Administration in foreign affairs.

The Senate's dove bloc, several of whose members scent the Democratic presidential nomination, is planning new hearings on Cambodia. The hearings should not be marred by political ambition.

Several senators already are charging violations of "the spirit if not the letter" of the Cooper-Church amendment restricting aid to Cambodia. This amendment bars introduction of U.S. ground combat troops or military advisers in that country. Despite dovish accusations, it has not been breached.

Laird has pointed out that the amendment doesn't bar mobile U.S. hospitals or communications men in Cambodia. It is hoped that he is merely demonstrating his skill at spotting loopholes and has no such intentions.

If Laird should put men on the ground in Cambodia—regardless of how loudly he insists they are not "ground combat troops"—it would be a tragic mistake. There could be a feeling of betrayal and dangerous division in this country.

Nixon is justified in sending arms and ammunition to the beleaguered Cambodians. With the aid of ground forces from neighboring South Vietnam, Cambodia may yet escape conquest by North Vietnam and the Viet Cong.

While the United States supports the anti-Communist government in Phnom Penh, it has no commitment to defend it on the ground and should not stumble into one.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF OUR SPACE PROGRAM

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Mr. George M. Low of National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) at the National Space Club luncheon in Washington, D.C., on January 26, 1971, at the Rayburn Building:

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF OUR SPACE PROGRAM

(By George M. Low)

I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity today to speak about the international aspects of NASA's space programs. The timing is most appropriate: we are actively engaged with the European nations in defining possible major cooperative efforts for the post-Apollo period; and only last week, we completed discussions with the Soviet Union concerning significant cooperation between the U.S. and the USSR in the exploration of space.

Greater international cooperation in space is one of the six specific objectives of President Nixon's space program, enunciated on March 7 of last year. The President stated: "I believe that both the adventures and the applications of space missions should be shared by all peoples. Our progress will be faster and our accomplishments will be greater if nations will join together in this effort, both in contributing the resources and in enjoying the benefits."

In my discussion today, I will first address cooperation with the Western Nations; then I will discuss our relationship with the Soviet Union.

COOPERATION WITH WESTERN NATIONS

In this area, we have a background of a decade of successful international space projects. These have involved 70 countries, 250 specific agreements, over two dozen joint satellite projects, and a run-out cost in excess of $400 million, with more than a 50 per cent share borne by other nations. The greater part of this work has been with the nations of Europe, although other western and neutral countries are included. This type of rewarding and cost-effective program, worked out in the 1960's is, of course, continuing.

In the 1970's, however, the opportunities exist for cooperation on a significantly larger scale. In line with the President's emphasis on international cooperation in the exploration of space, we wish to build a foundation for important benefit- and cost-sharing in the major space programs of the future. With this objective in mind, we have invited substantial Western World participation in our post-Apollo projects, the space shuttle, and the space station.

For over a year, we have made unusual efforts to give the European countries, Canada, Japan, and Australia—the countries having the most obvious potential for post-Apollo work-sharing—every chance to become fully acquainted with our plans and studies. Our purpose has been to provide these countries a proper basis for deciding, at the right time, whether or not they wish to commit their own resources to working with us.

We have been pleased by Europe's initial response in this informational phase. The European Space Conference, in particular, has put several million dollars of its own into studies of post-Apollo program possibilities. Some of its leading member countries have invested still larger amounts in related studies. And British, French, and West German firms, funded in Europe, are working with our prime contractors in the space shuttle design studies.

The problem for the potential participants is a serious one. There is little question that participation in major post-Apollo development tasks would be most rewarding in terms of technology. But Europe considers that it cannot now fund significant participation in the shuttle and fund an independent European booster program at the same time. A choice will most likely be necessary even if Europe funds only 10 per cent of the shuttle's price tab.

Naturally, if Europe is to give up the development of an independent launch capability to work with us, it wants to know what assurance there is that we will sell launch services for European satellite projects—some of them, perhaps, involving competitive commercial applications. Europe wants to know what the other conditions of its participation might be; for instance, what sort of voice it might have in post-Apollo program management and what access it could expect to program technology. Such questions are entirely understandable.

For us, of course, the detailed answers depend in some degree on the character and extent of European technical participation.

This has not yet been defined. Realistic management and political conditions must in the end be fitted to a specific technical program. Nevertheless, when a delegation of the European Space Conference came over here last September, we, with the other agencies concerned, provided the basic answers to the major questions troubling Europe—such as those I mentioned with regard to launch services, technology access and management roles.

We gave positive and generous answers, especially in the absence of even preliminary indications of Europe's potential participation. In summary, we said that we would sell launch services for projects consistent with peaceful purposes and existing international agreements. We said that general technical acess to the entire program would be available, but that technology at the level of commercial know-how would be transferred in either direction only where one side required it to complete its commitments to the other. We promised broad association in program management, but—since Europe is talking only of a 10 per cent share—we said that we would retain decisionmaking responsibility except where European costs were directly affected, in which case decisions would be joint.

It seems clear that the next moves are up to our European friends and other interested Western Nations. Our invitation to participate has been clear. Well over a year has been available for information and study. We have provided very broad access in this process, and we have given generous answers to questions regarding the conditions for participation. The urgent needs now are, first, that Europe develop a preliminary expression of its technical interests as quickly as possible. Second, that European personnel sit down with our project personnel to develop this preliminary concept into a joint technical proposition. Third, that we should together apply to this technical package the management and political conditions which are appropriate to it. Finally, the total package would be open for commitment by those nations prepared to go ahead with it.

Whether such a procedure will in fact begin and how far and fast it might then go remain to be seen. These matters must be resolved on the basis of national and international, short-range and long-range interests. If Europe wishes to proceed, we are prepared to do so on any basis consistent with our national program objectives and the requirements of good management. If Europe concludes that its interests lie elsewhere, we will, of course, continue our own programs by ourselves.

We believe that this program, or some other program involving new technology, should become the subject of a Western World joint enterprise: it is important that we in the West learn to work together, soon, on major technical projects. Our security, in the broad sense, depends on this. Increasingly, the problems of the modern world and its environment require large scale technical solutions along with political solutions. It is important that we learn to cooperate in such matters, so that, in President Nixon's words, we can share both the benefits and the costs of progress.

RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION

In the case of the Soviet Union (so far as space efforts are concerned), it is particularly important that we give clear recognition to both elements of the relationship: competition and cooperation.

We are competing with the USSR in the exploration of space, because accomplishments in space represent a measure of the state of our technology; and in today's world, the level of our technology is of first importance, strategically, economically, and politically.

We are striving to cooperate with the Soviets in the exploration of space, because we both live in a vast universe that must be explored, where important new knowledge is to be gained, for the benefit of all men, everywhere. It is in the United States interest to cooperate with all nations, including the Soviet Union, to share our resources in gaining this knowledge, and to share the results for the betterment of mankind.

And even though the words "competition" and "cooperation," at first glance, appear to be incompatible, the USSR and U.S. space programs are indeed developing along both of these lines: we were competing in technology, when they first put a man in space, or when we first landed a man on the moon. We are cooperating, for the sake of science, when we exchange lunar samples.

Competiton in Space Technology: In 1957, and in the years that followed, we were challenged, publicly, dramatically, and most successfully: Sputnik, Gagarin, and Luna demonstrated that the Soviet system could produce technological results that visibly gave the appearance of leadership.

We accepted that challenge—we decided to compete, to build a strong and powerful space capability for the United States. We built Gemini and Mariner and Saturn V and Apollo. By July 1969, we had clearly established and demonstrated our leadership.

But our leadership is under continual challenge by a capable and determined competitor, as evidenced by Luna 16 and 17, by a continuing Soviet manned flight activity, by the reported development of a new giant Soviet booster, by an R&D expenditure rate that exceeds ours, and by an increased Soviet launch rate while ours is decreasing: in 1970 alone, they placed 88 payloads into space to our 34.

Today the demonstrated lead is still ours, but it will not be an enduring lead without major new initiatives on our part—initiatives like the space shuttle and the exploration of the outer planets proposed in the President's space program for the 1970's.

Cooperation in Science and Application: We now come to my last subject, one that is particularly timely: cooperative efforts with the Soviet Union. On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of last week, we held detailed discussions, covering a broad spectrum of space research, in Moscow. On Thursday, we jointly initialled a document summarizing the results of these discussions—a document that is to be confirmed by both sides within 60 days and then made public.

The Soviet delegation was headed by Academician M. V. Keldysh, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. His delegation included 15 top Soviet scientists. I headed the United States delegation and was accompanied by Dr. John Naugle and Mr. Arnold Frutkin from NASA, Mr. William Anders of the Space Council, Mr. Arthur Johnson of NOAA, and Mr. Robert Packard from the Department of State.

At the opening session of our talks, I conveyed President Nixon's desire to expand international cooperation in space with the Soviet Union as well as with other nations.

Our discussions were frank, open, and to the point. The document we prepared, jointly, is quite specific. It spells out certain areas of agreement, and it presents a detailed list of proposals for further discussions, including the following:

Joint consideration of the objectives and results of space research,

The improvement of existing weather data exchanges,

Coordinated research with meteorological sounding rockets,

Techniques for studying the natural environment using space and conventional means,

The expanded exchange of data on space biology and medicine,

And the exchange of lunar samples.

In this last area, we specifically agreed, initially, to exchange three grams of sample obtained from Luna 16, for three grams each from Apollo 11 and 12. These relatively small amounts are sufficient for detailed scientific examination of a comparative nature.

We did not, during last week's discussions, hold additional meetings on compatible docking arrangements. This item was not on our agenda, because the docking discussions are well underway, and the planned exchange of information is taking place. We, therefore, merely took note of the fact that those talks were proceeding well.

While in Moscow, we were also invited to visit STAR City, the training area of the cosmonauts. We were welcomed by Cosmonauts Beregovoy, Nikolayev, Leonov, Shatalov, and Valentina Tereshkova. We were shown the Soyuz mission trainer, and were invited to attempt to dock two Soyuz spacecraft in their docking trainer. While there, I also presented a plaque in memory of Yuri Gagarin from the U.S. astronauts. The visit was warm and friendly.

In my remarks in Moscow, after we finished our discussions, I noted that I was pleased with the results. But I also noted that this is only a beginning; that we have now set the framework for cooperative efforts, but that much remains to be done.

Nevertheless, the results of the discussions so far met my hopes and exceeded my expectations. With the framework that has been established, and particularly with the attitudes exhibited and desires expressed by both sides, we have set the stage for substantial cooperation in space research with the Soviet Union, for the benefit of all.

WHY GRANDMOTHER LOVES ROCK AND ALL THAT JAZZ

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a thoroughly enjoyable article in the October issue of Black Enterprise magazine. It concerns a charming grandmother, Mrs. Ernestine White, who has made great progress in bridging the generation gap by combining a sharp business sense with a keen ear for the contemporary musical sounds: jazz, soul, and rock. Mrs. White owns and operates one of Detroit's largest independent discount record shops in partnership with her beautiful and businesslike daughter, Rita White Butler.

Ever since 1953, when the White family first reached a decision to join the music industry, White's Records has been known for courteous service and a choice variety of stock that ranges from Bach to Hendrix. Their popularity is evident not only among the many music lovers of Detroit, but also among the international artists whose records White's so effectively merchandises.

As one who is a good friend and customer of these personable ladies, it is with pleasure that I insert the following article in the RECORD:

THE SOUND IS PURE GOLD: WHY GRANDMOTHER LOVES POP, JAZZ, AND HARD ROCK

Way back in the fifties, before Detroit became the Motown City, hit records provided little more than background music for Ernestine White. She was too busy making artificial flowers to pay much attention to what any Detroit Dee Jay was saying. Not so today.

Today, the 57-year old Mrs. White, a grandmother, can tell you if Eddie Harris, Miles Davis or Sly Stone will outsell the Cowsills in concert or on record. She knows more about tapes and stereo accessories than any of the kids in the neighborhood.

Ernestine White knows and is known by all the big regarding artists who live in or play Detroit. She's a partner in White's Records, one of Detroit's largest independent discount record shops.

Dee Jays Fred Goree and Butterball, Jr. from Detroit's soul station, WCHB, do live shows from Mrs. White's store window. A loud speaker outside her shop alerts all of Ferry Park to the latest hit sounds. And, if you stroll past White's Records as late as midnight (or 2 A.M. on weekends) you may find Motown headliners or jazz stars signing autographs for fans.

"Oldies, but Goodies," psychedelic rock or underground jazz—whatever your tastes, Detroit music buffs will tell you, "If you can't get it at White's, it doesn't exist!" That's why last year, Ernestine White and her partner-daughter Rita, grossed over $500,000 in sales.

How did Mrs. White do it? In 1952, she was a widow with four young children to raise. With funds from her husband's insurance, Ernestine White went into business.

By the time her daughters reached high school, Mrs. White was the largest manufacturer of artificial flowers in the Midwest, when she rented a small shop on Ferry Street. Selling records started as a sideline. Daughter, Barbara, who was only 14 at the time, suggested they sell records to increase the walk-in trade.

"It sounded like a good idea, so I stocked a couple hundred 78's," Mrs. White remembers. "I thought that was all there was to it, until people began asking for records I had never heard of.

"I soon discovered that you either sell records or you don't. There's no such thing as stocking them for a sideline." The teenage Whites (daughters Rita, Barbara, and Marlene and son, Jerome, Jr.) concentrated on building record sales.

Rita is quick to dispel any "overnight success" myths. "Just when we were getting off the ground, a shop opened right across the street and sold records cheaper than we did. That's when we decided to go discount," Rita explains. "We practically broke our backs to survive. Competition from dime stores and department stores is one thing, but another record shop right in the neighborhood is something else entirely!"

At White's, singles sell for $.79; albums are $1.00 off the list price, and a $1.98 line of LP's is featured. "Oldies, but Goodies" bring in a good share of the profits, selling at 3 for $1.00. Inventory for the first quarter of 1970 was $83,700.00. That included a stock of cassettes, radios, stereos, music accessories and records. Sixty per cent of White's profits come from the sale of albums and tapes; the remaining 40 per cent from sales of singles, tape recorders and accessories. Rita says that vandalism and shoplifting from teenagers cause little or no problem. "The only youngsters that come into our store are those with money to buy. And, we have an armed guard on duty 24 hours a day. Besides adults between the ages of 21 and 45 account for most of our sales."

Part of what made White's a store worth over half a million dollars a year is good advertising and promotion. "Next to sleepless nights," Rita smiles, "advertising has been the key to our growth. Business doubled with our first 30-second radio spots on the soul stations.

"We also get good response with bus posters and local newspaper ads.

"Then, too, there's always something going on at the shop. When big name recording artists are in town, we have autograph parties. Recently we started promoting jazz concerts."

What about competition from white retail record shops in the area? "It's not much of a problem" says Rita, "because in four hours we can have any record for a customer if it's not already in stock. Most retail shops take as long as a week to order records for their customers."

The Whites order mechandise directly from distributors and pay prices slightly lower than retail outlets. For example, a record album that lists at $5.98 in retail stores costs the White's $3.00. The retailer pays $3.75 for the same album. White's will sell it for $4.95 and the retailer will charge $5.98.

"Our overhead costs are the same as any retail store's personnel (they employ 15), stock, etc. But being a discount store, we get larger discounts from distributors. Profits come from the volume of merchandise we sell." What kind of advice does Rita White Butler give prospective record shop owners?

"For years," she says "we just kept putting our money back into the business."

ADDRESS BY NEW YORK STATE COMPTROLLER ARTHUR LEVITT

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the New York State Bankers Association in New York City this week the Honorable Arthur Levitt, comptroller of the State of New York, had some very sage words to offer on the perils and opportunities facing all of us in the coming years. I recommend to my colleagues the reading of the remarks of the extremely capable comptroller of the State of New York. Under the permission heretofore unanimously granted me, I include his address at this point:

THE NEW YEAR—HOW NEW FOR FINANCE?

(By State Comptroller Arthur Levitt)

We meet tonight in the first month of a new year—a time when it is rather fashionable to wave aside the past in favor of a better future. You have caught something of this spirit in the very name of this, your Midwinter Meeting. It suggests that the worst of the weather may be over, and that Spring may arrive in due time. I hope that this is also true in the affairs of men—that we may look to a new season in our economy, free from the inclemencies of the past.

But in truth our economy will not stand still long enough for us to mark a new era. It observes no calendar. We live in a constant stream of economic forces, in which yesterday fuses with today and today merges into tomorrow. We clock the forces only by measuring their changes in direction, because change is the only time known in such a context.

And so tonight I shall explore with you a few of the changes we should be seeking in the world of finance—and more particularly, from my point of view, in the sphere of public finance. The two are increasingly related. And I do so because the American people desperately want a new season in the financial life of our nation, if the power exists to bring it about.

You and I have no greater duty than to help move our economy toward a better tomorrow, toward a day when the security of the people will be stronger than the latest quotation of the dollar. We cannot ordain it so, we must make it so. And this, it seems to me, should be the basic thrust of the new year into which we are moving.

If we would mark changes in direction, we must first establish some points of reference. Are there not some concepts, some basic strengths, which anchor our course? Indeed there are; and here, at once, is the glory of our past and the hope of our future.

I shall mention three of these concepts, so basic to our way of life. To be sure, they are truisms; and sometimes one is breached in favor of another, but without them we would have no nation as we know it. They are:

First, our high standard of integrity.

Second, our faith in free enterprise.

Third, our commitment to the common good.

Each citizen knows these concepts best from his own experience. All the books and lectures on the subject have far less meaning than what we actually find in our day-to-day life—something which our young people are trying to tell us, perhaps, from their own viewpoint today. I am glad to testify that the history of my own office is replete with examples of fundamental strengths in our economic life.

There is a matchless story of the integrity of the banking world back in the tenure of one of my predecessors, Comptroller Church. The year was 1859. And here is the substance of a remarkable letter he wrote to the President of the Bank of Manhattan Company:

"DEAR SIR: I regret to be compelled to inform you that the Legislature, at its recent session, neglected to provide any means to pay the interest on the new canal debt of $12,000,000 * * *. The amount required * * * will be * * * an aggregate of $385,000, necessary before the assembling of another Legislature. * * * I have ventured to write this note for the purpose of inquiring whether, in view of the unexpected and extraordinary omission of the Legislature, and the disastrous consequences which it would produce, your bank will not advance the amount required for this object, and thus save the State from the disgrace of having its obligations dishonored.

"You will of course understand that the advance, if made, must be voluntary on the part of the bank. I possess no authority as a public officer to borrow the money, or bind the State to repay it; nor can I tender any other security than the expression of entire confidence in the integrity of the people, and that they will, when the subject is brought to their attention, avail themselves of the first opportunity to vindicate their honor and credit by providing ample means to reimburse the bank for any advances which it may make, and by the adoption of such measures as will effectually prevent a repetition of similar neglect in the future."

Two days later, the President of the bank mailed back the reply, which contained these historic sentences:

"The high credit which this State so deservedly enjoys, both in this country and in Europe, and which has always been regarded with just pride by its citizens, must be preserved untarnished, and its obligations must not be dishonored. If neither the Comptroller nor the Commissioners of the Canal Fund possess authority to make a loan for the payment of the interest, and no other means can be made available, relying upon the ability, the honor and the faith of the State to repay the money, this institution will advance the necessary amount."

Such integrity is indeed one of our basic strengths. I have also witnessed in my office the second concept I mentioned, our faith in free enterprise. You might not think this true of a governmental operation but, if so, I wish you could read my morning mail. Every incursion by the State into the realm of private affairs brings a rash of protest from alarmed citizens, many of whom write me in the hope that I can withhold payments on one program or another. Or they seek, through my audit powers, to expose wasteful operations which tend to duplicate that which is best left to community initiative. We are constantly conscious of the power of the people, for it is in their name—and in their name alone—that we act. If this were not true of all government, free enterprise would long since have vanished from our society.

And this brings me to the third concept I mentioned: our commitment to the common good. If we listened only to the critics, we would think this is not so. The critics prate of the greed of industry, of the cold calculations of the bankers, of the self-interest of the professions, and of the evil of all politicians. They deny even the basic decency of the people. They must in fact dislike themselves.

Here again I am pleased to bear witness from public office. The comptrollership of a state the size of New York, with billions in cash flow and more billions in investments, requires a great amount of expert advice. I have called upon bankers, lawyers, accountants, insurance executives, labor leaders, and other qualified citizens, to serve upon a variety of advisory councils and committees. Not one has ever refused, except for other compelling commitments. They have come from all parties, from every part of the State. Not one has ever submitted a bill or expected any other form of reward. On the contrary, they have given freely of themselves toward the common good of the State. And my experience, I am sure, is duplicated in much of the public life of our nation.

And so, for all of these reasons, we can face the future secure in these convictions—that there is a basic integrity in our economic life, that there is unlimited strength in the enterprise of the American people, and that our ultimate goal must be the common good of all. These are the concepts which anchor us, much as economic forces disturb our course.

The disturbances have indeed been great. I need do no more than outline the major trends, so well known are they to every one of us in this room tonight:

Inflation has continued to take its toll from the usable income of the people, just as it has robbed the elderly, the infirm, and the retired. And this is so, despite an increase in unemployment, which was supposed to be the price of controlling inflation.

Meanwhile, the cost of public construction has soared, beyond even the point which could be ascribed to inflation. State after state, city after city, has found that a program planned only a year or so ago must now be revised to bring it within fiscal capacity. Or worse, means are sought to go ahead anyway, regardless of cost.

To these events, the bond market has responded, until recently, with rising fever. The cost of borrowing is still exhorbitantly high, by any normal standards. Our State has suspended interest rate limits altogether, as the only practical step to take under the circumstances.

Not only interest rate limits, but other limits are under pressure. I refer especially to the constitutional tax limits of our cities and city school districts, because some of them claim they are being strangled by tax limits set ages ago.

But so are the taxpayers being strangled, as the various layers of government add tax on tax, all in response to what we refer to as demands by the people, more and more people, for increased services.

All in all these factors, and the other events in our national economy, have welled up to a call for stronger action in Washington. We seek to cool the economy, to make a national attack on the urban problems that so vex our environment, and to find some formula for sharing the federal revenues. And many are the predictions of disaster if these steps do not succeed.

All this is bad news, to those who would like to think we can go on doing business as usual. But I do not mean to appear this evening as a prophet of gloom. Rather, as I said at the beginning, I believe we are in the position to seek change, based on the lessons we have learned from the past. And, as is so often true in life, our health may be the better for the experience.

Finally, then, what of the future as we move deeper into this fateful decade of the seventies?

We can respond to inflation, but we cannot adequately hedge against it. We can try to predict a future rate, but we cannot rely on it. And the trouble, it seems to me, is that our fundamental assumption is all wrong: We assume that inflation has become an inevitable part of our economy, with only the rate in doubt.

This is the inflationary psychology, on which the disease itself feeds. We need stronger medicine to root out the disease than mere palliatives. We need a nation-wide effort to reduce spending, public and private, to a prudent level. We need sensible priorities in our economic life—a forbearance of debt incurrence except for essential long-range projects. And we must make sure that wage increases are matched by increased productivity if we are to meet the challenge of inflation. Only when we get back on the road of steadily improving productivity in our economy can we look forward with assurance to lower unemployment and interest rates, to the elimination of inflation, and to a broad and sustained upswing in living standards throughout the nation.

As the fiscal officer of a large state, I have watched inflation have a worse impact on government than on private industry. There are several reasons, but the most important reason is that government deals mainly in service. Its major expenses are for those things which have been inflated the most—wages, the cost of materials and supplies, and interest on debt. Such selected costs have gone up faster than the consumer price index. I recently put the matter this way: in terms of the 1958 dollar, the consumer dollar is now worth about 75 cents, but the government dollar in New York is worth only about 61 cents, according to a study by my office. The effect on taxpayers is tremendous.

What we need, nation-wide in state and local governments, is long-range planning, and the establishment of reasonable priorities. For this reason I have long recommended five-year projections and planning It seems to me that we must take this prudent step if we are to cure our present fiscal ills.

For all of this, there is one term that sums up the direction in which we must change our economic forces—that term is self-discipline.

Our basic concept of integrity, of free enterprise, and of the common good, prove that we have the capacity to continue and enhance the greatness of America. Our recent economic disturbances have arisen in large part, from a lack of discipline as we have rushed into greater and greater economic activity. And the way to the future is clear, as we regain our national genius for curing ourselves of our own ills, once we tackle them.

Am I speaking of a loss of freedom, of some regimentation of our people? Not at all. Gentlemen, freedom has been defined as the opportunity for self-discipline. It is an opportunity, in this year 1971, we may never have again.

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of solid waste disposal must be treated in an effective way if we are to reverse the process of spoilation of our environment. In this effort it is vital that private industry apply technological know-how to combat pollution and preserve the quality of our environment.

As the following letter indicates, some private firms are working diligently to develop and apply technology to prevent further harm to our environment. Such efforts are commendable, indeed, and they indicate the potential for very favorable results from cooperation between private citizens and industry to solve our environmental problems.

The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BELL: A year ago I wrote all legislators in Adolph Coors Company's 11-state marketing area to advise that our company was embarking upon a cash-for-cans aluminum recovery program. We did that because this company and its distributors are solemnly committed to fight litter and solid waste in order to help keep America the kind of place we all want it to be. In light of that commitment, I believe you will be interested to know these things:

Public response to the cash-for-cans program has vastly exceeded our expectations. During the first 11 months of 1970, our 166 distributors received 5,218,463 pounds of aluminum or more than *120-million cans.* We paid the organizations and individuals who picked up that aluminum $521,846 for doing so. The program is not restricted to Coors cans . . . we pay for all aluminum containers, of whatever brand. Literally hundreds if not thousands of youth, civic and service organizations are cooperating with this program; they use the dime-a-pound proceeds for worthwhile community causes of all kinds.

Litter has been defined as the visible portion of the solids waste iceberg. Although unsightly and repugnant, litter is but a small fraction of the real, long-range environmental problem of solids waste disposal. We are confident that in the long run recycling of aluminum containers will be a more satisfactory answer than returnable glass bottles in minimizing solids waste. For example, both Pepsi Cola and Coca Cola report that they only average 90% return on returnable soft-drink bottles which are sold for home consumption. In densely populated urban areas, the rate of return drops as low as 75%. One thousand returnable bottles weigh about 750 pounds. At 90% return, each 1,000 bottles sold adds 75 pounds of glass to litter and solids wastes. One thousand aluminum cans weigh only 40 pounds. With no salvage at all the aluminum cans would comprise only about half the weight of solids waste that returnable bottles do. Yet we are confident of reaching a minimum 75% recycle level given the time to do so.

Although we regard litter as the pressing and immediate problem and our initial efforts with the cash-for-cans program have mainly been directed at correcting litter, we view the impending and ominous matter of solids waste and its disposal as the real and serious long-range environmental challenge. Thus, we regard aluminum can salvage and recycle as a permanent part of our overall operation. Of all of our management objectives it has the top priority. Our hope is that we will be allowed sufficient time to make it work. Our success to date exceeds our fondest hopes although we regard it as just a start.

Adolph Coors Company and its distributors will intensify their efforts to make the cash-for-cans program even more successful in 1971. We anticipate that far more aluminum will be recovered for recycling. More and more companies are turning to aluminum packaging because they realize its environmental value. Further, in 1971 our company will discontinue use of the tall tinplate can replacing it with an aluminum can of our own manufacture. When that changeover is complete, *all* canned beer marketed by Coors will be in aluminum cans.

A new and important program at Adolph Coors Company will provide for the salvage and reuse or recycle of our convenience bottles which have heretofore been nonreturnable. All such bottles will soon have a redemption value of one cent each. The majority of these will be suitable for reuse. Those that are not will be returned as cullet to a glass factory located a few miles from our brewery in Golden and melted up to be made into new bottles—that is—recycled. Glass like aluminum can be infinitely recycled.

Thus with the completion of our 1971 changeover on the tall can from tinplate to aluminum and the immediate adoption of a complete system of returnable bottles, every Coors can and bottle will have a cash return value. Both plans will be in effect throughout our entire marketing area . . . Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah and Wyoming.

One other thing. A top management committee at our company now is meeting regularly to determine how we can *recycle everything that Adolph Coors Company uses* . . . not only aluminum and glass, but also wood, paper and the rest. We have found some answers; we are seeking a total answer. This effort also has top management priority.

Our company is totally dedicated to the business of keeping this nation clean and inviting. We share and appreciate your concern with this vital problem. You have my personal pledge that Adolph Coors Company will be an outstanding leader in the preservation of a quality environment for America.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM K. COORS,
Chairman of the Board.

GRAZING FEES—PART X

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, late in 1969 the Secretary of the Interior deferred for 1 year an increase in the fees for grazing on valuable public lands. The increase was scheduled by his predecessor and was based on studies by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. These studies showed that fees for grazing on public lands were only a fraction of the worth of the forage.

Attempts to get the facts basic to the Secretary's decision were the subject of my first 9 statements in this series.

On November 6, 1970, I wrote the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, reminding them that it soon would be time to reach a position on the grazing fees for the year beginning March 1, 1971. I also asked some questions. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

GRAZING FEES ON NATIONAL FOREST RANGE—PAST HISTORY—AND PRESENT POLICY

INTRODUCTION

The National Forest System, administered by the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, contains 106 million acres of range environment found in 36 states. This rangeland extends from the vast prairies of the Dakotas to the arid semi-desert of the Southwest; and from the high mountain valleys of the far West and Intermountain region to the piney woods of the deep South. Management of these lands is based on the multiple-use concept emphasized in the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of June 1960. Full consideration is given to five primary resource values—timber, water, forage, wildlife, and recreation.

The Forest Service administers its nationwide program of range resource management with the following major objectives:

(1) To develop the range resources on all National Forest System lands to their reasonably attainable potential, and to manage them for sustained grazing in harmony with other resource values;

(2) To promote the stability of family ranches and farms in local areas where National Forests and National Grasslands are located;

(3) To provide nationwide leadership in conservation, development, and utilization of forest range including woodlands and brush-covered wildlands in mountainous areas.

(4) To practice and demonstrate sound grassland agriculture and conservation measures on the National Grasslands and promote similar practices on associated non-Federal lands.

BACKGROUND OF THE PERMIT SYSTEM

The Forest Service administers grazing privileges on the National Forest System lands under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture based on the Act of June 4, 1897, the Act of April 24, 1950, and Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Livestock grazing permits are allocated to ranch operators on the basis of certain qualifications. These include prior use of the public lands before they were established as National Forests or National Grasslands; local needs for additional grazing to round out yearlong ranching operations; and ownership or control of sufficient base ranch property to provide forage and feed for animals during the time they are not grazed on Federal lands. A primary consideration is to obtain physically well-balanced livestock units through the combined use of public and privately owned grazing lands.

Ranch operators who qualify are issued 10-year term grazing permits by the Forest Service. A permit has provision for renewal. It is validated each year by annual payment of a grazing fee. A permit may be re-issued to the qualified purchaser of base property or to the qualified purchaser of permitted livestock.

The permit specifies the number of animals to be grazed on the public lands along with the season of use. The Forest Service may make annual adjustments in the amount of grazing allowed in order to meet the estimated sustained grazing capacity of the range. Permitted use may be adjusted by limits on the number of animals allowed on the range, or by altering the length of the grazing season.

USERS HAVE GRAZING PRIVILEGES

About 63,000 farmers and ranchers graze livestock on National Forest System lands. Of these, approximately 19,000, or nearly one-third hold 10-year grazing permits for which a fee is charged. More than 41,000 permits are exempt from fees. The remaining 3,000 are private land permits and crossing permits. Most of the free grazing is for small numbers of milk cows or non-commercial work animals of a non-commercial nature needed by local rural residents.

Grazing privileges are vital to sustain the economic livelihood of approximately 19,000 farm and ranch families who raise commercial livestock herds in more than 600 rural communities. These permittees have a substantial investment in their ranch and farm operation. They own 45 million acres of their own land, and lease another 21 million acres of private land. Their livestock holdings total 3.3 million cattle, 4.2 million sheep, and 158,000 horses. Many of the permittees rely heavily on supplemental grazing provided by National Forest System lands as a means to maintain economically viable operations.

In 1968 some 7.5 million animals grazed on National Forest System lands. This grazing use amounted to 11.1 million animal unit months. (An animal unit month is the amount of grazing required by a cow for one month).

HISTORY OF GRAZING FEES

Charges for grazing were first made on the National Forests in 1906. The first regulation provided for possible fee increases based on markets, transportation, and demand for permits.

The method for calculating grazing fees was changed in 1931, based on studies of National Forest grazing values conducted during the 1920's. Forage quality, accessibility, water resources, proximity to market, and livestock handling costs were considered. Basic premise of the study was that private land data on range values, or rental rates on private rangelands, could be used to determine the use value of National Forest range. Base fees varied from area to area, depending on local private range lease rates and other local factors.

Base fees established in 1931 were adjusted annually by formulae expressing the relationship between the previous year's average price for beef cattle or lambs in the western states and prices in established base periods. Under that formula fees had increased in 1968 to 3½ times what they were in 1931.

However, over the years, it became clear that National Forest grazing fees still were consistently lower than lease rates on private land having comparable grazing value.

STEPS LEADING TO 1969 FEE CHANGES

In January 1969, the Bureau of the Budget announced a revision in fees for the grazing of livestock on western Federal lands.

The chronology of the various directives and studies leading to the grazing fee revision is as follows:

1951. Congress (Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952) directed each Federal agency to prescribe fees or charges that are fair and equitable and as uniform as practicable among the agencies.

1959. Comptroller General recommended that fair compensation be obtained for use of Federal lands. He also recommended more consistency in grazing fees charged by various Federal agencies and a joint study to arrive at a uniform fees system.

1959. Bureau of the Budget issued Circular A-25, pursuant to the 1951 Act, establishing the basic principle that where Federally-owned resources are leased, a fair market value should be obtained for use of them.

1960. Representatives of Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and the Interior formed a task force now known as the Interdepartmental Grazing Fee Committee. This task force was to study the fee situation on all public grazing lands, and to formulate recommendations for a more uniform approach to fee establishment among the Federal agencies. At the same time, the Bureau of the Budget began a study of user charges for all services and products provided by the Government and Federally managed natural resources, including grazing.

1961. The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, began a joint program of grazing fee studies.

1964. Bureau of the Budget issued study report entitled "Natural Resources Users Charges Study." It outlined guidelines for establishing grazing fees:

a. That a uniform basis should be used by all Federal agencies.

b. Fees should be based on economic value of use of public lands to users.

c. Economic value should be set by an appraisal that will provide a fair return to the Government and equitable treatment to the users.

1966. Data collection project. This was carried out by the Statistical Reporting Service, USDA, for the Forest Service and BLM. Its purpose was to obtain data on costs of grazing use on some 98 National Forests, 19 National Grasslands, and 48 BLM grazing districts in the western states. These data were to be studied and analyzed for evaluating current fee structures.

During the field survey, the principal livestock grazers, grazing associations, and financial institutions cooperated with Federal agencies in obtaining economic data that could be used in determining an equitable fee system.

The Statistical Reporting Service gathered data on non-fee costs of using public and private lands, lease rates on private grazing lands, and the market value placed by permittees on grazing permits.

Some 10,000 individuals were interviewed and more than 14,000 questionnaires were collected by the Statistical Reporting Service in the 1966 survey. Interviewees included Forest Service and BLM grazing permittees, ranchers who lease private grazing lands, and lending institutions.

1967. Analysis and discussion of 1966 survey data.

Preliminary results of evaluations were discussed with livestock representatives in October. This was one of a series of conferences with the livestock industry and concerned organizations. These included the Secretary of Agriculture's Advisory Committee on Mutiple Use of the National Forests, American Farm Bureau Federation, National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, and several National conservation organizations. These groups were kept informed and their comments and recommendations were solicited.

1968. The new fee schedule was proposed by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture on November 15, 1968. A proposed regulation implementing the program in the western National Forests was submitted for review to the Forest Service's local grazing advisory boards and other interested organizations. Interior published its proposed fee regulations in the Federal Register November 16 and reviewed the proposals with its grazing district advisory boards and with its National Advisory Board Council.

An Interagency Technical Committee was formed to recommend ways for testing the combined FS-BLM grazing fees data for possible common fee areas. The Committee included representatives from Statistical Reporting Service, Economic Research Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Bureau of the Budget ex officio. The following conclusions were summarized in an October 1968 report:

a. Forest Service and BLM data can be combined. Survey data did not provide a basis for differential fees between the Forest Service and BLM.

b. Cost data collected in 1966 survey statistically supported only one base fee in the West.

c. An adjusted western-wide difference between private lease rates and public costs, excluding the grazing fee, was $1.23 per animal unit month for both cattle and sheep.

These conclusions provided the basis for establishing fair market value of grazing use on western public lands. "Fair market value" is defined as the difference between total costs of operating on private leased grazing lands and total non-fee costs of operating on National Forest System lands. These costs include lost animals, veterinary services, moving livestock to and from permitted areas, herding, salting and feeding, travel to and from permitted areas, water, horses, fence and water maintenance, development depreciation, and other miscellaneous costs. The private costs also include the private lease rates.

PRESENT FEE SYSTEM

Revised grazing fees as announced by the Bureau of the Budget, were put into effect in January of 1969 for certain Federal lands administered by the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior. The announcement followed the publication of Section 231.5 in the Federal Register of January 14, 1969 (Vol. 34, No. 9, pages 504 and 505), giving complete details of the new fee system.

On National Forest System lands, the revised fee system applies in 1969 to 15,000 out of a total of 17,300 grazing permits. The new fees apply to all National Forests in the 11 western states, plus South Dakota and Nebraska. Changes in fees for grazing on other National Forests and on the National Grasslands will be implemented starting in 1970.

Schedules call for base grazing fees to increase in ten annual steps until they reach the 1966 fair market value of $1.23 per animal unit month. Annual adjustments to the fair market value will be determined by an index of the preceding year's private lease rates. For 1969 this adjustment was plus two cents. The $1.23 fair market value for use of the public range resource was based on an economic analysis of the 1966 survey data.

Calculations have indicated that the 1969 fair market value of grazing use on public lands is $1.25. This represents the $1.23 base adjusted by the current private lease rate index of two cents as described above.

Grazing fees for a large percentage of permit holders will continue to be less than this calculated fair market value figure for a 10-year period while the fees are raised in annual steps to minimize the effect on stockmen.

As announced in January 1969, fees on western National Forests managed by the Forest Service will range from $0.31 to $1.25 per animal unit month for cattle. Sheep fees will be from $0.06 to $0.25 per sheep month. (Five sheep grazing for one month is the equivalent to one animal unit month). In 1968, these National Forest fees ranged from 21 cents to $1.80 per animal unit month.

PERMIT VALUE

Studies of the grazing fee data confirmed the fact that among farmers and ranchers grazing permits had accrued a value in themselves because in effect they had been bought, sold, and used as collateral. Disposition of the permit value per se because of a point of contention.

Members of the livestock industry took the position that capitalized permit values should be considered a cost to those who graze public lands. They contended that on that basis the permit values should be included as a cost in calculating the fair market value of public grazing use.

The Forest Service has not agreed, for the following reasons:

1. Livestock grazing on National Forests is a privilege and not a right that can be transferred. It has been so considered since Secretary's Regulation 10 in 1905. Court cases have substantiated this interpretation and have held transfers of National Forest grazing privileges by permittees as illegal and unenforceable.

2. Special interests cannot be granted to any user group on the National Forests. To do so would erode the capacity of National Forest land to serve other people. Many grazing areas must also serve other public interests—wildlife, recreation, water and timber production. These public interests must be protected. If livestock grazers are given special rights to range resources of these areas, other users could not expect an equal level of benefits.

3. Recognition of permit value as a deductible cost in fee calculation would in effect compensate permittees for:

a. That portion of the value they had paid to private individuals and

b. That portion of the value develops through appreciation over time as the gap widened between fee charged and fair market value.

4. If permit values were recognized, permittees could conceivably demand compensation for any portion of a grazing permit value no longer available to them because of Forest Service resource management actions affecting size of the permit. The U.S. would then have to take similar action to reimburse permittees deprived of the use of other resources on the National Forest System.

5. The grazing fee value described has come into existence primarily because the fees paid to the Government for use of the resource have been less than the fair market value of that use. The economic impact of the grazing permit value is the result of a value which ranchers have built up among themselves in their transactions of livestock business. No payment for a permit value has ever been made to the real owner of the resource upon which the permit value is based.

A recent court decision relating to the inclusion of capital costs in determining fair market value for grazing fees was filed in the U.S. District Court for New Mexico at Albuquerque, on May 9, 1969. The plaintiff charged the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior acted illegally in determining fair market values for grazing fees without including the capital costs of permits and the costs of improvements made by the permittees on public lands. The plaintiff also charged that the fee schedule was a violation because it did not meet the test of reasonableness.

The Court determined against the plaintiff on the following principles:

a. The statutes entrust the Secretaries with wide areas of judgment and discretion in setting fees.

b. The Secretaries acted within the area of discretion and judgment committed to them by law in promulgating the new regulations.

c. It was not shown that the Secretaries failed to consider all of the factors as directed by Congress.

d. The Secretaries did not exceed statutory authorities in excluding permit value as an element of cost in operating on the Federal lands.

SOME FEES CONSIDERATIONS

The decision to revise the fees was reached after careful consideration of the effects upon livestock producers and obligations to the general public. The public obtains benefits from recreation, water, wildlife, and timber resources from many of the same lands under Multiple Use management principles emphasized in the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of June 1960.

In determining new fees policies, the impact on the permittee, who is most closely concerned, and on community stability, rural economic needs and Government programs were important considerations in addition to the foregone Federal Revenue and the rights of the general public to obtain multiple use benefits of Federal lands.

The Forest Service will continue its long established practice of issuing no-charge grazing permits for non-commercial livestock up to 10 head owned by resident farmers and ranchers. It also recognizes the problem of small operators in low-income areas where opportunities for off-ranch income are limited. Special attention will be given to this matter in areas where it deserves consideration.

The new fees system does not affect the tenure of a Forest Service grazing permit. Term permits will be issued for the amount of grazing available on the National Forest System within the constraints of proper management and needs of the American public including the livestock producing farmer and rancher.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. *How long has the Forest Service been charging for grazing?*

A. Grazing fees were authorized in 1905 by Regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture and the first fees were charged by the Forest Service in 1906. These initial fees were based upon the criterion of "reasonableness," and varied from place to place depending upon ". . . advantages and locality of the reserve." In 1931, the method of determining these fees was changed to include factors such as accessibility of grazing lands, forage quality, availability of water, nearness to markets and costs of livestock handling. The 1931 fees varied from area to area and were adjusted annually, based on the previous year's livestock prices.

Q. *How many acres of National Forest System lands are now used for grazing?*

A. A total of 106 million acres make up the range environment on the National Forest System. These same lands contribute many other benefits through multiple-use management of all resources.

Q. *How many paid grazing permits does the Forest Service issue?*

A. The Forest Service has 18,800 10-year term grazing permits in effect for 1.4 million head of cattle and 2.3 million sheep. The new fees system in 1969 involves 15,000 of these permits for 1.2 million cattle and 2.2 million sheep on National Forests in the West.

Q. *What about the remainder of the cattle and sheep? Why aren't they included in the new fees system?*

A. Management factors and current grazing fee structures are different in the East and most of the Midwest, as well as on the National Grasslands administered by the Forest Service. The fees for the Grasslands have a different base, and, in most cases, are higher than on National Forests. The remaining range lands managed by the Forest Service are primarily in the Southern States. Studies indicate that under the fee system currently in effect there, Forest Service permits for grazing have not gained appreciable monetary values.

Fair market value fee structures will be developed through similar studies for the National Grasslands, Land Utilization projects and other National Forests not included in the new fee schedule. Implementation of new fees systems on these lands is scheduled to begin in 1970.

Q. *Why was it decided to change the fee system?*

A. In 1951, Congress ordered that each Federal agency come up with fees that were fair and equitable, and that were as uniform as practicable among the agencies. This decision was reinforced in 1959 by the Bureau of the Budget, which ordered that where Federally owned resources are leased a fair market value should be secured for them. This was the now famous Circular A-25. Then, in 1964, the Bureau of the Budget offered additional guidelines, including a requirement that a uniform basis should be used by all Federal agencies in establishing fees. It had become clear that National Forest grazing fees were lower than private land lease rates—i.e. less than fair market value—and that criteria for fee determination varied too much between Federal agencies.

Thus, a decision to change the fee system.

Q. *What is a fair market value?*

A. Fair market value is the amount the prospective user of a product is willing to pay for that product—in this case, the value of use of the public grazing resource to the livestock owner.

More specifically, the use value of this grazing resource is equal to rental costs of private pastures leased by the livestock owner, after adjustment for differences in the cost of services provided on private lands by the landowners, but not provided on public lands.

After intensive evaluation of these factors, the Forest Service and other Federal agencies have determined this value of use to be $1.23 per animal unit month for the National Forests in the 11 Western States, South Dakota, and Nebraska.

Q. *What is the legal basis for charging grazing fees?*

A. The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to permit and regulate grazing use on National Forest lands emanates from the Organic Act of June 4, 1897. While the act does not specify that fees will be charged, this has been understood to be part of the regulatory procedure. In 1905, the Secretary of Agriculture approved a regulation under authority granted by this Act, which states in part: "Regulation 25. On or after January 1, 1906, a reasonable fee will be charged for grazing all classes of livestock on Forest Reserves. . . ." Secretary Regulations authorizing the charge of grazing fees have been in effect since that time and have been judicially upheld.

The Granger Thye Act of April 24, 1950, while not specifically authorizing collection of grazing fees, does recognize that fees have been authorized and are being collected in its provision which states: "Of the monies received from grazing fees by the Treasury from each National Forest during each fiscal year, there shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress, an amount equivalent to two cents per animal month for sheep and goats and ten cents per animal month for other kinds of livestock under permit on such National Forests. . . ."

Q. *What does a grazing permittee obtain under his permit?*

A. The permit grants a privilege to use National Forest land for livestock grazing for certain periods of each year to supplement the grazing resource he has on his private property. Applying to the holder alone, the permit is issued for a term of 10 years and is validated annually on payment of the fees.

Q. *How much did these fees cost before the new system was put into effect in January?*

A. They varied from area to area. In 1968, the National Forest grazing fees in the West ranged from 21 cents to $1.80 per animal unit month (One cow grazing for one month).

Q. *How much are the new fees?*

A. New fees range from 31 cents to $1.25 per animal unit month, adjusted by changes in economic factors from 1966 when our major survey was made. Sheep grazing varies from six cents to twenty-five cents monthly.

Q. *Doesn't the new fee schedule call for all fees to be $1.23 per animal unit month?*

A. No. This was just the fee figure established for the base year of 1966. Each year, that figure will be adjusted, either up or down, by the forage price index. This index figure in 1969 was two cents more than the $1.23 base figure. Thus, the 1969 fee is $1.25. The aim of the new system is to put all grazing permittees on National Forests in the 11 Western States, plus South Dakota and Nebraska, on the 1966 base (plus or minus the forage index) by 1979.

Q. *What is the forage value index?*

A. It is the adjustment made annually, based on analysis of private land grazing lease rates by the Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service for the year preceding the fee year. It is the one cost item in the fee formula that is allowed to be determined competitively. It is the most accurate factor that can be used to adjust the fee annually and assure that the fee is equivalent to the fair market value.

Since the range resource is a limited resource, ranchers bid against each other for private forage. The amount they bid on a private lease rate will depend directly on their expected returns from use of the resource and their costs of using it.

It quite accurately measures the market value.

Q. *What kind of economic impact does the new fee charge have on the permit holder?*

A. The immediate impact is an increase in annual production costs and a likely reduction in net income. But the new fee schedule has been designed to make adjustment to it as easy as possible. It is being phased in over a 10-year period in equal stages. For example, in a selected area of Utah, where the overall average number of animal unit months was less than 500, the fee increase to bring payment up to fair market value is seventy-two cents per animal unit month.

This would mean that if the increase were to take place in one jump, the total average fee paid for 500 AUM per permittee would climb from $255 to $615—an increase of $360. Realizing that such an increase at one time could be a severe hardship, the Forest Service has spread the increase over 10 years. Thus, the first increment, in this case, is $35 for this "average" permittee—from $255 to $290.

Q. *What is the estimated increase in revenue to the Treasury expected from the fee increase?*

A. We estimate the revenue increase in 1969 over 1968 will amount to $335,000. Over the 10-year period of increase, the accumulation of new money to the Treasury will come to more than $26.5 million.

Currently, the grazing fees for use of National Forest range bring in a little over $4 million each year. Total increase in fees, 1973 over 1968, will be $5.1 million. Thus revenue in 1978 is estimated to be over $9 million.

Q. *Do any permittees get to use National Forest range free?*

A. Yes. The Forest Service nationally issues about 63,000 grazing permits. About 19,000 are issued on a fee basis. More than 41,000 are issued free of charge. The remaining 3,000 are private land permits and crossing permits. The Forest Service has and will continue the longstanding practice of issuing nocharge grazing permits for non-commercial livestock up to 10 head by resident farmers and ranchers. Further consideration will also be given to the problem of small operators in low income areas where opportunities for off-ranch incomes are limited.

Q. *Won't the small operator bear most of the impact of the fee increase?*

A. Those paying the lowest scales will have the biggest per-animal fee increases over the 10-year period to achieve the $1.23 base figure. But on both National Forest and other Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the larger operators have major shares of the grazing. Thirty percent of all National Forest grazing is allotted to 3 percent of the permittees. For BLM, 52 percent of all AUM's are allotted to 5 percent of the permittees.

Q. *What are the objections cited by the livestock industry to the increase in fees?*

A. Substantial agreement was reached with the livestock industry and other interested groups on all issues but one—the decision by the Federal Government to disallow permit value as a cost of grazing on public lands.

Q. *What is permit value?*

A. First, a bit of background is necessary. Grazing fees charged by the Federal agencies have not been determined in the market place and have been lower than the value of use of the range resource to the user. Consequently, a separate value has developed in the market place because of the fees level—value of use gap. This separate value is the "permit value."

In order to qualify for a Forest Service grazing permit, a rancher must own base property and livestock. Permits cannot be exchanged directly between any two individuals, but the buyer of the base property and livestock owned by a previous permittee may apply for the grazing represented by the permit waived by the seller. The prospective buyer frequently has been willing to pay additional money for the required base property or livestock to get the permit.

Q. *Since it has obviously become a cost of doing business, why isn't the Federal Government willing to include this "permit value" as a factor in determining a rancher's cost of operation?*

A. Historically, the Forest Service, with the backing of court decisions, has viewed livestock grazing on National Forest lands as a privilege, not a right. Recognition of the permit value would give permittees strong argument that grazing is indeed a right and that they should receive payment for any portion of the grazing permit value they might lose through administrative action. Including the permit value as a deductible cost in fee calculation would recognize it as a right. The United States would then have to reimburse a permittee in order to take administrative steps to protect or develop range by limiting its use to the permittee.

In addition, if grazers are given special rights to grazing resources, other resource users could well suffer because the livestock permittees would have, in effect, a proprietary interest.

Q. *What effect on the fee schedule would occur from recognizing permit value as cost of operation to the permittee?*

A. Recognition of the permit value would mean leaving the fee essentially as it was until this year. The United States which owns the land would be relinquishing more than $5 million a year from a value which logically belongs to the people of the United States, rather than to individual livestock owners.

At the same time, as soon as the permit value was recognized, the value would begin increasing. This would require additional fee reductions to recognize the additional permit value as a production cost. Eventually, the fee could be reduced to zero and even result in the Government owing the permitted for allowing him to graze livestock on Federal land.

Q. *How can the Federal Government deny the permit has a value when it is used as collateral for loans and has a definite tendency to raise the price of base land or livestock when a National Forest grazing permit is involved?*

A. The Federal Government does not deny that a "permit value" exists and recognizes such value did accrue for permits over the years. But it is a value the private parties involved arranged among themselves in buying and selling base property and permitted livestock. Their reasoning, apparently, was that permits provided grazing at a lower price than they could get in leasing private land.

The Federal Government was not a party to the growth of value of the permit over the years. However, when the widening gap between the fee and fair market value became apparent, the Federal Government started its program of studies to determine the facts so that necessary action would be taken. The resulting new fee schedule is designed to recover that value for the American public which owns the land.

The extent of loss to the permittees is not so large as has been implied. More than half the present permittees acquired their grazing permits prior to 1950. Values placed on permits then were much lower than today, and present values are based on significant appreciation. Many permittees have, in effect, amortized their permit values by paying fees over many years which were less than the fair market value.

Q. *How was fair market value determined?*

A. According to the "economic model" the value of use could be determined and measured by either of two methods. Theoretically, the value of use determined by either method should be the same.

One method was to determine the permit value and capitalize it at a rate of return appropriate to the rate of return expected from other ranch investments. This *plus* the current grazing fee would be the full market value of use.

The other method of measuring the value of use of the public range resource was to determine the total cost of operation to the user on private leased grazing land (including all non-fee costs plus the private lease rate) and subtract from this private cost the total non-fee cost of operation to the user on public rangelands. This difference is the amount the rancher should be willing to pay per AUM for the use of the range resource on public lands. The $1.23 value of use was determined by the latter method—i.e. the cost of operation difference method.

Q. *What led up to the fees decision?*

A. A series of studies, data-gathering surveys, interviews, questionnaires, conferences and analyses was conducted over a period of almost 10 years. The scope of the cost survey in 1966 is reflected by the fact that 10,000 individuals were interviewed and more than 14,000 questionnaires were collected. Comments on the proposed fee system were solicited from those involved or otherwise interested. More than 1,300 of these comments were received and reviewed. Other comments were received from Forest Service grazing advisory boards. All these steps were taken before the new fee system was implemented in January. Livestock industry representatives were involved in every stage of the survey, analysis and decision.

Q. *Why were the Federal grazing land management agencies unwilling to wait until the Public Land Law Review Commission completed its studies on land uses?*

A. This possibility was considered. But it was decided that a wait of indefinite length would not be carrying out the agencies' responsibilities to the public, nor would it eliminate the uncertainties to the industry. In addition, it did not appear that work underway by the Commission would provide the exhaustive data needed for the grazing fee decision. Finally, the Commission itself has stated its creation should not act to stop the on-going activities or programs of Government.

The new fee system was originally scheduled to go into effect in 1966. It was delayed again for the 1967 and 1968 grazing seasons. When the decision was put into action this year, 1969, the Federal Government sponsors knew the information obtained was sound. It had been given full and careful evaluation, and it had been thoroughly discussed with representatives of the livestock and lending industries, farmer and rancher associations, grazing advisory boards, the Department of Agriculture's Advisory Committee on Multiple Use of the National Forests, and the major conservation groups.

Q. *Why was the Forest Service's variable fee scrapped in the new System?*

A. The data collected by the Department of Agriculture's Statistical Reporting Service showed that differences between areas and between seasons of use are not statistically significant. Thus, these data will support only one base fee in the West. However, there may well be other factors outside the scope of the study that will provide basis for a variable fee in the future. Studies will continue on this subject. The Forest Service variable fee has not been scrapped.

Q. *Has the new grazing fee permit system been tested in the courts?*

A. Yes. The most significant to the Forest Service was a case decided May 9, 1969, in the U.S. District Court for New Mexico in Albuquerque. Actions against both the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior were decided jointly by the judge. The plaintiff, Pankey Land and Cattle Co. of Truth or Consequences, New Mexico, challenged the new fee regulations. The company charged the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior acted illegally in setting up the regulations without including the capital costs of permits and the costs of improvements made by the permittees on public lands. The company also said the fee schedule was a violation because it did not meet the test of reasonableness.

Earlier in Salt Lake City, the Federal District Court of Utah was the scene of a suit against the Secretary of the Interior calling for an injunction against institution of the new fee schedule.

Q. *What were the decisions by the judges?*

A. In both cases the courts upheld the decisions of the two Secretaries.

In its memorandum opinion the New Mexico court held that the Secretaries acted within the area of discretion and judgment committed to them by law in promulgating the new regulations and that there is no legal remedy available to the plaintiff from the court. The court found that it was not shown that the Secretaries had failed to consider all of the factors as directed by Congress.

The fact that the Secretaries did not consider the capitalized value of a permit as an element of cost in operating on the public domain, cannot, the court said, be held as a matter of law to reflect an action in excess of statutory authority.

Q. Has Congress taken any interest in the new regulations?

A. The Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings, February 27 and 28, 1969, on the grazing fees issue. Similar hearings were held by the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, March 4 and 5, 1969. All interested parties were given an opportunity to testify at these Hearings. The hearings were a constructive means for laying out all of the ramifications of the fees issue. Additional hearings have been scheduled by the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains of the House Committee on Agriculture but have been postponed.

The livestock industry, at the two hearings held, stressed an adverse economic impact, and a contention that the permit value should be included as a cost of doing business in establishing the fees. Conservationists supported the increase as a means of recovering fair market value for the Government and opposed inclusion of permit value in the formula on the basis it would establish a right to the permittee.

The Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, is dedicated to the principle of multiple use management of the Nation's forest resources for sustained yields of wood, water, forage, wildlife, and recreation. Through forestry research, cooperation with the States and private forest owners, and management of the National Forests and National Grasslands, it strives—as directed by Congress—to provide increasingly greater service to a growing Nation.

The increase in fees from public lands administered by Interior's Bureau of Land Management consists of 9 cents as the annual increment needed to reach toward fair market value, while the Forest Service average annual increment is 7 cents in this respect. Both Interior and Agriculture are increasing fees an additional 11 cents to reflect market increases in forage prices during the 2 years since the last fee change. The increases will add to revenues for local and Federal governments and will expand funds available for land improvements.

NOVEMBER 6, 1970.

Hon. WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It soon will be time for your Department to reach a position on the proper level of grazing fees for the public lands you administer. This will request that I be notified promptly when you reach your decision.

A number of reasons were announced as bases for last year's moratorium. Among them were pending court action and the upcoming report of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

I have studied that report, especially Chapter 6 dealing with Range Resources, and find no comprehensive analysis of the fee schedule which resulted from the study initiated in 1966. So I will appreciate any and all analyses your Department or its agencies have made dealing with issues of Fair Market Value and also with Chapter 6 of the PLLRC Report.

Am I correct that the court decision in the Pankey case affirmed that the fees adopted under the schedule were properly within your delegated power?

Would Fair Market Value in its normal sense be the result if the caveat under PLLRC Recommendation 44—"equitable allowance . . . for permit values"—were adopted?

Please advise on the normal legal meaning of the word "tenure" and how adoption of Recommendation 44 would "establish more stability of tenure for permittees" than now exists.

Do you agree with the observation that "An increase in grazing fees will tend to decrease the value of permits?" If this is so, how will this better tenure, either legally or economically? What data have you on the trend in permit values since 1960 vis-a-vis the grazing fee? Does it support the initial observation?

The Burlington Northern owns substantial grazing lands in Montana. What is their current fee and future schedule? What provision do they make in their permits for: (a) termination, (b) compensation upon termination, (c) recognition of permit value, (d) fee level recognition of higher operating costs in some areas, (e) variability of fee based on carrying capacity, lushness of vegetation, season, or length of use?

One option available to your predecessor was to change a fee of $1.23 per AUM in the first year. He decided instead upon a schedule which over a decade would rise to $1.23 per AUM. In comparison with the fee schedule then existing, was any revenue foregone? In comparison with an initial fee of $1.23 per AUM, how much revenue would have been foregone over the decade if last year's moratorium had not been put into effect?

Based on current total grazing use in total dollars, how do these amounts relate to the disposition of grazing revenues for range improvement, payments of shared revenues to states and counties and Treasury net proceeds? Specifically, what are the appropriate figures for Montana?

I am sure you can appreciate the widespread interest this topic has for conservationists, ranchers and local governments. I'll appreciate your answer at your earliest convenience, hopefully on or before 16 November.

This same letter is also being directed to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture was able to respond to my letter under date of December 16, by which time the Secretaries had announced a fee increase for the 1971 season. As the 91st Congress adjourns, I have yet to hear from the Secretary of the Interior. I hope that as a new Congress convenes he will find time to answer my questions which are important to conservationists, ranchers and local governments. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Secretary of Agriculture's report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1970.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is a further response to your November 6 letter about grazing fees on public lands administered within the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In addition to the enclosed comments on your questions we are including a copy of "Grazing Fees on National Forest Range," a statement concerning Chapter 6 of the Public Land Law Review Commission Report, and a copy of the news release regarding the recent grazing fee decision.

We apologize for the delay in getting this material to you, but hope it will still be helpful.

Sincerely,

T. K. COWDEN,
Assistant Secretary.

REPLY TO GRAZING FEE QUESTIONS

The following comments are in response to and in the same order as the questions asked in Senator Metcalf's November 6, 1970, letter to Secretary Hardin.

1. The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled that in promulgating the new grazing fees, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior acted within the discretion and judgment committed to them by law.

2. Fair Market Value would not result if an "equitable allowance . . . for permit values" were adopted as recommended by the Public Land Law Review Commission.

The present grazing fee system establishes a fee that is based on Fair Market Value.

The economic definition of Fair Market Value is the value of a transaction between a willing buyer and a willing seller in a time and place market. The Forest Service in establishing a base value had to measure this value. The approach used was based on the premise that the value of grazing use to a permittee may be measured as the difference between the permittee's total nonfee operating costs on the Forest Service range and his alternative total operating costs, including the lease rate, on comparable private lease lands. Under this definition if any allowance were made in the formula for the permit value, the resulting fee would not be representative of Fair Market Value.

3. "Tenure" in normal usage refers to the degree of security or certainty a permittee has in holding a grazing permit.

Adoption of PLLRC recommendation #44, although not legally establishing more stability of tenure, would from an administrative and political standpoint strengthen the security of tenure. The permittee would no longer simply hold the permit, but he would be given credit for its value and would have to be compensated for his loss should the permit be terminated. He would, in this sense, be part owner of the permit and, although without legal rights, his privilege to hold the permit would thus take on a greater feeling of security. Even if the permit were terminated he would be compensated for his loss of permit value.

4. There is no reason to believe that an increase in grazing fees will decrease the value of grazing permits or have any effect on tenure.

An increase in grazing fees to the Fair Market Value equivalent will decrease to zero that portion of the permit value that exists due to the difference between actual fee charged and Fair Market Value as defined above. However, it is recognized that in actuality the permit value as measured in the 1966 Western Livestock Grazing Survey may not decrease. In fact it may increase. The total permit value came into existence because of the Forest Service policy to allow a permit holder to designate his successor when he sells his land and/or livestock. The successor purchases a total operating unit and is willing to pay the going value for that unit, including the Forest Service permitted portion, as long as he is assured he will be issued a permit to graze those livestock on National Forest land. The 1966 survey estimated the value of the Forest Service permit to be $25 per Animal Unit Month. This permit value has been increasing for many years. However, since 1960 or 1961 the value has leveled off at about $25 due to speculation of a grazing fees study that might increase fees. In the absence of this uncertainty the permit value would have continued to increase. When the announcement was made in January 1969 that fees would increase to a $1.23 equivalent over a 10-year period the uncertainty was removed and the permit value moved to a new level. Although not certain of what that level is it is not as high as it would have been without the uncertainty and the fee increase. It is suspected, however, that the value has increased over the $25 level.

5. It is understood that the Burlington Northern Railroad Company currently charges $2.10 per animal unit month on most of their rangeland although plan to increase this over the next several years. However, the fees do vary depending on the quality of range. A fee of about $1.00 to $1.25 per animal unit month is charged in western Montana for use of intermingled railroad lands which are managed by the Forest Service. The lessee of such railroad lands accepts the Burlington Northern lease subject to Forest Service regulations. The lease arrangements are very similar to Forest Service grazing permit procedures and no permit value is recognized.

6. When the new grazing fee was implemented in 1969 the revenue from Montana was about $5,000 less than it would have been under the previous fee system. For the Western National Forests as a whole total receipts from grazing were approximately the same as they had previously been. However, the 1970 moratorium resulted in a total loss of about $900,000, 25 percent of which would have gone to the counties. In Montana the moratorium resulted in a total loss of about $55,000 of which $13,750 would have been returned to the counties. The total loss in grazing receipts over the decade, due to the 1970 moratorium, amounts to about $4,000,000. In Montana this would be about $335,000 of which 25 percent would have been returned to the counties.

CHAPTER 6—RANGE RESOURCES

Recommendation 37: Public land forage policies should be flexible, designed to attain maximum economic efficiency in the production and use of forage from the public land, and to support regional economic growth.

There is a need for flexibility in public land forage (grazing) policies. However, consideration should involve goals other than just attainment of maximum economic efficiency and support of regional economic growth.

Forest Service grazing policy with respect to permit transfer allows a Forest Service grazing permit to move readily from one holder to another, via the Federal Government. Permittees no longer in need of a permit relinquish it to the Federal Government who in turn issues a new permit to a qualified applicant if grazing continues to be available for allocation. In most instances the purchaser of land or livestock owned by the retiring permittee is issued a permit if he is otherwise qualified.

A second essential issue within the recommendation is the Forest Service policy of upper limits as it relates to ". . . attain-(ment) (of) maximum economic efficiency . . . ."

It is true that the Forest Service upper limits policy has constrained full operation of the market in permits and, in so acting, has maintained a population of small- to medium-size family-size ranches. (Upper limits is simply a maximum limit on the number of cattle or sheep that can be grazed by a single permit holder.) However, the premise of current USDA policy is that ranchers who wish to remain in the range livestock business utilizing the National Forest System for part of their grazing should be protected in part from monopolistic competition which could arise from very large ranches assembled by aggregation of private ranch lands and the Forest Service grazing permits associated with them.

A Forest Service grazing permit may be "transferred" upon sale of either the land which makes its holder commensurate *or* livestock. (BLM grazing permits generally transfer only through sale of land.) This has meant that Forest Service permits have "moved" to new land areas and the former base properties have become available for other ranching or farming interests to meet needs of ranchers for increased scale on non-public land grazing operations.

A policy which would allow grazing privileges to be *fully transferable* upon request of the permittee, as suggested under this recommendation, would in essence convert National Forest System grazing privileges to grazing rights. The Forest Service has historically maintained that livestock grazing on the National Forest System is a privilege and not a right. This position has been sustained in the courts.

A Forest Service grazing permit grants a privilege to use the National Forest land for livestock grazing. It stipulates conditions under which grazing may take place. The privilege granted by the permit is a personal one and applies to the holder alone. Permits are issued for a term of 10 years and are validated annually upon payment of fees. In order to qualify for a Forest Service grazing permit, a rancher must own base property and livestock. Permits cannot be exchanged directly between any two individuals.

If a permittee no longer wants to graze livestock upon the National Forest, he relinquishes his grazing privilege by waiving his permit back to he Government. An interested second party may apply for the grazing represented by the waived permit if he in fact has purchased either the land or livestock owned by the previous permittee.

National Forest System lands are public resources. Areas used for grazing usually serve several other purposes at the same time, such as fish and wildlife habitat, watershed protection, timber production, or outdoor recreation. Demands from all groups and interests for these resources and benefits are growing apace.

A policy which would allow permits to be fully transferred at the discretion of the user would allow the fair market value of grazing permits to be determined in a market between ranchers while the Government remained neutral. There would be no payment for this value to the real owner of the resource upon which it is based.

An equally important situation could result from fully transferable permits if Recommendation 44 were to be accepted. That recommendation includes a statement calling for ". . . an equitable allowance (to) be afforded current permittees for permit values in establishing grazing fees." Under that provision the market might increase the permit value up to a level where the fees would be either zero or negative. In the latter case the Federal Government might be obligated to compensate the user to graze livestock on public lands.

An alternative would be to retain the current permit allocation policy (see comments on Recommendations 39 and 44). Under the current grazing fee system the public landowner will receive a value more representative of fair market value than in the past. The reallocation of permits will continue on the basis of sale of base property and/or permitted livestock. Even under this system it will be the more efficient operators who will become new permittees or who will enlarge their operations, thus supporting regional economic growth.

Recommendation 38: The grazing of domestic livestock on the public lands should be consistent with the productivity of those lands.

This recommendation is consistent with the Forest Service concept of land management on a sustained yield basis and with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Although the recommendation refers only to "the grazing of domestic livestock," other resource needs and uses should also be considered. Range must also provide habitat and forage for wildlife needs. Timber regeneration or other resource uses must also be considered on these lands.

A subrecommendation concerning rehabilitation of deteriorated range lands includes: *"should exclude domestic livestock grazing from frail lands where necessary to protect and conserve the natural environment."* This is important and is currently an objective of managing National Forest System ranges.

Recommendation 39: Existing eligibility requirements should be retained for the allocation of grazing privileges up to recent levels of forage use. Increases in forage production above these levels should be allocated under new eligibility standards. Grazing permits for increased forage production above recent levels should be allocated by public auction among qualified applicants.

Existing eligibility requirements are in accord with objectives of rural development programs and could generally continue to be used in allotting grazing privileges of existing and future forage production levels, with recognition given to the possible need for continued updating of certain criteria. Implementation of this recommendation could mean that increased forage production resulting largely from investments by existing permittees would be only available to them if they out-bid competitors.

Increased forage production, as well as other benefits to the environment, generally result from cooperative efforts with current permittees in improvement programs and intensive management of the range resource. Permittee incentive to participate in such efforts would be essentially nullified if the resultant increase in forage production were to go to someone else. It should also be recognized that cooperation of many current permittees also contributes benefits to other resources uses and values such as wildlife, watershed condition, recreation, etc.

Public auction presumes a relatively free and competitive market. Such condition does not exist for many National Forest System users. A given range area can frequently be used more conveniently and efficiently by a certain operator because of the allotment location, property boundaries, water developments, topography, and other factors. The auction approach would also pose administrative problems that cannot be readily resolved. Some allotments are presently subdivided into several units to facilitate rotation systems of intensive management which have materially improved conditions of range ecosystems. Some of these situations involve private lands and those administered by more than one agency to comprise a suitable management unit.

The range resource and forage availability is also influenced by coordination needs with other resource uses and values. Grazing use must adequately consider such values as wildlife, watershed, recreation, and timber.

Recommendation 40: Private grazing on public land should be pursuant to a permit that is issued for a fixed statutory term and spells out in detail the conditions and obligations of both the Federal Government and the permittee, including provisions for compensation for termination prior to the end of the term.

This recommendation concerns several separate thoughts; these are discussed separately as follows: (1) (A) the term of grazing permits be established by statute; (2) (B) *grazing* permits should detail with greater precision the range conditions which will trigger use changes (both increases and decreases); (3) (C) range land should, whenever practicable, be allocated on an area basis to a permittee and he should be required to maintain a specific range condition regardless of the number of animals grazed; (4) (D) the kind of public purpose for which a grazing permit may be canceled should be identified in the permit; (5) (E) permittees should be compensated when permits are canceled to satisfy other public uses.

(1)(A) Although the matter of tenure has received much attention from the livestock industry, the problem has not in reality been a serious one. The issuance of 10-year renewable term permits has been the normal manner of authorizing grazing use by the Forest Service, although temporary (one-year) permits are issued under certain conditions. The Granger-Thye Act (Sec. 19) authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for the grazing of livestock for periods not exceeding 10 years and renewals thereof.

Adjustments in permitted use have been necessary for resource protection, violations of permit conditions, and need of the land for higher uses. However, most adjustments have been made for resource protection and these have usually been accomplished on a negotiated basis with the objective of minimizing the impact on the permittee. Adjustments because of higher use have been relatively minor, and in most of those cases alternative sources of grazing have been provided.

If term of permit were further fixed by law to include size of permit, the statute might incorporate a safety margin for environmental considerations, catastrophies such as fire or drought, and the possible need to use the land for other purposes. Permitted levels, thus, might be lower or higher than under present policies.

(2)(B) Detailing with greater precision the range conditions that will trigger use changes (both increases and decreases) has merit. Currently this is being done through Forest Service range management plans that are made a part of grazing permits. However, dealing with a biological entity such as range environment is a very complex matter. It is not easy to formulate the environmental conditions necessary to "trigger" a change in grazing use. The recommendation has practical limitations. Regardless of the criteria used, conditions will vary sufficiently from one place to another so judgment factors will necessarily be involved.

(3)(C) Forest Service range allotments are now allocated to permittees on an area basis, but grazing permits also specify livestock numbers and grazing seasons. The number and season controls serve two purposes. First, they provide an equitable basis from which to make user charges. Second, they establish controls which help regulate grazing use at a level consistent with the needs of the range and other resource considerations.

Although Forest Service grazing permits usually specify livestock numbers and grazing seasons, these are not inviolate. Grazing seasons often are modified, as are livestock numbers, depending on range productivity, other resource needs, and the desires of the permittee. At some times, more livestock are allowed for a shorter season; or, season length is extended when forage is available.

Such matters are relatively easy to administer where only one permittee is involved, but become more complex on community allotments, for which uniform grazing seasons with specific numbers are important.

Responsibility could be more fully delegated where grazing was essentially the only use of significance than where a complex of interacting resource uses exist—the typical situation on National Forest System land.

(4)(D) Identifying in the grazing permit the kind of public purposes for which the permit may be canceled deserves further attention. A definition of "public purposes" is important and raises the question of how to develop criteria needed to make resource protection adjustments. In addition, the matter of compensation for canceled permits and the length of time (tenure) for which a permit is issued become involved.

(5)(E) With respect to compensation for permits canceled before the termination date, the longstanding position of the Forest Service has been that the privilege of grazing on National Forest lands under a permit issued pursuant to the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture is not a property right. Numerous court decisions have supported this position.

Recognition, through legislation or otherwise, that the holder of a grazing permit on the National Forests is entitled to reimbursement for grazing privileges withdrawn or reduced could be contrary to this basic concept. And such an interpretation might erode rather than enhance the stability of tenure now enjoyed by those who have grazing privileges on the National Forests. (The Forest Service is aware of legislation relating to payment for cancellation of permits on DOD lands.)

The recommendation states that a permit be "issued for a fixed statutory term and (which) spells out in detail the conditions and obligations of both the Federal Government and the permittee . . ." Forest Service permits now include a number of conditions and provisions, most of which obligate permittee to certain requirements. However, to the extent that funding is available, the Government also often becomes obligated to perform certain rehabilitation work, construct range improvements, etc. Such obligations often commit the Government to spending tens of thousands of dollars on range improvement projects on a given range allotment. Therefore, except for the reference to compensation for terminated permits, these "conditions and obligations" are, in our judgment, now largely met in an equitable manner. A review of the provisions and terms of grazing permits with representatives of the livestock industry could result in an improved permit to the mutual advantage of the Government and permittees.

Recommendation 41: Funds should be invested under statutory guidelines in deteriorated public grazing lands retained in Federal ownership to protect them against further deterioration and to rehabilitate them where possible. On all other retained grazing lands, investments to improve grazing should generally be controlled by economic guidelines promulgated under statutory requirements.

Under administrative policy, investment in National Forest System range improvement has essentially been in accord with the recommendation. As indicated, Federal range funds are basically used for range lands in need of rehabilitation. In situations involving a term grazing permit, user contribution is commonly in the form of partial or total nonuse by permitted livestock until a satisfactory range condition has been realized.

Cost-benefit considerations (if not analyses, per se) have historically been used in determining investment priority. However, increased production of forage for the exclusive benefit of livestock grazing is seldom the sole concern in allocating investment in public range land. The environment and its resource components such as soil stability, hydrologic conditions, aesthetics, wildlife habitat, recreational opportunity, etc., invariably benefit from range improvement programs.

Cost-sharing for forage production on public lands has merit. In fact, the Forest Service and its grazing permittees have traditionally shared the costs of range development and improvements maintenance. The estimated ratio of investment by Federal Government and the permittee is somewhere near 4:1. By and large, little difficulty has been experienced with cooperative agreements, special use permits, or other arrangements that have been used. User investment beyond that which can be reasonably amortized has not been encouraged. Also, the grazing fee system implemented in 1969 made allowance for the permittee's investment in public land range improvement.

Funding from "earmarked" National Forest grazing receipts for range improvement programs has not been a major item in relation to total need. The Granger-Thye Act (Sec. 12) authorizes grazing receipts to be used for range development purposes; approximately $700,000 are made available each year. Nonetheless, some of the range resource improvement and rehabilitation would not have been accomplished without this source of limited funding. A desirable investment level for National Forest System range improvement has little relation to grazing receipts. Recognized needs for range development are far in excess of current levels of receipts.

The PLLRC proposal concerning crediting a user for his investment as he pays his grazing fee (page 114) raises some interesting points. The basic concept is not different from proposals made internally by the Forest Service. Those proposals would allow the user to invest only to the point whereby he would receive an 8 percent return on his investment. The Federal Government would pick up the remainder of the cost. Total project benefits would have to exceed total project costs. Further, under the proposal, the user's cost share would be allowed through deduction in grazing fees.

A major problem with such a method—deduction in fee as a cost share portion of the user's investment—is that it would result in a double benefit to the user if carried out under the current fees schedule. The current fee already includes an allowance for user investments. The user would receive benefits from the deduction in fee for his cost share plus the added benefits resulting from more grazing. In order to be fair to all users, a change in base fee would be necessary.

Such a program could be a nightmare to the District Rangers who would have to run cost-benefit studies on each improvement project on each one of about 12,000 Forest Service grazing allotments and determine how much each user is to be credited for his investment.

Nonetheless, this recommendation lays out the ground rules we may have to follow as program budgeting becomes more a way of life in Government planning. This recommendation could also be handled satisfactorily under administrative procedure rather than by statutory requirements.

Recommendation 42: Public lands, including those in national forests and land utilization projects, should be reviewed and those chiefly valuable for the grazing of domestic livestock identified. Some such public lands should, when important public values will not be lost, be offered for sale at market value with grazing permittees given a preference to buy them. Domestic livestock grazing should be declared as the dominant use on retained lands where appropriate.

This recommendation involves two principal thoughts. One concerns disposal of land which is identified as being "chiefly valuable for grazing." The other pertains to retained lands and provides for identifying those which are chiefly valuable for grazing as opposed to those less valuable for grazing. It further proposes that grazing be prohibited on other areas classified as not suitable for grazing.

National Forest System lands that are used for grazing also serve other national, regional, and local needs in most situations. They grow timber, produce water, provide recreational and aesthetic benefits, and provide wildlife habitat, besides producing grazing for livestock. Few—if any—National Forest System lands are valuable for only a single use or purpose.

The Forest Service has had formal experience since 1911 in classifying the degree to which National Forest System land should, and can, be grazed by livestock through its various programs of range survey, range inventory, and more recently, range environmental analysis. These programs have revealed National Forest System areas best suited to range livestock production, but they also have revealed their multipurpose nature.

Part of the recommendation provides for "classifying for grazing as the dominant use those lands retained in Federal ownership and identified as being chiefly valuable for grazing of domestic livestock." Also, recognizing that certain lands are too steep, unstable, unproductive, expensive to rehabilitate, and otherwise generally unsuitable for grazing, another subrecommendation is made:

(4) *"Such frail and deteriorated lands should be identified, as well as those chiefly valuable for grazing. Once identified they should be classified as lands not suitable for grazing, and (grazing) should be prohibited to the fullest extent practicable."*

Needs for public land resources change, and the administrator must be able to modify his programs to best meet emerging needs. To classify certain lands as chiefy valuable for grazing and consider grazing as the "dominant" use could limit the administrator in meeting the total public need. The National Forest System environment is ecologically complex. It contains varied plant communities from slope to slope—frequently within 5- or even 1-acre tracts. Native animal population of many species inhabit such areas. A change or modification of one resource may set off a chain reaction with widespread effects. This is part of the range environmental analysis procedure and is currently considered in the development of all multiple use management plans.

Recommendation 43: Control should be asserted over public access to and the use of retained public grazing lands for nongrazing uses in order to avoid unreasonable interference with authorized livestock use.

Aside from watershed and wildlife, grazing of livestock is the most widespread use of the National Forest System. Approximately 106 million acres of National Forest System lands alone are included within grazing allotments. All of these lands have resource values and uses in addition to grazing. The range itself is but part of a wildland environment containing many ecosystems with multifaceted and interrelating resources. As population continues to grow, more and more people will come to the National Forest System. As people pressures on the public lands increase, demands will increase. Use priorities may have to change. More intensive management of all resources and uses must be accomplished to meet emerging needs. Development of criteria and procedures for controlling people will be necessary. Unreasonable levels of interference by any group of users with established or establishing uses will need corrective action. Levels of control may well need to be related to relative priorities of the different user groups. In some cases, restrictions may need to be imposed against grazing to assure low interference with nongrazing uses.

As pressures increase and conflicts develop, priorities must be established to best meet the needs of society and the environment. In many cases a use of National Forest System land which adversely affects livestock grazing can be mitigated through more intensive management and range development programs. The Secretary of Agriculture currently has the authority to and is largely meeting the objectives of this recommendation.

Although not specific, this recommendation seems to imply that the greatest conflict for use of the range environment occurs between livestock and wildlife. However, it would be difficult to develop meaningful general standards for allocating forage resources between these uses. From a practical standpoint this this is now done to a limited degree, but each situation must be handled on its own merits and local conditions.

Recommendation 44: Fair market value, taking into consideration factors in each area of the lands involved, should be established by law as a basis for grazing fees.

Fair market value is a generally accepted basis for establishing grazing fees. The Department has favored the view that fees should be based upon conditions in each permit area and, thus, should vary from place to place, but has not favored the Commission view that current permittees should be afforded an "equitable allowance . . . for permit values" in establishing grazing fees.

The current formula does not accurately determine fair market value in the economic or legal sense. The approach taken by the Forest Service and the Burtau of Land Management in developing the current fee base of $1.23 is to approximate fair market value as closely as possible to the price a rancher would be willing to pay for use of these lands. The total cost of operating on private leased grazing land was considered as the full value a rancher would be willing to expend for an AUM of grazing on other than deeded land. The formula used compared the total operator cost on private leased land (including the private lease rate) with the total non-fee operating cost on public land. The difference measures the amount a rancher would be willing to pay for an AUM of public forage use and is thus a simulation of fair market value.

An important objective of the Government was to charge the public land user a fee such that he not have a competitive advantage over his neighbor who does not have a public land permit. If such advantage should exist, it could be considered a subsidy to the public land user. This would be discriminatory against the nonpublic land operator.

The Forest Service had hoped to develop a series of fees by area more representative of "fair market value" within any given area. Analyses of the available cost data, however, showed that the cost of operation by individual users is so variable due to differences in efficiency of operation that significant differences in fair market value between areas could be measured.

The new fee schedule will result in elimination of that portion of the permit value created due to the difference between low public land use fee and alternative private lease rate. The grazing fees program is being carried out under the principles and guidelines established by the Bureau of the Budget in Circular A-25, September 23, 1959, and the Natural Resources User Charges Study, June 1964.

Recommendation 45: Policies applicable to the use of public lands for grazing purposes generally should be uniform for all classes of public lands.

It would be helpful to users for Federal land grazing policies to be as uniform as practicable among the various land-administering agencies. However, not all grazing polices can be made uniform without affecting equity among present users.

Forest Service grazing policy began in 1905 and was partly based on earlier Government policy when the Federal lands were administered by the General Land Office. Early Forest Service policy evolved to meet then-existing needs. Modifications have been made to accommodate needed changes. Other Federal land grazing policy has a shorter life. The Bureau of Land Management, which now administers grazing policy set up under the Taylor Grazing Act, was patterned to some degree after Forest Service policy. But BLM policies were built to fit needs peculiar to the public domain lands just coming under Federal administrative grazing control in the early 1930's.

Because of widely varying ranching situations from place to place and from range ecosystem to ecosystem, public land grazing policies have, in fact, by necessity been variable. Some of the variability could be reduced.

Policies of the Forest Service with respect to control of permit size—i.e., upper limits—have served to prevent monopoly. The Bureau of Land Management has no upper limits policy. Forest Service grazing is spread over a rancher population of much smaller size than that of the Bureau of Land Management.

The geographic extent of range programs is an important factor in the matter of uniformity in grazing policy. For example, Bureau of Land Management grazing is essentially all in the public land States where the emphasis in ranching (excepting for Alaska) is on livestock production and many ranches are commercial-type enterprises. Many ranches in this area are largely producers of animal products or are diversified operations producing beef or sheep products, but also producing sugar beets and other crops. The Forest Service, on the other hand, administers grazing programs on National Forest System land in more than 35 States. Forest Service range programs in the public land States bear reasonable resemblance to Bureau of Land Management programs, and many ranchers hold both Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management permits.

Opportunities for uniformity in grazing policies in the public land States are reasonably good. However, in the nonpublic-land States, the situation is quite different. Forest Service permittees in the Midwest and South vary from rancher-type to diversified farmers, with livestock raising playing only a minor part of their operations, to subsistence farmers—even public-land "squatters" who depend upon livestock raising for some cash income and for food. The total mission of the agency or department is related to grazing policies affecting use of the Federal lands. Grazing policies set forth in the interests of uniformity among agencies to apply to the generally recognized kind of cattle or sheep ranch would ill fit the Southern subsistence farm. Helping the subsistence farmer meet his basic needs is part of the mission of the Forest Service.

AGRICULTURE AND INTERIOR RAISE GRAZING FEES

Acting Secretary of Agriculture J. Phil Campbell and Acting Secretary of the Interior Fred J. Russell announced today that public land grazing fees will increase for the 1971 grazing season. The new fee schedule affects ranchers who graze livestock on public lands administered by Interior's Bureau of Land Management and Agriculture's Forest Service in 11 Western States, South Dakota, and Nebraska.

On lands administered by Interior's Bureau of Land Management, the grazing fee will increase from 44 cents to 64 cents per animal unit month beginning March 1. On the average, fees on National Forest lands will increase from 60 cents to 78 cents per animal unit month. (The Forest Service has a variable fee system which in 1971 will range from 53 cents to $1.04 per animal unit month.) An animal unit month represents the forage used by one cow for one month, and these are used as the basis for permits, licenses, and leases.

The increase follows a one-year moratori um the two Departments had placed on fee increases to allow time to review recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission. In announcing the increase, the Secretaries said that a review had been made both of the Commission report and of the decision of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals on the matter of grazing fees. The Commission report, while criticizing the formulation of the fee structure, indicates that the announced 1971 level is within its concept of moving toward fair market value. The court found that the fee structure was consistent with existing law and the intent of Congress, and that it was fair, reasonable, and equitable.

The increase in fees from public lands administered by Interior's Bureau of Land Management consists of 9 cents as the annual increment needed to reach toward fair market value, while the Forest Service average annual increment is 7 cents in this respect. Both Interior and Agriculture are increasing fees an additional 11 cents to reflect market increases in forage prices during the 2 years since the last fee change. The increases will add to revenues for local and Federal governments and will expand funds available for land improvements.

NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to establish procedures for the fair and equitable selection of qualified young men to meet the continuing military manpower needs of the Nation.

The Vietnam war has served to emphasize the inequities of our present system. While occupational deferments are being phased out, young men with money and/or intelligence are going off to Cambridge and other college campuses instead of to Saigon and the jungles of Vietnam. The rich go to their draft boards armed with medical X-rays and lawyers to pursue their appeals. The poor not only cannot afford such things but too often they come face-to-face with segregated draft boards.

In seeking a solution to these and many other problems in our present system, let me state initially that I agree with the conclusion of the single most thorough public study of the draft, that of the Marshall Commission, that "the Nation must now, and in the foreseeable future, have a system which includes the draft." Even the Gates Commission on an all-volunteer Armed Forces favors leaving a Selective Service System in being, on a standby basis.

This is simply because our first concern must be to guarantee a continuing supply of manpower for national defense purposes and past experience has amply demonstrated that the draft provides such a guarantee.

At the same time, so long as all eligible persons are not required to serve, we owe it to those who must serve to devise as equitable and workable a system as possible—one which fills manpower needs while allowing individuals the maximum amount of choice.

I believe that the National Service Act would provide such a system. Under it young men would register at age 17: receive counseling on their service options; and then at age 18 make one of three choices:

First. To volunteer for military service; or

Second. To volunteer for civilian service as an alternative; or

Third. To take their chances on being drafted under a lottery system.

Civilian service could accommodate those dedicated, capable, and talented young Americans anxious to serve their country in nonmilitary service. A registrant who elects civilian service could seek a job with an approved employer in one of the following categories: State, Federal, and local agencies; public, private, and parochial schools; nonprofit hospitals; law enforcement agencies; penal and probation systems; or noncommercial organizations such as the Red Cross, whose principal purpose is social service.

To qualify, an employer would have to meet requirements promulgated by the Director of the National Service Agency on the type of job and the amount of job training and supervision available, as well as indicate how they intend to insure that participation of civilian service registrants in the occupation would not interfere unreasonably with the regular labor force in that area.

Qualified employers would have to pay the going rate for the type of work that the registrant does. This salary, however, would be paid to the National Service Agency which, in turn, would return to the registrant an amount determined by the Director for "subsistence." The difference between these two amounts would go to the National Service Agency to offset the cost of administering the program.

In addition to these jobs, a registrant could choose to serve in the Peace Corps or VISTA or the National Service Corps. The National Service Corps would directly operate Federal programs in areas of social need such as reforestation; mass-produced housing for the poor; or, more generally, as an "environmental task force."

The corps would also operate educational and training programs especially for registrants from deprived backgrounds. These programs would enable the registrant, first, to do useful and semiskilled work for the remainder of his civilian service tour; and second, to find skilled jobs following the completion of his service.

The enlistment and lottery options would be essentially unchanged from what they are now. Those who choose to take their chances in the lottery would undergo 1 year of liability in a lottery based on random selection of birthdays.

The length of time registrants would have to serve in civilian service—a period of time equivalent to 2 years in the Armed Forces—and the extra benefits of military service—for example, higher salary, travel, GI bill—would be valves to check and control the flow of men into the three options. If, for example, the Director concludes that not enough men are choosing the lottery option because civilian service is too attractive, the length could be increased. After some manipulation of the positive and negative elements, a desired balance among the three options would be achieved.

To get the needed variety, experience, and skills, the bill would permit volunteers for either military or civilian service to defer their term of service for a maximum of 5 years while attending college or while participating in approved training programs including apprenticeship and on-the-job training.

Thus, when military manpower requirements are low, these requirements could be met largely through the pool of volunteers, thereby providing an essentially volunteer Army with most men who choose the lottery not having any service required of them.

In a shooting war—that is, when the number of casualties exceeded 10 percent of the number of draftees for 3 consecutive months—student and job training deferments would be suspended. In addition, if the Director certified that there were not enough men to fill the monthly calls, then the option to join the civilian service would be temporarily suspended and the lottery would apply to all 18-year-olds.

This discontinuance insures that when draftees face an appreciable risk of being sent to a combat zone, all young men must stand as equals at that particular time before the draft process. To permit some to elect to enter college or job training while denying this election to others would be to continue one of our present system's worst features.

It is important to note that the discontinuance would not apply to persons already in colleges or occupational training when the 10-percent figure was reached. These young men did not make their choice to avoid a war—because the shooting had not reached an appreciable extent at the time of their decision—and so their deferment would stand.

I would also like to take a moment to discuss several other changes that would make our draft law more equitable. First, the bill would extend the protection afforded by the courts and the legal process to the selective service process. Thus, registrants would be permitted counsel to represent them in all national service proceedings, and indigent registrants would be provided with counsel.

Second, as previously mentioned, the bill would require the National Service Agency to provide each registrant with full and clear information about his options under the law and any regulations. Too often in the past registrants have simply not been informed of their options and I believe it is the duty of the Government to inform each individual of his rights in such an important matter.

In addition to the above changes in procedure, there is one final change that is essential—to prohibit local board discrimination on the basis of race. The present law prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex but says nothing of race. Consequently, it is not surprising to see that only 7½ percent of all local board members in 1970 were black, while, in 1969, 14 percent of all inductees were black.

My bill would require the membership of all local placement centers to represent all elements of the public it serves and would prohibit discrimination based upon sex, race, creed or color.

In short, I think the National Service Act would provide the three elements which are essential for effective draft reform—flexibility, to adjust to either high or low manpower needs; certainty, to insure that the system will be uniform and predictable, so that every young man will know to the extent that it is possible when he will be called to serve; and fairness, so that every young person is treated equally.

Mr. Speaker, with the selective service system due to expire on June 30, 1971, the time is ripe for a reevaluation of our present system. Therefore, I urge the Armed Services Committee to convene hearings to consider all proposed reforms of the draft—the National Service Act, the all-volunteer proposal, universal service, and many others—so that we can provide the most equitable system possible for the youth of our Nation.

LATEST FROM THE POVERTY FRONT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, instances of fraud, mismanagement, and coddling of criminals continues to increase as a socialistic central government falters in its endeavors to make unequal men equal. Of course, free men can never be equal, for if forced to be made equal, they are no longer free.

In the District of Columbia, it has been disclosed that about $600,000 in food stamps was obtained fraudulently by falsifying income and under false pretenses. Yet, the USDA, steward of the taxpayers' moneys, refuses to prosecute the criminals because the individual amounts fraudulently obtained were very small—seemingly $600,000 is not such an insignificant sum to many taxpayers.

Welfare recipients in the District of Columbia are encouraged to buy new townhouses over a 15- to 25-year period. Additionally, plans have been announced for the construction by federally subsidized private developers of a 283-unit high-rise building for families who are too "rich" for public housing but cannot afford market-rate rents.

In New York, taxpayers footed the bill for $70-a-night rooms at the Waldorf-Astoria for a welfare mother and her four children, who really preferred a cheaper Brooklyn hotel because the maid service was more responsive to her needs.

If only money were needed to cure poverty, there should be very few poor neighborhoods. The American taxpayers have been giving by the tens of billions. But, the record of Government handouts raises the question as to whether we have curbed poverty or are perpetuating the same.

Poverty can only be effected by willing individuals through production and work. And neither of these have ever been shown to be a virtue of government.

Our immigrant ancestors had no guaranteed income, only ambition. No job was too menial to impair their dignity. Italians who could not even speak English pushed carts many weary miles a day selling whatever they could; the English worked in mines; the Germans ran small shops, and the Irish worked at construction jobs. People of these and many other nationalities worked hard and built this Nation and their own self-respecting future.

The best way to fight poverty is to work.

I include the following news clippings on this subject:

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 22, 1971]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOOD STAMP PLAN RULES ARE CHANGED

(By James Griffin)

In the wake of disclosures that about $600,000 in food stamps was obtained fraudulently last year, the Mayor's Committee on Food, Nutrition and Health plans to meet next week to discuss new food stamp regulations.

The food stamp cheating was revealed yesterday as D.C. Food Stamp manager John E. Saunders, 49, explained the regulations to irate food stamp recipients, mostly mothers.

Under the proposed regulations, all food stamp applicants would be checked thru a central computer and stamps would be mailed to those qualified to receive them.

The food stamp recipients complained that mailing the stamps would cause delays of up to three days and could lead to theft of the stamps from mail boxes.

Mr. Saunders told the mothers in the City Council chambers that the proposed new regulations resulted from an audit which "showed a better than 30 percent picture of irregularities." The Department of Agriculture, which oversees all food stamp programs, conducted a special audit of the D.C. Food Stamp Department's books over a six month period last year, at the request of Public Welfare director Winifred Thompson, according to James Springfield, Agriculture's food stamp director.

The General Accounting Office and the USDA's Inspector General's office took part in the investigation. The audit, performed by a special sampling method—which takes a number of cases and then projects a theoretical conclusion showed the 30 percent abuse of the system. Mr. Springfield confirmed that in October of last year USDA Asst. Sec. Richard Lyng met with Mayor Walter E. Washington to tell him of the findings.

Mr. Springfield said USDA had decided not to prosecute in any of the fraud cases because the individual amounts were very small.

Mr. Saunders said that the frauds were perpetrated by falsifying income of food stamp clients or by "shopping around" from one food stamp certification office to another obtaining under false pretenses food stamps from each. He denied that any of his 39 employees were in on the frauds.

Normally, a food stamp client goes to one of the District's centers and "certifies" his income, rental payment and address. This is usually checked on the spot. However, under an "undue hardship" clause in Agriculture's guidelines, "we can certify them for stamps without verification. This is called 'pending verification,'" said Mr. Saunders, who took over as food stamp manager 3½ years ago. The food stamp program began here in 1965.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 21, 1971]

TENANT-BUYERS SOUGHT IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR "TURNKEY 3" TOWNHOUSES

(By Harvey Kabaker)

The District's public housing agency is advertising for applications for low-income families who would like to move into 92 new townhouses and buy them over the next 15 to 25 years.

It is the first home-ownership project undertaken by the National Capital Housing Authority, which now rents apartments and houses to about 10,000 low-income families and elderly and handicapped persons. The federally sponsored "Turnkey 3" program began in 1968.

Applications, according to the advertisement in yesterday's Star, will be accepted through Jan. 29 at NCHA's offices, 1170 12th St. NW, for families that require three, four or five bedrooms. They may also apply at any of the agency's 18 management offices around the city.

The townhouses are part of a development that includes a 228-unit high-rise building for the elderly, also scheduled to open soon with residents taken from the top of NCHA's waiting list of 1,900 persons or couples.

Later, according to present plans, ground will be broken for a privately developed, federally subsidized, 283-unit high-rise building for families who are too "rich" for public housing but cannot afford market-rate rents.

The 92 townhouses are to be managed by a community-based Capitol View Development Corp., a nonprofit organization formed by several Far Northeast-Southeast civic and antipoverty groups. The community group will select the new tenants from the NCHA-approved list of applicants.

The housing authority said yesterday that final approval is being sought from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to designate the project, already built at East Capitol Street and Southern Avenue SE, for the home ownership program. All that remains to be done, officials said, is approval by inspectors.

Meanwhile, they said, NCHA will prepare the list of applicants who qualify under the agency's income limitations. For example, a family of four with income—after certain deductions—of under $5,100 a year can move into public housing and may stay until its income rises to $6,400. The latter figure is the cutoff for the home ownership program.

A family of six with a yearly income under $5,700 is eligible for public housing rental and may remain until the income reaches $7,100. A family of six whose income is under the latter figure is eligible for home ownership.

This is how the Turnkey 3 program works:

The resident's basic monthly payment will be the same as if the home were being rented—a maximum of 25 percent of the family's adjusted income. But a certain portion—to be determined by NCHA—will be withheld by the resident, to pay for utilities. The resident as in any private home will be responsible for utilities and extra costs from waste or negligence.

Part of the resident's actual payment to NCHA will be set aside in an "equity account." Nationwide, the "equity" payment averages $10 to $11, while in Montgomery County it is $14. NCHA has not set the amount in the District.

The "equity account" represents the amount of work, and perhaps materials costs, expended by the resident in maintaining his home. NCHA will not be responsible for normal upkeep.

Over the course of 15 to 25 years—depending on the price of the home, and whether the resident contributes extra money as his income rises—NCHA will be paying off the construction debt, with federal subsidies, as it would for any housing owned by the agency. But when the unpaid debt (plus closing costs) is equal to the amount accumulated in the equity account, title goes to the resident.

Charles Norris, a community worker with Far East Community Services has been working for such a program at Capitol View Plaza for nearly three years and is spokesman for the group that will run it in cooperation with NCHA.

Norris said a six-member screening committee will consider the suitability of applicants for home ownership by "the way they pay their rent," according to credit ratings and previous landlords. He said the committee might also consider the family's housekeeping habits as well.

He said that a family's dependence on welfare payments would not automatically exclude them from the program, according to some tentative conclusion for the committee.

He added that there was some concern the city would place a lien on a home bought with welfare funds. An official of the Social Services Administration, however, asked about such a policy, discounted it.

He said that there is no legal authority to attach a lien on property of families receiving aid-to-dependent-children grants. (In some cases involving handicapped persons, the city seeks control of property the recipient is incapable of managing.)

A doctrine of "recovery" used to be practiced here, which would require the city to regain property acquired by welfare recipients, the official said, but successful legal and political challenges ended that he said.

NCHA's interpretation of the equity procedure also concludes that the property will be protected.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 21, 1971]

WALDORF-ASTORIA STORY: WELFARE FAMILY MOVES OUT

NEW YORK.—A welfare mother and her four children were moved out of their $70-a-night rooms at the Waldorf-Astoria yesterday and the three city employes who had booked them there were suspended. The mother said she didn't care that much for the elegant hotel.

Mayor John V. Lindsay said sending Mrs. Cleole Hainsworth and her children, aged 10 to 18, to the Park Avenue hotel showed "colossal bad judgment or worse" and may have been done with "malicious intent." He ordered the employes' suspension.

(The Associated Press reported that about 200 welfare workers at a Brooklyn center walked off the job this morning to protest the suspensions. The walkout threatened to spread, the AP said.)

The Hainsworths were put up in the Waldorf on Tuesday when the Human Resources Administration could not find other accommodations.

A hotel spokesman said the rent was paid until checkout time today and the family could have stayed, but they moved out yesterday, into the home of a woman friend. Mrs. Hainsworth had wanted to go there in the first place. "They (welfare officials) said a flat 'no,'" she said.

Mrs. Hainsworth called the Waldorf rooms "very nice," but said she preferred the Manhattan Beach Hotel in Brooklyn where the family had been living for the past month. "It was very beautiful," she said. "We even had a sun porch." She also preferred the maid service in the Brooklyn hotel. Maids made up their room at 7 a.m. At the Waldorf, she said, the maids were not in until afternoon. But she said the children, believing the Waldorf was filled with movie stars, liked it better.

The hotel in Brooklyn told her to leave Tuesday because it needed the room for other guests. An HRA office in Brooklyn could not find rooms in any hotels on the list approved for welfare clients and made arrangements at the Waldorf.

The Hainsworth family had been without a home for three months since the foundation of the apartment where they had lived for eight years collapsed. Mrs. Hainsworth said she is "just tired of moving."

The welfare agency has tried to get Mrs. Hainsworth to move into an apartment in the Red Hook project of Brooklyn with $145 monthly rent. "I don't like that place," she said. "My kids are good kids and I want a place they like."

A spokesman for Lindsay said the three suspended employes were Salvatore Ciccolella, Alan Bear and one person identified only as Mr. Henderson.

A TALE OF TWO JAILS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) and I visited New York City's Kew Gardens jail. With us was writer Jack Newfield.

Mr. Newfield's report on our experience and how this compared with what he and I witnessed a few weeks earlier in the city's Federal Detention Center, appeared in the January 21 issue of the Village Voice.

I am submitting the story for printing in the RECORD because it speaks so precisely of the inhumanity in some of our jails and the urgent need for the Congress to act in passing prison reform legislation. Our colleague from Illinois, Mr. MIKVA, has introduced a bill which I am cosponsoring to establish Federal standards for State and local prisons and to provide Federal funds to assist these institutions in meeting the standards. I hope that the Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on this matter shortly.

Jack Newfield's report follows:

CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN NEW YORK—A TALE OF TWO JAILS

(By Jack Newfield)

"I suspect that all the crimes committed by all the jailed criminals do not equal in social damage that of the crimes committed against them." (Dr. Karl Menninger, "The Crime of Punishment".)

A tale of two jails, one federal, the other municipal, one the responsibility of Attorney General John Mitchell, the other, the responsibility of Mayor John Lindsay.

On January 5, two days after a small riot, Congressman Edward Koch and I spent three hours inspecting the Federal House of Detention, at 427 West Street near 11th Street. It is old, over-crowded, and under-staffed. But it is, on balance, one of the less dehumanizing jails in the country. Inmates voluntarily told us that the new warden, Louis Gengler was "humane," "honest," and "liberal." One even said he'd sent the warden a Christmas card.

Warden Gengler permitted Koch and myself to go into the cells alone to talk to inmates without any guards present. One inmate told me, "I've been in the Tombs, in Brooklyn, in Newark, anu this is paradise."

Inmates told us there was no brutality, that they get clean underwear three times a week, that the food was "okay," and that they have a gym to work out in. One of them said: "The warden comes around twice a day and asks us for our complaints. He tries to do what he can for us." Other inmates told us there were law books in the library and that common-law wives and friends were allowed to visit them on holidays. The inmates were permitted to leave their cells and walk around the cell block during the day.

At one point Koch asked a famous alleged Mafioso if he had any grievances about the jail, and the man answered, "Just that we don't have girls and weekend passes . . . This is a very decent joint." When I asked another group of about 12 inmates playing cards in one cell if they had any complaints, the only one offered was the absence of kosher food. Again, this conversation was conducted with no guards within hearing distance.

The visit persuaded me that despite antiquated physical facilities and not enough funds, and despite slow courts and unfair bail, a relatively humane administration was still possible within the rotting shell of the existing criminal justice system.

When Koch returned to his office he drafted a letter to Norman Carlson, director of the Bureau of Prisons. In it Koch wrote: "Over the past two years I have visited four prisons in New York City and elsewhere, and I must tell you that no other wardens in any other prison that I visited had the same laudatory comments made about them as did Warden Gengler. . . . In my opinion he is doing an excellent job in spite of the handicaps."

It was not easy getting a view inside a New York City jail. My first request to visit a detention facility, made six weeks ago, was rejected by Commissioner McGrath. A tour scheduled for January 13 with Congressman Koch was canceled at the last minute. John Parsons of CBS–TV was promised an "open door" tour of the Tombs last week, but was not permitted to talk to inmates, or see the isolation cell (bing). A tour of Kew Gardens for about 45 print and television reporters last week also excluded any direct contact with inmates. I insisted that any legitimate tour must include access to inmates, as did my visit to the Federal House of Detention.

Finally, on Monday of this week, Representative Koch, Representative Joseph Adabbo of Queens, and I were given a two-hour tour of the Kew Gardens jail by Commissioner McGrath. This is the newest of the city's six dentention jails, and was completed in 1962. On the outside it looks impressive with its clean new bricks and modern design.

Inside, the human part of it, is another story. The prison holds 530 inmates. They are locked in their cells 21 hours a day. For three hours they are permitted to congregate in the narrow corridors outside their cells. They have no recreation facilities whatever, no radios, no checker games even. They have no methadone withdrawal treatment for narcotics addicts, and about 60 per cent of all the inmates are addicts. About half of the jail population is awaiting trial; most have been waiting for more than four months. The warden of this jail is Albert Ossakow, who was named in several affidavits filed in federal court as personally witnessing the brutal beating of inmates after the October riot, and not objecting. One part-time psychiatrist, on duty nine hours a week, services all the 530 inmates.

We first visited a tier of cells on the fifth floor. About 15 inmates were sitting in the four-foot-wide corridor, as part of their "recreation time" outside their six-by-eight cells. Congressman Koch asked them if they had any complaints.

One man, about 45, said in broken English that he had been wearing the same underwear and the same pants ever since he was arrested six months ago. He said he had no family to bring him clean clothes. "I've asked the guards to get me clean underwear," he said, "but they don't listen."

Warden Ossakow, who looks and sounds like the comedian Phil Foster, said, "Maybe his English isn't understandable." When I asked how many of the guards speak Spanish, he said, "Two, and one is the cashier in the commissary."

We next spoke to a narcotics addict in his cell. "I came in here sick as a dog," he began. "I'm a junkie. I stayed awake for 25 days. I didn't eat for 14 days. I asked the guard to let me see a doctor, but they wouldn't let me. I belong in a hospital. I need methadone. I kicked heroin here alone. I was in agony.

The guard told me there was no doctor available. They only gave me tranquilizers."

Koch, who was instrumental in obtaining a 20-bed methadone withdrawal program at the Tombs jail, repeated the man's story to Commissioner McGrath, who said, "I can't believe it."

At the end of the tour we went down to the medical office to look up the inmates' record. It consisted of a blue card with information filled in.

"You see, he's lying," McGrath said.

Koch, examining the record closely, said, "He's not lying, Commissioner. Look here." Koch then showed the Commissioner that the story the inmate had told us of being arrested in Brooklyn and then being transferred to Queens was substantiated. The blue card described the prisoner as a "four bundle a day" heroin addict, but "not in withdrawal." It showed no record of medical treatment, except for tranquilizers, since he was admitted to the jail. (There was one part of the card that neither Koch nor McGrath could decipher.)

"This man belongs in a hospital!" Koch exclaimed.

The combined presence of the Commissioner and the warden could offer no response.

The next inmate we talked to also was an addict. He said he had been in his cell for the last four days and had no soap, no razor, and no towel.

"All he has to do is just ask for a towel," said Ossakow. Koch asked the guard (black) if the prisoner had in fact requested a towel.

"Yes, he did," said the guard, "and I told the A officer about it." However, the A officer (white) claimed he had received no such request for a towel. The inmate said, "If I can't get a towel with the Commissioner standing right here, what chance do I have when he's not around?"

Later, when Koch suggested to the warden that the second guard was lying, Ossakow replied "Let's just say he was fearful of making a mistake."

Similar Catch-23 absurdities were apparent at other points of the visit. One inmate complained that he had not been permitted to receive visits from his common-law wife. The warden said the inmate had to "fill out a slip" for that privilege. Then the inmate explained that he was told there were no more of those particular slips available to be filled out.

When Koch asked why prisoners in the big cell were not allowed mattresses, he was told that was to prevent suicides. When Koch asked why drug addicts were not placed in a dormitory, rather than the six-by-eight cells, he was told that "suicides were more likely in dormitories." ("Nonsense," Koch said later.)

At the end of the tour I remarked to mayoral aide Michele Dontzin that it all seemed crazy to me, particularly that the most modern of all the city's jails was without dormitories or hospital facilities. Dontzin said: "Of course this is all crazy. Kew Gardens is a maximum security prison, and half the people in it have never been convicted. An idiot designed this jail. In 1962 Wagner was the mayor."

When the tour was completed I asked Koch to compare the physically deteriorated federal jail with the brand new city jail.

"Of course the federal jail is much better," Koch replied. It's totally different there because the warden is a good human being. There is a different attitude here in Kew Gardens. Basic indignities are committed against inmates here. There is a bad attitude here, and it is compounded because they want to hide things here. But Kew Gardens represents the normal corrections mentality. Gengler is the exception."

There's almost nothing more I can say about this city's jails. (Kew Gardens, remember, is the best.) Everyone who cares now knows these are zoos where 6000 men and women, waiting for trials, are rotting because they are too poor to make bail, and where they are subject to the most brutalizing conditions imaginable. Cold turkey, dirty clothes, no towels, no recreation, locked in their cells 21 hours a day. Ten years ago New York Times editorials called the city's detention jails "dehumanizing" and "barbaric." But nothing has changed. It is as if the riots never happened.

There comes a time when even a writer—perhaps especially a writer—feels that words are worthless. The situation with the jails is now comparable to Germany in 1943 in the sense that there can be no more good New Yorkers; no one can pretend any longer that he is ignorant of what is happening behind the walls.

We all know it is a horror and a scandal. We know men have been stripped naked and beaten; we have seen the photographs of inmates having limbs smashed by baseball bats and ax handles. We know there have been 17 suicides during the last 24 months. We know inmates have been beaten and persecuted after all the official promises of no reprisals.

We don't need any more studies or articles, or committees. We know all there is to know. No more words of shame, no more words of regret, no more words of anger. Only action.

PROTEST IN POLAND

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 27, it was my distinct privilege to be the principal speaker at a rally to protest injustices the Polish people continue to endure.

Fittingly enough, the rally was held in Independence Hall Square in my home city of Philadelphia. The rally was sponsored by the Eastern Pennsylvania District of the Polish American Congress, which represents 145 church, fraternal, veteran, and civic organizations and the 250,000 Polish Americans who live in the Philadelphia metropolitan area.

The day was bitter cold with a hint of snow in the air and the fact that 1,000 persons came to participate in this brief march and outdoor rally is testimony to the depth of the concern about their brothers and sisters across the sea. It is also a tribute to the dedication of Henry J. Wyszynski, president of the Polish American Congress—Eastern Pennsylvania District. At the request of the Congress and Mr. Wyszynski, I enter here a resolution, which I heartily support, approved at the rally:

RESOLUTION

Whereas The twelve million Americans of Polish descent in this country, together with all freedom loving people of the world, are shocked at the unmerciful and inhuman treatment imposed by the communist rulers of Poland upon the men, women, and children in the various cities when militia and armed police of that government killed or wounded many who protested the sharp increase in the cost of food, fuel, and clothing recently; and

Whereas, the Polish American Congress Eastern Pennsylvania District, Polish citizens now residing in the United States of America, all Americans of Polish ancestry join all Americans condemning the Communist government in Poland for the bloody terror it dealt to the Polish people who were expressing their opposition to price increases that threatened their very survival.

Now therefore, the Polish American Congress Eastern Pennsylvania District, assembled this 27th day of December, 1970, in the City of Philadelphia, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,

Resolves as follows:

That the President of the United States, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Secretary of State and all people and bodies in authority, express to the Communist Government in Warsaw, on behalf of the Polish American Congress Eastern Pennsylvania District and all Poles in the United States of America, their condemnation of the recent unlawful killing of the men, women, and children in Gdansk, Gdynia, Szczecin, and other Polish cities, because of their protesting the price increases.

HENRY J. WYSZYNSKI,
President, Polish American Congress, Inc., Eastern Pennsylvania District.

I would also like to take this opportunity, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, to enter in the RECORD my remarks of that day:

Calm has once again come to the Polish people, a false, empty, calm imposed by the presence of tanks and the very visible threats of police and army violence. The long-suffered reasons for the violence of a few days ago remain; the exorbitant prices of staple foods, fuel and clothing, the shoddy quality of the goods, the inadequate supply of even the most essential of foods, the meatless Mondays, the spiraling inflation, and the endless excuses to keep wages low. Inefficiency, corruption, antiquated management policies, and intransigence; all of these the Polish people have suffered for thirty years and still there is no end in sight. Twenty people are dead as a result of five days of violence according to official Polish news reports . . . the true figure could be many times twenty.

The national emergency curfew has been lifted, and the Polish television shows us pictures of workers doing their Christmas shopping. But what can they buy? What can they afford? A chicken costs three dollars, much too expensive for the poorly paid Polish workers. In fact, food prices were raised as much as twenty percent, prior to the rioting, and no one yet talks about lowering them. At the same time the prices of some industrial goods were decreased, decreased from impossibly high to nearly impossible high. So now, although the Polish people are hungry and cold, many more of them will be able to watch television. But they won't see the rioting over lack of food and fuel on their sets. Even those with television sets now know little more than outsiders about the strife torn cities of the north since the government has censored most news on the rioting.

But, we are told, there is hope. A new government has taken charge, a new government which promises to be more attuned to the needs and desires of the Polish people, a government which promises an end to economic inefficiency and waste. But the speeches used by the new leadership to restore calm sound strangely familiar. The new leader denounces the old leader and talks about the mistakes of the Gomulka regime. But surely the Polish people can remember the rioting of 1956 over the prices and supply of food and fuel. Surely they can remember the soothing speeches of the newly selected First Secretary Gomulka. Those speeches also promised reforms, lower prices, a better life, a "Polish nationalist communism." What was the result of those reforms? Farm production has decreased markedly in the last few years. Today Poland's economy is stagnant, inflation is rampant, consumer goods are scarce. In fact, Poland is one of the poorest of the communist bloc nations. Politically, the Polish government is still closely aligned with Soviet Russia, even to the point that Polish troops joined Soviet troops in an enthusiastic occupation of Czechoslovakia. Poles are still without liberty, without the simple freedoms you and I take for granted. Poland under Gierek is still Poland under the thumb of an autocratic and Russian-oriented communist party.

Let us assume that the new government does solve he economic problem of Poland. Will the people of Poland be allowed to live their own lives unhampered and unrestricted by harsh rulers loyal to Soviet masters? Unfortunately not. For Mr. Gomulka's successor, Edward Gierek, may be a better economic manager, but he is also a tough loyal communist who looks to the Kremlin for instructions. Four other members of the Politburo have also been ousted as of this date. And their replacements, unfortunately, are men of an even more conservative, party orientation. Many writers, well versed in Polish affairs, predict, not an era of liberalization, but an era of enforced orthodoxy, strict party control of the nation, and closer ties with the Soviet Union.

The lesson of 1956 and the loss of 1970 are clear. The Poles must be free to choose their own leaders, their own governments. The Russians must learn that the puppet masters they impose can only rule Poland, but never govern it.

So once again we must say to the Kremlin:

Freedom for Poland and freedom for the Polish people.

I am proud to add my voice to that chorus.

THE ROLE OF THE EXIM BANK IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the February issue of Worldwide Trade Horizons, a monthly publication of Pan American World Airways, devoted to the promotion of international trade, an excellent discussion of the contributions and functions of the U.S. Export-Import Bank appeared. It strikes me as one of the better expositions of the role of the Bank, particularly in conjunction with the promotion of export trade, and consequent positive entries in the U.S. balance-of-payments summaries.

Two very signficant points are made by the article. The Bank operates on its own resources, and does not spend the American taxpayer's money. Second, it does not compete with U.S. banking interests. On the contrary it enters international transactions only on request of a private bank, disbursing dollars only within the United States and accepting payment of both principal and interest in dollars. Thus, it encourages sales of U.S. products overseas, and going beyond its favorable impact on the balance of payments, it contributes to the creation of additional jobs within our economy.

The article to which I refer reads as follows:

HENRY KEARNS' EXIMBANK GIVES NEW AID TO INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Revitalized to broaden overseas markets for American products, the Export-Import Bank of the United States reflects the drive and enthusiasm of its Chairman Henry Kearns.

"At least half of the business that we help finance is in deals initiated abroad," Mr. Kearns said recently in an interview granted this magazine. "There's no lack of demand for this country's goods when international businessmen find advantageous ways to finance purchases.

"In most other industrial countries the governments insulate the foreign financing rate from the domestic rate. Eximbank is the only institution to offer similar support in the United States. We have programs—many of them new—that can help buying companies of all sizes in most nations of the world. Now we're setting up communications to let prospective customers for American goods know just what we can do for them."

The sole function of the Export-Import Bank of the United States is to finance the nation's exports. Right now, Eximbank (as it is abbreviated around the world) has $6 billion out in loans. Mr. Kearns explains, that Eximbank's cash resources recycle within the United States. This is because, although the credit is extended to the buyer abroad, the money disbursement is to the domestic supplier of the product or service. Repayment by the borrower is made in Eximbank in dollars of both principal and interest. To achieve maximum usefulness of its cash resources, Eximbank makes its loans at 6 percent interest, which is lower than commercial interest rates.

Yet Eximbank is not in competition with commercial banks. On the contrary, it lends money only in partnership with them. In fact, Eximbank enters a transaction only when the commercial bank prefers not to finance it alone. The support of Eximbank makes certain business deals attractive to commercial banks that might otherwise consider them unattractive because of risk, length of term, or cost of money. In practice, defaults are extremely rare in business affairs in which Eximbank participates.

"We are creating an atmosphere which gives an American businessman confidence that he can sell overseas," Mr. Kearns says. "He may be a manufacturer who has never traded internationally before, but who stands a good chance of success in competition with producers in other countries when he tries."

Eximbank has served world traders in various ways since it was founded in 1934. Traditionally, the Bank has dealt with large companies and government bodies abroad, typically relative to long-term financing of capital equipment. In these matters, with which it is still actively concerned, the institution had a reputation for moving conservatively with the loans, guarantees and insurance required.

Under Henry Kearns, who took charge in 1969, the bank is paying considerably more attention to small and medium-sized firms around the world while expanding its services to the larger buyers and suppliers. Its new programs reflect President Nixon's policy of attacking the nation's balance of payments problem by encouraging exports which, of course, means attracting overseas buyers.

With that objective, Eximbank is joining with businessmen to promote better competitive positions for American goods around the world. One of the most enthusiastic salesmen for the Bank's innovations is Chairman Henry Kearns.

The Relending Program provides one example of how a government agency can get closer to buyers abroad. Within a one-year period, some 36 overseas financial institutions agreed to use Eximbank funds to make subloans to small and medium-sized companies desiring to import specified products from the United States. By this means, Mexican firms have been enabled to finance the purchase of machine tools; Spanish companies have bought business machines; farm implements have been exported to Thailand buyers; candymaking machinery has been sent to Brazilian customers. All the products were made in the U.S.A. The international transactions are proving to be mutually beneficial.

It is useful to point out that the business deals mentioned, like all those supported by the Export-Import Bank of the United States, did not spend the American taxpayer's money. The Bank operates on its resources, which include $1 billion capital, $1¼ billion in accumulated reserves, and authority to commit the U.S. Government up to $13.5 billion. Its sole stockholder is the U.S. Treasury which is receiving annual dividends out of Eximbank profits.

The Relending Program is considered a "seeding" operation to open new markets to American products. Once the credit has been used, normal commercial channels are expected to take over.

An outgrowth of relending is the Cooperative Financing Program which operates on a continuing basis and is also most useful to small and medium-sized businesses. It provides for joint financing between Eximbank and overseas banks and financial institutions. The agreements cover a specified amount of money, usually available for a year, to be used for exported U.S.A. goods and services. The program was introduced in April 1970, and numerous agreements are now in effect, the earliest relating to Latin American development.

Still another new program is available to companies of all sizes outside the United States, but is expected to be mostly used by small and medium-sized companies leasing American equipment. Eximbank offers two types of guarantees; one covering political risks such as war or expropriation, and the second adding to that coverage protection against commercial risks such as protracted default and insolvency of the lessee.

The programs applying to overseas companies of less than giant stature have a particular appeal in the developing nations. "We have to seek them out, too," says Henry Kearns. "The biggest potential markets in the world are no good without income. If we help them get started, using American products and equipment, they'll become better customers as their own funds develop."

A recent sampling of export sales made under a newly revised Discount Loan Facility shows that Eximbank is extending its usefulness to smaller overseas firms in another way. A typical beneficiary of this program is an American manufacturer trying to deal with a potential importing customer who will buy only on credit. The American's private bank may not want to tie up its own money for the duration of the loan, even though the deal qualifies for an Eximbank guarantee. However, under the Discount Loan Facility, Eximbank, will, at any time, lend the private bank up to 100 percent of the outstanding amount of the export debt obligation and will charge the bank less interest than the bank charges the borrower. At the start of fiscal 1970 the extent of the program was increased from a one-year time limit to five years. Since its revision in July 1969, business done under the program increased more than 300 percent.

Henry Kearns believes that other gains in foreign trade will result when the details of the Bank's innovations become known to the people who can benefit from them. "At the moment, world trade amounts to more than $240 billion and a major part of it needs financing. But, while trade is growing at the rate of 8.9 percent a year, the money supply is growing at a little less than 3 percent annually. The Bank's services are needed, more each year, here and abroad."

This accounts for greatly expanded efforts to disseminate information about those services. Literature is being made available in several languages. Bank officials are going out to meet potential buyers of American goods.

For example, on a 1970 trade mission to Brazil and Venezuela, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Commerce and Pan Am, Eximbank officer Gilbert Lochrie played a valuable role. He was of immediate help in consummating several deals by offering applicable services to the businessmen on the trip. Perhaps just as important for the future, he met and spoke with about 150 Latin American businessmen in individual interviews, explaining services now offered by the Bank.

Eximbank officials have also been traveling overseas to trade fairs. There, they have been providing on-the-spot counsel to prospective buyers concerning American financing facilities.

Eximbank's overseas seminars are attracting the interest of dealers and distributors who attend sessions tailored to their interests. Bankers in host countries are invited to special seminars. Favorable reactions to these meetings are being received from Europe and Latin America. A team of Eximbank officials is planning a series of similar seminars in the Far East during 1971.

The same approach is being used for the benefit of embassy personnel stationed in Eximbank's home city of Washington so that they will have valuable information for their nationals who inquire about doing business with the United States. Bankers from abroad are often invited to spend a month in Eximbank's offices learning the details of procedure. The course is very like that provided for American bankers.

While the programs for small and medium-sized business are receiving the stimulus of special promotion, the traditional concern of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for major overseas projects continues unchanged.

From memory, Henry Kearns can circle the world with the names of nations where Eximbank's money is at work on projects that can beneficially alter economic conditions. Under one or another of the Bank's programs, it is helping to finance roadbuilding equipment in Colombia and an east-to-west highway in Malaysia; a heavy engine manufacturing plant in Israel, airport construction in Saudi Arabia, an oil refinery in Kuwait, and a hotel in Ceylon; a nuclear energy power plant in Taiwan and a hydroelectric and irrigation dam in Afghanistan—all these along with projects in Europe, Africa and the islands of the Pacific make a list that could fill many pages.

While there is a chance for American goods and equipment to improve conditions around the world, Henry Kearns and the Eximbank will strive to make the list longer and the world trade of the United States stronger.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION IN CAMBODIA

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, as reports of increased U.S. participation in the Cambodian war continue to attract the attention of the Nation, my concern over the direction of our Southeast Asian commitment has heightened. Although this is only the first full week of the 92d Congress, I must express my serious reservations over these new events.

I have carefully studied the statements of various administration spokesmen, and have heard the President explain his plans for withdrawal from Southeast Asia. Although I did not always agree with the pace of the withdrawal plans or all of its components, I felt that the President was moving in the right direction.

Recent reports from Cambodia and Thailand have increased my concern that the United States might be slipping into another massive military commitment. Reports of U.S. air support of Cambodian operations, U.S. airlift service for Cambodian troops, U.S. instructors for Cambodian and Thai troops, all rekindle memories of the early sixties before large numbers of U.S. advisers were provided to the then Diem regime in South Vietnam.

After the invasion of Cambodia last year, President Nixon attempted to reassure a troubled American people by stating:

> The only American activity in Cambodia after July 1 (1970) will be air missions to interdict the movement of enemy troops and material where I find that it is necessary to protect the lives and security of our men in South Vietnam.

This declaration is seemingly undermined by the new reports of heavy U.S. air support for Cambodian troops and the introduction of instructors for Cambodians and Thais seems a violation of the spirit, if not the letter of the Presidential declaration.

I do not feel that such vague terms as "protective reaction" and "interdiction" hide from the American people the implications of these new moves. If the U.S. experience in South Vietnam is any indication, air support and instructors suggest a further U.S. military commitment. This, I submit, flies in the face of the Vietnamization plan and the Nixon doctrine so often offered by the administration.

I would respectfully suggest to my colleagues that these latest activities expose the Achilles heel of the President's plan. Earlier my doubts were aroused by the continuous use of the term "ground combat troops." This is a very vague term but at base means that there will be a continued presence of U.S. air support and logistical personnel numbering around 150,000 in Southeast Asia. The President has not talked about the withdrawal of forces other than "combat troops" which suggests a large and potentially dangerous commitment of U.S. personnel for many years. This is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the President must state clearly and concisely what is our policy in Southeast Asia. I am aware that the President has, and on some occasion needs, discretion in foreign policy, but if the American people are being asked to take up new burdens in Cambodia or in other Southeast Asian Nations, the President has the obligation to inform the American people and to seek the authority from Congress.

The last Congress, of which I was not a Member, attempted to exercise its responsibility by passing a modified form of the Cooper-Church amendment. This amendment prohibited U.S. ground combat troops in Cambodia and U.S. advisers from Cambodia. The administration has so fractured the language of that amendment as to ask us to believe that "instructors" are not "advisers" and thus not restricted by law.

I feel that the Congress must establish its authority in this matter. First, I urge the President, himself, to report to the Congress and the American people his view of the obligations of the United States in Southeast Asia and to prepare legislation for congressional approval to support this plan. Second, I am introducing an addition to the Cooper-Church amendment which expressly forbids the continuation of U.S. air support or sea combat support in Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, I remain willing to work with the President in the elimination of our direct military commitments in Southeast Asia. The experience of the last 10 years is eloquent testimony to the unacceptable costs of attempting to be the world's policeman. This Nation stands, as it always has, ready to assist those nations who desire to fight for their freedom, but given our own pressing domestic problems, we cannot assume the entire burdens of these battles. And given our democratic form of government we cannot embark upon wars without the consent of Congress and, ultimately, of the American people.

FAMILY OF SEVEN TRIES LIVING ON $6.21 A DAY FOR FOOD

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, there are obvious differences of opinion over whether it is possible for a family subsisting on welfare to purchase nutritionally balanced meals. As we all realize, numerous attempts have been made on an experimental basis which have resulted in abject failure. I have inserted the following article printed in the San Diego Union as evidence that an attempt has been made to procure balanced meals on the amount budgeted by the welfare department. Without making a decision as to the correctness of either claim, I wish to question whether the Federal Government itself has conducted a study of this question, and whether anything is being done to educate welfare recipients as to the types of nutritious food available and instructing them on the purchasing and preparing of such foods within their allocated budgets.

WELFARE BUDGET: FAMILY OF SEVEN TRIES LIVING ON $6.21 A DAY FOR FOOD

CARLSBAD.—A family of seven here has set out to prove that a family can eat nutritionally and appetizingly on a welfare budget of $6.21 a day for food.

Dr. and Mrs. Leon Jones and their five children yesterday began a week-long experiment to prove that, with good planning and good cooking, a welfare budget is adequate.

For breakfast yesterday, they had bacon and eggs, orange juice, milk for the children, toast and coffee—a total of $1.62.

They had such a big breakfast that no one was very hungry at lunchtime, so they had only sandwiches and milk. This meant saving the soup they had planned to have. Last night dinner consisted of fried chicken with rice and gravy, carrot and celery sticks, date nut bars and milk or tea.

TOTAL FOR DAY

"We spent $5.93 for food yesterday," Mrs. Jones said. "All that is required is proper planning and purchasing to live within a budget of 29 cents per person per meal."

Mrs. Jones buys the groceries after working a half day in her husband-chiropractor's office.

"I buy for quality as well as for price," she said, referring to a discount store where she likes to shop. "Milk and eggs come from a wholesale dairy." She buys nine half-gallons of milk at a time.

Dr. and Mrs. Jones feel it is a fallacy to believe that growing children are always hungry.

FALLACY CLAIMED

"If the children are fed an adequate, balanced diet they don't have such a craving for snacks," Mrs. Jones said. "Another fallacy that boosts the food budget of many families is the belief that the family must have meat for protein.

"Protein comes in many foods. Fresh milk can be stretched by adding powdered milk and powdered protein may also be added to the milk," she explained.

The family decided to try the experiment after seeing a television couple who tried the budget for a week and reported that the welfare budget was not adequate.

The children are Jeff, 14; Scott, 12; Jennifer, 11; Jay, 8; and Missy, 6.

PHONE CALLS

Yesterday they had three telephone calls from people who thought they were trying to embarrass people on welfare.

"We feel sorry for people who are unable to manage," Mrs. Jones said. "Perhaps it would help if people on welfare were taught to plan and purchase meals. We do not include any tobacco or liquor on our grocery bill. One person called to complain that we were saying that people on welfare should not smoke or drink beer.

"What we are setting out to prove is that children of people on welfare can be fed nutritionally," she said.

Dr. and Mrs. Jones will feed their family without augmenting their budget with the $18 a month in surplus commodities that are available to people on welfare.

"We certainly could live well if we had all the protein that is available from surplus commodities," Mrs. Jones said.

YOUTH AND THE ESTABLISHMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished member of "the establishment," Mr. John D. Rockefeller III, has given a great deal of thought to the question of how the generation gap might be bridged, how young people can be effectively brought into meaningful participation in our national life. Mr. Rockefeller incorporated some of his ideas in a speech at Amherst College last month.

In reprinting Mr. Rockefeller's speech in its issue of January 2, the Boston Globe had the following to say, by way of introduction:

Last month John D. Rockefeller 3d journeyed from New York to Amherst, Mass., to address students representing Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, Smith and the University of Massachusetts. In the back of his mind he had an idea about how to encourage student-establishment cooperation. He was even prepared to offer $25,000, no-strings attached, to cover organizational expenses for projects the students might want to undertake.

But even before Mr. Rockefeller could explain his ideas, some students threw up the picket lines. They questioned the morality of accepting money from "Mr. Establishment" himself, questioned the complicity of Rockefeller oil and industrial holdings and the Vietnam war.

Ten days later the students changed their minds and voted to accept the gift. One over-30 editor thinks the gracefulness with which Mr. Rockefeller accepted the temporary rebuke and the ideas presented in his speech, printed here, had much to do with their change of mind.

The text of Mr. Rockefeller's address, as reprinted in the Boston Globe, is as follows:

YOUTH AND THE ESTABLISHMENT—CAN THEY WORK TOGETHER?

(By John D. Rockefeller III)

More than two years ago I began a brief excursion into the world of the young. In preparing for a speech I had agreed to make, I decided to try to find out, to my own satisfaction at least, what the youth revolution was all about.

The experience turned out to be rewarding. But by the time I delivered the talk, I knew the excursion had become a journey, one that is still going on with no end in sight.

It is still going on for me because the problem I tried to understand still exists—and in many ways has become more complex and difficult. Our society appears to be more divided and polarized than before. And yet, my thesis then—and now—is that this need not be so, that we are wasting our best chance for constructive action.

I said in my remarks two years ago that the ferment of youth is potentially a powerful and constructive force in dealing with the problems our society faces. If that is true, then the crucial issue is not the youth revolution but the nature of the older generation's response to it.

I believe then, as I do now, that a basis exists for cooperation between youth and the Establishment. I said in the speech: "A unique opportunity is before us to bring together our age and experience and money and organization with the energy and idealism and social consciousness of the young."

I felt satisfied. But then I sent a copy of the text to my son Jay in West Virginia. He liked it with one exception. He pointed out that my conclusions dealt in generalities, that I was not specific about how the linkages could be made between youth and the Establishment in working on the critical social issues of our time.

Ever since, I have been turning over in my mind the question of finding specific ways to bring the resources of young and old together. I have discussed this question with many young people—present and former Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers, Federal employees, central city and suburban high school students, leaders of youth organizations, college students, young professionals. I have discussed it too with members of the Establishment—businessmen, lawyers, government officials, university professors.

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

Very early one idea emerged which offered promise of fulfilling the need with one major stroke. Not a new concept, it seemingly had great promise. Simply put, it was a National Service program, launched and sponsored by the Federal Government, in which young men and women would devote one to two years in nonmilitary service to their country.

In recent years this basic idea has been advanced by a number of respected national leaders. It was the subject of an excellent study by a group called the National Service Secretariat. The plans that have been proposed vary in details, but the central theme is the same: a large-scale program to employ the restless energies of young people in areas of genuine need for subprofessional manpower, areas such as the environment, tutoring, and delivery of health services.

In many ways, this approach has great appeal. And yet, the more I studied the idea, the more I came to the conclusion that it is not the answer.

I say this not because of the obvious and formidable problems of implementation—getting legislation passed, handling large numbers of young people out of the 4 million who turn 18 every year the substantial cost involved, the bureaucracy which would arise in Washington to manage the program. If these were the only obstacles, one could roll up one's sleeves and go to work.

But there is a more fundamental difficulty. A formal national program of service, organized and funded by the Federal government, is not in tune with the mood and temper of the young today. It might have been a good design in the 1950s or even the 1960s, but my strong belief is that in this country now it is obsolete.

WHAT THE YOUNG WANT

Most of the concerned young people do not want to be cogs in a national program. By and large, they are very skeptical about working for the Federal government. They much prefer a loose and free form of organization which can move flexibly to the targets of opportunity at the local and regional levels. And they want to have some influence over any activity to which they make a personal commitment.

A major factor is the desire of many young people for action that is directed toward social change, recognizing as they do that basic changes are essential if we are to cope with the problems our society faces. It is not that government programs cannot generate social change, but that they are often indirect, slow-moving, and bureaucratic. Moreover, government programs involving change are always politically sensitive, and this seems intensified when they employ the young.

This limiting factor came through clearly in my discussions with ex-Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers. They agreed that on balance their service had been worthwhile. They also agreed that as long as the volunteer engaged in straightforward service activities, everything was fine. But if he pressed for social change, he became controversial and therefore a threat.

It is of course disappointing to come across what appears to be a grand solution to a major need and find out that it is no solution at all. While I favor increased government support for programs involving the young, it must be recognized that such programs will be mainly in the service and training areas rather than in areas involving social change. If young people are to work directly on the massive problems confronting our society, and if fundamental social change is to be possible where necessary, then I believe it will be the private sector which will have to develop and support the required programs. Is it realistic to envision this happening on a big enough scale to be significant?

One essential condition is the readiness of the young to be involved in social issues. In my judgment this still continues to exist.

I stated before that the youth revolution was no passing fancy, no mere generation gap, but a fundamental shift in values and commitment. I believe the evidence of the past two years bears that out. Young people continue to be actively involved—in political action, in pressing for institutional reform, in scores of new organizations dealing with the environment and other issues. The scale of this involvement justifies saying that the beginnings of a "national service" program do exist in this country, scattered and sporadic to be sure, but grass roots effort from the bottom up rather than the top down. It consists of tens of thousands of individual and group efforts by young people all over this nation.

This involvement is all the more impressive because it is voluntary. The young have other options, but they act out of genuine commitment and conviction. Far from being some radical frenzy, it is in the original American tradition of private initiative, of voluntary action.

At the same time, however, violence and militancy have also increased. A sense of perspective on this issue is badly needed. Every activist movement will contain its destructive elements and so it is with the young. The vast majority wants to improve this society, wants to solve the problems we have lived with too long, wants to help build a decent and just life for all. The chief danger is that these responsible young people will become frustrated through lack of success in their efforts.

THE FAILURE TO RESPOND

In my judgment, the fundamental issue still is relative lack of response by the Establishment to the constructive potential of the young. We may have a "national service" effort in this country in terms of the motivation and energy and commitment of tens of thousands of young people. We do not have it in terms of organization and money and expertise. This is what the Establishment could supply. But it has not done so to any significant degree. In the past two years, I have not seen a response on the part of the Establishment comparable to the build-up of projects and activities on the part of the young.

Thus we play into the hands of the extremists by frustrating the efforts of the large number of dedicated and positive young people who want to be constructive. By our failure to respond positively to youthful activism, we are throwing away what is potentially our best asset for needed social change; indeed we may well be converting it from an opportunity to a major problem.

And so we arrive at the underlying question: Is it possible for youth and the Establishment to come together, to break through the misunderstandings, the anger and hostility, which now divide them?

It seemed to me that the only course was to probe this question more deeply, to try to find out in some systematic way whether or not there are genuine grounds for cooperative effort between young people and Establishment members. What are the obstacles to cooperation, and can they be overcome? How would both groups react to specific projects in which they would work together?

A SOLID BASIS EXISTS

Answers are beginning to emerge in the work and research of a small task force which I have sponsored. The approach was first to develop a number of specific ideas for joint action by young people and Establishment members, and then to test the more promising in a scientific survey of both groups. The survey was also designed to diagnose the mood and temper of the two groups on a wider range of issues and try to find out what they think of each other.

In the course of the research, 872 students and 408 Establishment leaders were interviewed. Within the latter group, it was decided to concentrate mainly on business executives.

If I were to summarize in one sentence what these interviews tell us, it would be this: while there are formidable obstacles to be faced—and I do not underestimate these for a moment—there does exist a solid basis for cooperative effort between young people and the Establishment. Cooperation is wanted by both groups. Both believe that it is urgently needed.

Findings from the survey strongly support this central conclusion. For one, there is substantial agreement among college students and business executives on the issues which must be dealt with. Both groups single out as collaborative issues the major aspects of the urban crisis: poverty, racism, pollution, overpopulation, drug addiction. Ending the Vietnam war remains a dominant concern for the students but when asked about problems to which they will devote their personal time, they rank the war fourth behind poverty, pollution, and racism.

This seems to indicate a pragmatic shift which can be summed up in a comment by one respondent: "Let's stop talking and start doing."

Another important indication is the expressed willingness of the two groups to work with each other. In spite of their misgivings, young people are ready to give cooperation a try. By almost a 3 to 1 margin, they say they would rather work with the Establishment in coping with the social issues of our time than with protest groups.

At the same time there is an enormous frustrated desire on the part of business leaders to establish dialogue with the young. Three out of four desire active cooperation. Their prevailing view is summed up by the comments of one businessman:

"Whatever the causes of the rebellion, we had better get together with these young people, for the issues they are raising are our issues, the problems facing us as a nation. We need their ideas; we need their help. They are frustrated; we are frustrated. They are angry; we are angry. Neither generation can afford merely anger or frustration. Instead we must work together."

SOME OTHER INDICATORS

There are many other indicators. Among businessmen there is less backlash against students than is the case in the general population. The accent is not on writing off or further isolating the college rebels, but rather part, the great majority of students believe that the American system is flexible enough to solve problems and overcome flaws without resort to radical change. They overwhelmingly reject violence as against reason.

Most encouraging as to the possibility of cooperative action is the fact that both the students and businessmen endorse all four of the specific sample projects in the survey.

One of the projects deals with a number of ways to encourage and support the involvement of the young in the political life of this country.

Another has to do with setting up public interest study and action groups in the Ralph Nader manner, but at the local level.

A third, called "Dialogue Week" is a method of bringing young people and business executives together for a substantial period of time. This would be done in a setting designed to help stimulate genuine communication and the planning of an ongoing project.

Ranked highest by both students and businessmen is a project calling for a two-year environmental program in a major river valley. It would involve creating a student corporation, based in a consortium of universities in the area. The students would draw on faculty expertise as needed, and work to enlist the know-how and support of the Establishment in the area, especially the business and civic leaders.

FORMIDABLE OBSTACLES

So much for the encouraging factors. As I have already indicated, the survey also highlights many formidable obstacles to cooperation. They involve a strange and difficult combination of problems, ranging all the way from the rational and practical to the emotional.

One major factor is the continuing frustration of students over the Vietnam war. Another is the growing number of students who now hold a radical diagnosis of society. Between young people and the Establishment generally, there is a mutual display of surface anger and hostility, and a deeper kind of mistrust. The students do not trust the businessmen to stay with any project in which business interests become affected. The percentage of student activists who see businessmen as overly-concerned with profits as against social responsibility has increased sharply in just one year. For their part, the businessmen are wary of student immaturity, and radicalism, and few see any reason why they should subject themselves to harangues and abuse.

Then there are the new values held by a great many students which often conflict with those held by most businessmen. These students do not doubt their ability to make a living, to be successful in the conventional sense if they so choose. Taking these benefits for granted, they discount them and emphasize the importance of the individual, the desirability of social change, the search for meaningful personal relationships and meaningful work. They question authority on almost every count and hold up virtually every institution of our society for re-examination. For the most part, they find them wanting.

Another barrier to cooperation is a growing feeling of isolation and alienation on the part of many students as they react to the public's anger against campus unrest. The students are drawing back and intensifying their identification with other groups in the society who are seen as fellow victims.

These are the obstacles which have tended to immobilize the situation, to dampen initiatives between two groups for whom mechanisms for coming together do not normally exist in our society. Ironically, these obstacles are mainly of the kind that can be met only by coming together, by working them out in contact with one another, in genuine dialogue.

The forces operating in favor of collaboration between youth and the Establishment and the obstacles standing in the way are fairly evenly balanced. Whether the balance will be tipped positively or negatively in the future will depend very largely on the nature and extent of the leadership exercised by Establishment groups.

UP TO THE ESTABLISHMENT

For it does seem to me, when all things are considered, that the main responsibility for a movement toward reconciliation and joint action now rests with the Establishment. Young people have been involved and committed for some time; it is our turn now. The situation cries out for reconciliation, for directing energies toward cooperation rather than conflict, for joint action on the awesome problems we face. We must be generative rather than reactive. We must take the initiative to create the conditions that will bring us together.

I believe that a process of reconciliation can succeed if we do not come to it with naive expectations. The realistic hope is for mutual understanding to the degree that we can work together despite differences in values and attitudes.

The task force I have mentioned to you briefly will continue to exist and is now working to bring several projects into being. But none of us sees these projects as anything more than points of entry, an opening wedge into some of the complex and difficult problems confronting us. We know that a few scattered efforts will not bring about fundamental results. The hope is to help start a process of reconciliation of collaboration, and thereby serve to stimulate and encourage many more joint-action proposals.

There are almost infinite possibilities for youth-Establishment cooperation. It might be as simple an idea as major businesses and law firms going to campuses not only to recruit students, but also to find out how they can help the students to use their developing professional tools in the search for social progress. It might be a state or major city developing an intern program which really works, as the New Jersey intern program has. It might be providing logistical support—a meeting place, telephones, transportation—for a local group working on the environment. It might be a genuine effort within a large organization to open up communication with its younger members.

If 100 corporate presidents each undertook to develop or respond to one such idea for youth-Establishment collaboration, what a difference it would make. If they were joined by 100 university presidents, by 10 or 20 governors, the heads of our ten largest unions, the leadership of half a dozen of our religious denominations, the presidents of 20 foundations, the leadership of a dozen professional societies—if each of these leaders develops one good project for youth-establishment cooperation on the pressing social problems of our time, what a massive impact it will have.

I am talking now about new projects, not merely listing the activities in which we are now engaged, but new projects specifically based on responsiveness to young people. If we can do this on a meaningful scale, it will begin to complete the picture of a "national service" program generated in the private sector, matching the motivation and drive of the young with the comparable response by the establishment.

RESTORING THEIR FAITH

If this could happen, the faith of the young activists in the American system would be redeemed. It would go a long way toward meeting their urge to be relevant and constructive, to be part of the decision-making process, to really contribute to the forward motion of our society. The best impulses of the establishment would be maximized, including the desire for reconciliation with the young and readiness to use skills and resources for purposes larger than private success.

And perhaps the most important, we would make progress on the tough issues that face our society today.

I believe these goals are possible. Whether they are attained will depend on the efforts of each one of us. I have confidence that we will rise to the challenge. And this is the prospect which makes me feel these are exciting times to be alive.

TWO-YEAR REVIEW OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote in full the report of Attorney General John N. Mitchell on his 2-year review of accomplishments of the Justice Department:

TWO-YEAR REVIEW OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

(By Attorney General John N. Mitchell)

Ladies and gentlemen, this particular date—January 19—has a special significance to me, because exactly two years ago I was still enjoying the blessings of private life. All that changed the following day, however, when Richard Nixon became President of the United States. On that occasion he promised the American people a new beginning in a number of national priorities, including the administration of justice. As he took office, that particular program—designed to bring the machinery of justice into the twentieth century—included:

1. Getting new supporting legislation from Congress.
2. Mounting an effective assault on organized crime.
3. Improving the enforcement of civil rights in all statutory areas.
4. Hitting the narcotics traffic on all fronts.
5. Using all available antipollution enforcement tools to enhance the quality of the environment.
6. Protecting free competition for the benefit of the American consumer and the American economy.
7. Giving new life to the concept of justice by upgrading the processes of enforcement, adjudication, and corrections.

These were the objectives, and in offering you a brief summary of the Department's accomplishments in the past two years, I will leave it to you how well these objectives are being fulfilled. Specific details, including some charts and tables, have been given to you for your information and analysis. Let me touch upon some of the highlights before I entertain your questions.

LEGISLATIVE

Out of some 39 legislative items submitted by the Department, Congress enacted 27 or approximately 70 percent. These included those that we consider the most important, such as the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, the D.C. Court Reform and Criminal Procedures Act of 1970, and the Comprehensive Drug Abuse, Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

The Department also won Congressional financial support for its intensified programs. From fiscal year 1968 to 1971, Department employment has grown from 34,800 to a projected 43,600—an increase of more than 25 percent—in order to carry out our larger objectives. One agency—the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—required a budget increase of 6400 percent during the same period, in order to fulfill its program of financial aid to state and local governments. Our needs were substantial, and we were able to win corresponding support from Congress. Department of Justice appropriations for 1968 were $437.5 million. So far in fiscal 1971 the Department has received appropriations of $1,150.6 million—representing a 163 percent increase—and some other necessary appropriations should still be forthcoming. I should point out, of course, that $480 million of the last figure represents funding for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which grants aid to state and local organizations; this is a very substantial increase for LEAA over previous years.

ORGANIZED CRIME

In response to President Nixon's call for an all-out war against organized crime, an interdepartmental assault has been made on this national evil. The President established a National Council on Organized Crime, composed of the heads of all Federal departments and agencies who can bring an enforcement effort to bear on the problem, with the Attorney General as Chairman. The Council has developed national strategies against various aspects of organized crime and has provided top-level direction to the interdepartmental strike forces established in most large cities.

In the past two years the Department has put the strike force approach on a permanent basis, has increased the number of such forces from 7 to 16, and is able to report exceptional progress in securing evidence against organized crime syndicates and in bringing prosecutive action. The number of high-echelon organized crime leaders indicted rose from 58 in calendar 1968 to 103 in calendar 1970—nearly 78 percent. The number convicted rose in the same period from 20 to 45—or 125 percent. In the past two years approximately half of the top bosses of the nation's two dozen organized crime syndicates were indicted or convicted.

Our intelligence work tells us that some of the organized crime leaders can't stand the heat and have left their areas of operation.

One of the weapons that has greatly aided this battle has been court-authorized wiretapping, which was provided in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, but which the previous Administration refused to use. It was stated at that time that wiretapping, even when hedged about by Constitutional safeguards, was an invasion of privacy, and that anyway, it couldn't really help at getting evidence.

When President Nixon took office he sanctioned the use of this court-authorized wiretapping, and I am able to report that of the 214 Federal interceptions authorized and executed during calendar 1969 and 1970, nearly all produced incriminating evidence. They have resulted in more than 600 arrests and more than 500 indictments—mostly against organized crime figures. While most of these cases are still in progress, we have already won 30 convictions.

At the same time, there have been no complaints that anyone's privacy was invaded. Moreover, we have strongly enforced the prohibition against private wiretapping contained in the same 1968 act, and as a result complaints of such violations have dropped from nearly 100 a month to about 30 per month.

Another important gain in the war on organized crime has been the intensified use of criminal tax evasion charges against organized crime figures, with indictments increasing by 250 percent and convictions by 53 percent between 1968 and 1970.

OTHER CRIME

In the broader area of crime, including street crime, the Administration has acted decisively wherever its jurisdiction permitted. Employment in the United States Marshals Service has been increased by nearly 55 percent for the 1971 fiscal year. In the past two years the number of Assistant United States Attorneys has been increased by 51.3 percent, compared to a 27.4 percent increase over the entire previous eight-year period. In the District of Columbia the number of Assistant United States Attorneys increased almost 100 percent, paralleling a sharp increase in the D.C. police force. In addition, the Department of Justice supported D.C. authorities in developing an effective drug treatment and rehabilitation program.

The results have been especially apparent in the District of Columbia. Starting in July, and for every month recorded since then, the crime rate has decreased decisively in comparison with the same month a year earlier, reaching a 25.4 percent decrease in September 1970 and a 23.3 percent decrease in November.

A crucial factor in the D.C. criminal justice picture was the D.C. Court Reform and Criminal Procedures Act of 1970, which was drafted by the Department of Justice. Among other things, this Act created many new judgeships to ease the backlog of cases. The Department swiftly processed the proposed appointees for these judgeships, and we can begin to see a reduction of the case backlog. In fact, the huge backlog of approximately 6,000 juvenile cases has been virtually eliminated.

To speed the processes of Federal justice throughout the country, the Administration has accelerated the appointment of judges to fill vacancies. President Nixon appointed 115 Federal judges—83 of them in 1970, when the number was the largest in American history. Every one of these was cited as qualified by the American Bar Association. Processing of judgeship candidates, including investigations and recommendations, was accomplished by the Department of Justice at a much faster rate than in the two previous Administrations.

At the same time, Federal grants to help improve local law enforcement agencies have been greatly strengthened within the last two years. Total funding for the agency established for this purpose, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, climbed from $63 million in 1969 to $480 million appropriated for fiscal 1971.

While the nationwide crime rate has not yet turned downward as a result of these efforts and those of state and local governments, it is encouraging to note that in the first nine months of calendar 1970 the crime rate did drop in 23 cities of more than 100,000 population, including Baltimore, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, Seattle and St. Louis.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In the field of Civil Rights, the Department of Justice has made an outstanding contribution in the past two years. In the area of education we filed 94 cases compared to 68 over the previous two years. The number of school districts sued jumped from a total of 56 in the two years, 1967 and 1968, to a total of 254 in the past two years—a 350 percent increase. Due in large part to Justice Department negotiation and litigation, the percentage of black school children in the 11 southern states attending desegregated systems increased from less than 6 percent prior to the opening of school in 1969 to 92 percent at the opening of the 1970–1971 school year. Of the 50 remaining school districts in this area that are without any desegregation plans, 22 are now under private suits, 16 under Federal suits brought by the Department of Justice, and the remaining 12 are under analysis preparatory to further action.

Let met emphasize that our figures reflect an analysis on a district by district basis, because that is our framework of concern. They are not on an individual school basis. A few days ago the Department of Health, Education and Welfare released figures on this same general subject. Those figures were necessarily different from ours, since they referred to schools and not to school districts. They confirmed not only conversion of the districts, but substantial integration of schools within those districts.

In the housing field, we have successfully implemented a national fair housing program following the 1968 act and its 1969 amendment. In 1969 and 1970, 64 housing cases were filed in 22 states and the District of Columbia. Equally important, negotiation resulted in securing the removal of racial discrimination from the policies of 19 United States title insurance companies. Similar progress has been made through negotiation or litigation with multiple listing services, real estate brokers, apartment operators, and large housing developers.

Achievements in fair employment may best be measured by the cases actually brought to trial, and by the relief won. The number of cases brought to trial moved from two in 1967 to 16 in 1970; appellate arguments, from 0 in 1967 to 11 in 1970; consent decrees entered, from 0 in 1967 to 8 in 1970. These actions included many multi-defendant suits, such as one against five building trade unions and three joint apprenticeship training committees in Seattle, the first of its kind; another state-wide suit against a power company; one against an Ironworkers local, resulting in the most comprehensive relief yet obtained in any trade union case. Through negotiation, with more than 80 potential defendants involved, the Department won an anti-discrimination agreement from the movie and television industry in Los Angeles. The Department also filed the first cases alleging discrimination against women, Mexican-Americans and Indians.

In public accommodations, the Department filed the first cases in the North, the first cases alleging discrimination against Puerto Ricans, and the first cases against penal institutions.

I also wish to emphasize that the Civil Rights Division is devoting considerable attention to the Department's Title VI responsibilities. Last year it established a Title VI unit whose sole responsibility is to work with Federal agencies in assuring non-discrimination in federally assisted or funded programs.

Besides the dedicated work of the Civil Rights Division, the Department's Community Relations Service made substantial progress in helping minority groups and organizations in their dealing with other elements of our society, including state and local governments. In its role as conciliator in disputes and as a liaison agent in potential community problems, the Service helped to move minorities forward while promoting peace and stability on the campuses and in the communities. In the past two years CRS has decentralized so that two-thirds of its professional staff is in the field, rather than one-third prior to 1969. The measurable decline of racial outbreaks in the United States over the past twelve months is due to many factors, not least of which is the continuing work of the Community Relations Service.

NARCOTICS

Against the nation's growing narcotics problem the Nixon Administration mounted an all-out campaign on all fronts—at home, at our borders, and at the foreign sources of illicit drugs. This has been the first administration to make narcotics control part of its foreign policy. As a result, new cooperation has been won from Mexico in destroying drugs at their sources and in policing our common border against dope smuggling. At our urging, France and Turkey have stepped up their anti-narcotics efforts.

Through the initiative of President Nixon, broader cooperation has been won from international organizations. Last summer the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society, an arm of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, agreed on methods by which NATO could combat the drug traffic. Following that meeting the United Nations Committee on Narcotic Drugs created a special fund for anti-narcotics programs in September 1970. The Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations Secretariat has already visited Thailand and Burma to start implementing these programs.

At home, narcotics agents have closed down an average of one clandestine laboratory per week for the last two years. With the help of the interdepartmental strike forces they have staged raids against major distribution rings, including one—largest such operation in history—that so far has netted 169 arrests. Prosecutive action against drug traffickers has increased correspondingly—from an average of 486 defendants filed against per month at the end of 1968 to 808 by the last of 1970—an increase of 66 percent.

I should point out that this later figure is even more potent, because we changed our mode of operation to concentrate on the large interstate distributors, leaving to state and local agencies the responsibility for enforcement against local drug peddlers. In the same period the amount of illicit drugs removed from the domestic market increased decidedly from 1969 to 1970. It more than tripled in the case of heroin and doubled in the case of marihuana. Due in large part to efforts by our Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, similar increases are shown in the amount of drugs removed from the international traffic.

Anti-narcotics legislation passed by Congress last October will certainly permit still more effective action against this national menace.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

As part of the comprehensive environmental quality program initiated by the Nixon Administration, legal action against polluters has greatly intensified, and the battlefield has been expanded to include mercury and thermal violations.

In the past two years the Department has reinstituted the Refuse Act of 1899 as a weapon against polluters. Cases under the Refuse Act increased fourfold in 1970 against the preceding two years. Injunctive suits under this Act were first introduced in March 1970, with 25 suits filed since then, including ten mercury dumping suits—some against very large operators.

The first Federal action to enjoin thermal water pollution was brought against a Florida power company, bringing a landmark ruling that dumping hot water is a form of pollution and is actionable under the Refuse Act.

In the first Federal enforcement of the Clean Air Act, the Department won an order from a Maryland District Court (sustained by the appellate court) to close down a plant because of air pollution.

In addition to these actions by the Land and Natural Resources Division, the Antitrust Division secured a consent decree winning prompt and effective relief in the automobile smog case. Without the expense and delay of a court trial, the decree provided very stiff penalties and requirements against the big four manufacturers, and promises to speed the development of an effective auto smog device.

ANTITRUST

The Department has made significant strides in preserving the free competition that lies at the center of our country's economic system. Through five major conglomerate merger cases, most of which are still pending, the Antitrust Division has helped create a climate in which the incidence of conglomerate mergers has sharply declined. In addition the Department has challenged the systematic practice of reciprocity marketing agreements that have worked against competition among suppliers. Seven such cases have been filed in the past two years, compared to none previously. Altogether, the Department filed 112 Antitrust cases in two years—more than in any two years of the previous Administration. Antitrust cases grew from 55 in 1968 to 67 in 1970.

CORRECTIONS

In response to President Nixon's 13-point program for Federal corrections reform, the Department developed a 10-year plan to modernize and upgrade the Federal prison system. Not only will this program carry out the judgments of the courts for the protection of the community, but it will also provide custodial care consistent with human dignity and will place greater emphasis on correction of the offender.

Major progress was also made in 1970 on programs to teach industrial skills to inmates, to provide the most advanced therapeutic and psychological help, to provide daytime community work to selective inmates, and to assist in creating a meaningful transition in the return of prisoners to normal life.

In addition, construction funds for a multipurpose Metropolitan Correctional Center in New York City have been provided. Plans are being drawn for a similar center in Chicago, and for a facility in North Carolina to treat mentally disturbed and violent offenders. The Bureau of Prisons will soon open the first regional staff training center for Bureau employees and for state and local correctional officials.

At the same time, through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Department is providing funds to improve state, city and county correctional institutions. Such grants have increased from $3 million in fiscal year 1969 to over $100 million for 1971.

TAX ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement of Federal tax laws has been greatly improved in the past two years. Processing of cases has been streamlined, so that in 1970 the processing of a criminal tax case averaged only two months and six days, compared to three months and ten days in 1967—an approximately one-third reduction. The percentage of cases won in the trial courts increased from 73 to 81, in the appellate courts from 79 to 81, and in the Supreme Court from 73 to 85. The number of civil and criminal cases closed both increased in this period, and with special reference to criminal cases the figure rose from 659 to 1005—approximately 50 percent.

As for results, collections by the Tax Division grew from $69 million in 1967 to $76 million in 1970, while the amount of money saved in the same years increased from $85 million to $104 million.

PORNOGRAPHY

Lastly, I want to mention progress against smut peddlers—a campaign that has been at times frustrating, but has always had a significant place in the Administration's program. First let me acknowledge the key role of the Post Office Department, which has generally provided the initial investigations leading to prosecutive action and which has been especially active under Postmaster General Blount. The following figures speak for themselves:

As of January 1, 1969, the Department of Justice was involved in five investigations of major distributors, and eight distributors were under indictment. By January 1, 1971, the figures had jumped to 58 and 55, respectively, or more than 1000 percent for investigations and more than 600 percent for indictments.

In the past 12 months, out of 13 cases involving major distributors, the Government has won 11. Virtually every decision against the defendant is on appeal to a higher court, but several convictions have been sustained at the appellate level, including cases against two of the largest distributors in the country.

As you know, only one of the three anti-pornography bills drafted by the Department and proposed by President Nixon was passed by Congress. We intend to resubmit anti-pornography legislation to the 92nd Congress.

CONCLUSION

Ladies and gentlemen, these are only some of the accomplishments of the men and women of the Department of Justice in the past two years. Limited time prevents my including many others representing equal diligence and dedication by the various divisions, bureaus, and services within the Department. Again, I leave to your candid judgment the degree to which they represent the fulfillment of our goals.

Now I will be happy to entertain your questions, which I trust you will confine to the subject of the Department's two-year achievements.

THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, January 16, 1971, I had the pleasure of being the principal speaker at the combined annual banquet and installation of officers of the Philadelphia County Council and Pennsylvania Third District, Disabled American Veterans. This affair was held at Sciolla's Restaurant, 521 West Pike Street, Philadelphia.

I should like to call my statement to the attention of my colleagues because it pays just tribute to the Disabled American Veterans, a major organization, but also because it attempts to explain why the veteran is entitled to special treatment. I do believe that elements of this statement might well be repeated throughout the country. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EILBERG

Commander Roseman, Commander Richards, Commander Bonatucci, Commander Ostash, Vice Commander Fishman, Vice Commander Cornfield, Mr. Haas, Mr. Seidler, Mr. Tammy, Mr. Norris, Representative Lederer, Mr. Zinkoff, Mr. Gormley, fellow veterans, Reverend Clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to the DAV, its distinguished history, its members, its present programs, and its future plans. Members of Congress well know that this great veterans' organization has accomplished much. And I am also proud to tell one and all that I am a member of the DAV.

For wounded veterans of the First World War, the Second World War, the Korean War, and now the war in Vietnam, the DAV has been a strong helping hand. Although its membership is restricted to the wartime disabled, it nevertheless works tirelessly for the welfare of all veterans, and the leadership which it provides has been outstanding. The testimony of its national officers is always heard with the utmost seriousness and attention by the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committees of both the House and Senate, and, of course, all Members of Congress follow veterans' legislation very closely, whether we are members of the Veterans' Affairs Committees or not.

All Americans owe a great and continuing debt to those who fought for our freedom and were wounded or suffered illness or disease because of their active service in our armed forces. Acknowledging that debt here today is a task in which I take pride, and please be assured that it is one which is uppermost in my mind when occasions arise when I have the opportunity to vote in favor of veterans' legislation, particularly for those bills benefiting the wartime disabled and their dependents.

In all of its many splendid activities in behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents, the DAV is ever aware of the guiding principle of its founding. This principle was that our nation's first duty to her veterans is the care and rehabilitation of the wartime disabled and help for their dependents or survivors.

The DAV's objectives include the following: proper medical care and treatment of veterans for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by military service; training and education designed to restore the wartime disabled to gainful employment; and adequate compensation to the widows, minor children, and dependent parents of those veterans whose deaths are caused by their service-incurred disabilities. These are worthy aims that deserve everyone's support.

I have heard it said many times, the day a nation turns its back on its veterans, that is the day it becomes an ungrateful nation and will no longer be considered great among the other nations of the earth. I concur in that thought.

Incidentally, let me say here and now, it matters not to me or the DAV what the editorial writers, other associations, or the do-gooders say about our veterans benefit program. I have only one comment for these people and that is simply this—the veterans benefit program was awarded to our nation's defenders by a grateful Congress and a grateful people; and I want to assure you that we in the DAV will fight like hell if need be to keep them in the law books of our land.

Too many Americans have forgotten what *all* veterans have done. It is not enough to think of and honor the heroes of war, both living and dead—the men who have won our nation's highest honors by their military valor or by their bravery—the gallant soldier who parachuted behind enemy lines—those who, single handed, captured or killed large numbers of enemy troops—or who threw themselves on a hand grenade, overseas or here in this country in training, to save the lives of their comrades.

No, it is not enough to honor only these noble men. All veterans have made great sacrifices. And it is not right to say, as many people do, that these who have served as our defenders in war "have merely done their duty."

One newspaper expressed its opinion candidly, "when veterans made up a tiny proportion of the U.S. population, it perhaps could be reasonably argued that they deserve special treatment as long as they lived, but well over 22 million Americans are veterans—well over ten percent of the population. Congress must decide whether it really wants to *perpetuate* the *preferred* status of such a large segment of our society." We hear simliar statements on news broadcasts and read them in the press.

Now, therefore, for those who downgrade the preferred status of veterans and are jealous of the earned benefits, I would like to explain what is so special about the veteran.

First of all, the veteran is special because he is selected. Right away, the fact that he is selected makes him something special and puts him in a class by himself. He is no longer free; he is subject to military law, and he becomes a special breed, committed to give his life, if necessary, for the ideals of freedom around the world.

He cannot be flat footed; he cannot be lame; he cannot be uncertain or short of vision—he must be as perfect as possible. And, not only physically perfect, but the veteran must be mentally alert. Furthermore, he must be morally fit—he cannot be a criminal; he cannot be perverted; he cannot be emotionally unstable. He must know the difference between right and wrong; he lives in unsegregated barracks, black and white together, as equals—they fight together and they sometimes die together for freedom.

The lame, the sick, the uncertain are rejected.

Conscientious objectors, students and key people in lucrative positions are excused or labeled "4-F." Only the best physically, mentally, and morally are called to war. And, so only the best are fit to be killed. So, even in our sophisticated society this special breed performs a sacrificial service. Only the brave are selected and only a race of ingrates would forget their sacrifice.

From the heights of Iwo Jima to the depths of Vietnam, the veteran is a special breed. Our enemies recognize the veteran as special—that's why they single him out and rage: "Go home, G.I.!" He can made an amphibious landing; he can take a hill; he can storm a bunker; he can annihilate the enemies of freedom. But he can also feed the widow and the orphan; he can become the friend of children in foreign lands; he can charm more people than the most experienced diplomat. And yet, some people have the gall to ask "What is so special about the veteran?"

Well, I can tell you that Congress thinks the veteran is "special."

During the past year, it became apparent that the VA hospital system was in dire financial need. And the Congress responded. We allocated $105 million more than the President requested for the VA hospital system.

Another bill passed in the last Congress with my vigorous support also expanded the services of the VA hospital system. Public Law 91-496 provides for greater sharing of medical facilities and talent between VA hospitals and university or teaching hospitals of proven excellence. This certainly should improve the quality of care available to the hospitalized veteran.

On Veterans Day, 1969, I visited the VA hospital at University and Woodland Avenues. I was impressed with the commitment to service of the doctors, nurses, and administrators at the hospital. I also was impressed with the increasing demand for more hospital beds needed in the Philadelphia area.

Last summer, I was instrumental in convincing the Veterans Administration to contract for an additional 25 beds for veterans care at the Navy Hospital, bringing the number of contract beds available there to 75. These beds, along with the 488 available at University and Woodland Avenues, has brought the total bed capacity for the Philadelphia area veteran to 563.

This is clearly not enough. The Philadelphia Veterans Administration services the fourth largest veterans population in the country but 20 other American cities have more VA beds.

This clearly is unjust. This clearly is impractical.

I have taken the case of the Philadelphia veteran directly to Donald E. Johnson, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, in Washington. I have urged that the VA seek authorization and funds for either a new 500-bed hospital in Philadelphia or a 500-bed annex to the University and Woodland Avenues facility.

And we have received a ray of hope. Johnson has told me there seems to be considerable evidence of the need for another VA medical facility in Philadelphia.

He went on to say that the project has a high priority and has assured me that every consideration will be given to its early development and implementation.

This is not to say that we are going to have a new VA hospital tomorrow. But it does mean the VA recognizes our problem here in Philadelphia and that is the first big step. I pledge to you tonight that I will do all I can to ensure that the VA converts its concern for our problem into bricks and mortar and beds.

We in Congress have not forgotten the veteran and we will not forget the veteran. That too I promise.

Thank you.

POLLUTION: POSSIBLY A SOLUTION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the May and June 1970 issue of the University of Chicago magazine carried an article in which Dennis F. Miller perceptively discusses the problem of pollution and suggests several approaches to the resolution of this problem.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of Mr. Miller's comments, I insert the text of his article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POLLUTION: POSSIBLY A SOLUTION

(By Dennis F. Miller)

Everybody talks about pollution and everyone does something to contribute to it—burns coal, drives a car, etc. Everybody talks about pollution but can do something about it. Individuals at the University of Chicago are trying to point the way. The author is a graduate student in history at the University.

The idea of pollution is not new in America. Conservationists and ecologists have been warning the nation of the inherent dangers of the gradual poisoning of the environment for years. But the widespread interest by the public in all aspects of pollution is a relatively recent phenomenon. People at all levels of society have begun to be vitally aware of the connection between the heavy pollution around them—the dirt and dust they must live in daily; the smelly and dirty air they must breathe—and the dangers to their health and that of their children born and unborn; many forms of life are being driven to extinction; indeed man's own existence seems to be at stake.

Not everyone, however, is frightened. There are still differing opinions on pollution common among governmental officials, educators, businessmen, and the population in general. One common assumption is that this concern with pollution is only a fad and will be only a transient episode in history. Optimists scoff at the current emotional outbursts of doom and smugly say that the imagination should be held in check and a more rational approach be taken. They say that pollution is not really a problem, because if it were, California voters would not have turned down legislation for the mandatory installation of air pollution devices on automobiles. These people point out that this so-called pollution only amounts to a change in our environment brought about by the natural evolution of man and his technology. People of this opinion say that we have nothing to fear, since man is the most adaptable of creatures on the earth and that man will continue to exist and flourish no matter what happens to the environment.

Based on the assumption that man is not really greatly affected by his environment, this approach predicts that man will remain essentially the same through the future, with perhaps minor modifications brought about by the need to accommodate the increasing levels of pollution in the environment. But this best of all possible worlds view disregards the more than probable mutagenic effects of prolonged exposure to heavy pollution on future populations. Man may not become extinct, but he may develop into something inferior to his present state of biological development.

Another approach to the problem, held by leading conservative economists, points out that the responsibility for this situation lies with the people who create the demand for the product. Just as the obstetrician cannot be blamed for the baby, the generating plant cannot be blamed for the pollution that accompanies electricity. If pollution is to be cleaned up, it should be the consumer only who bears the cost. If it is to be cleaned up, the consumer must do away with the automobile. To decrease the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, the theory goes on, one could stop exhaling it. The amount of clean air, water, etc. we want will depend solely on how much we are willing to buy, and will not be solved by being emotional and talking in terms of good or evil. Obviously this approach releases the manufacturing industry from any obligation for its contribution to pollution, and the state and federal governments from action and leadership. It is the voracious consumer who alone should be blamed for his lack of foresight and greediness.

A third, unconcerned view of pollution argues that the current interest in pollution is merely an upperclass fad that will function to the detriment of the working class. For example, those people who would most benefit from a clean lake would be those people who would use it for swimming, boating, fishing, i.e., suburbanites and well-to-do citizens, whereas, it is the workers who benefit from the factories and other industries operating at full production on the lake. If the polluting plant is shut down, then the worker is out of a job.

What is most significant about these opinions on the pollution problem is that they represent the conventional wisdom that now directs the country, and as long as they are dominant there is not likely to be any noticeable change in pollution control. Pollution cannot be solved by a piecemeal effort with little or no planning. It will require a reconceptualization of the aims of our technological development and ways of approaching and solving the problem of pollution.

FEDERAL ACTION OR INACTION

What has the federal government done to insure that its citizens need not live in mortal fear of epidemics and continually increasing amounts of pollution? In his State of the Union Message of January 22, 1970, President Richard M. Nixon said "the great question of the seventies 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, to our land and to our water?" and went on to propose the Clean Waters Act with $4 billion to be authorized immediately, for Fiscal 1971, to cover the full federal share of the total $10 billion cost on a matching fund basis. This would be allocated at a rate of $1 billion a year for the next four years, with a reassessment in 1973 of needs for 1975 and subsequent years. Basically this measure will upgrade municipal sewers and sewage treatment plants. But many people in the environmental management field consider the proposal an utter waste of money. Why? Because the government has made no long-term studies of any significant nature, nor attempted to reconceptualize the pollution problem so that it can be solved for the entire nation. The notion seems to be: take these billions of dollars, spend them on pollution and the pollution will disappear.

What is more, the government has been steadily reducing and eliminating research funds. Argonne National Laboratory, for example, which has had many environmental research projects, has been forced to abandon a number of them and even to release some scientific and technical staff members because of budgetary decreases. This uncoordinated shortsightedness reflects government's own frustration: it allows one agency to fund environmental research and another one to cut back on funds. Logically, the government should begin in the national laboratories to study the many complex problems of pollution, and to sponsor independent studies elsewhere, and to develop plans of attack; but these steps are not being taken.

President Nixon's $10 billion proposal for secondary sewage treatment for all urban areas and major industry reflects poor planning and is similar to trying to stop a flood by throwing one shovelful of sand at a time in front of the onrushing water. The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago has had secondary sewage treatment for forty years (and this facility is called one of the engineering wonders of the United States), but it will still require at least $2.4 billion to improve its present system, which is now the most modern in the nation, to meet federal water quality standards over the next ten years. The land area of the district is a little over 860 square miles. Therefore, it would appear that the amount of money that will be required to upgrade the remainder of the nation to the point that Chicago is today would stagger the imagination. It must also be kept in mind that the envisioned $10 billion system will be designed to remove only solid substances and reduce BOD (biochemical oxygen demand) loading, but completely inefficient in coping with dissolved materials and deadly viruses. Obviously something is wrong with this approach. The $10 billion will barely take care of repairs and day-to-day operations over the given time span. What is needed is a new approach, not the spending of more and more billions, which literally will go down the drain.

STATE ACTION OR INACTION

State action too has been ineffective. For example, when the Metropolitan Sanitary District for Greater Chicago (most of Cook County) asked the state of Illinois for permission to tax itself in order to meet state water quality standards. At that time, the state legislature told MSD that it could not receive the money to do the necessary work, which in 1969 amounted to $1.9 billion. The legislature told the MSD that it could receive $380 million, but it could only spend $60 million per year, which would be scarcely enough to keep up to the population growth. Now the cost for the same system amounts to $2.4 billion in 1970 dollars.

UNIVERSITY ACTION

The University of Chicago has taken an official stand against pollution by its recent, very costly conversion from coal to gas in all University buildings and plants, but individual members of the faculty are trying to go beyond that stand by developing formal academic programs to deal with the pollution question. R. Stephen Berry, professor of chemistry and in the James Franck Institute; David P. Currie, professor of law, who has been teaching environmental law for the past several years; John R. Sheaffer, research associate in the Center for Urban Studies, known nationally for his ideas on solid waste disposal; and David Atlas, professor in the Department of Geophysical Sciences, who has served for several years as an advisor to the Chicago Air Pollution Control Department, are all exploring ways to establish a program of environmental study and research, and management. During spring quarter such a course was taught jointly by Berry, Sheaffer, Currie, and Daniel H. Janzen, professor in the Department of Biology and the Committee on Evolutionary Biology. What they hope for eventually is to have a formal academic unit, a committee on environmental studies, that will graduate highly trained environmental managers.

Those who enter such a degree program to achieve competency in environmental management will find the curriculum to be rigorous and very demanding in terms of both time and effort, above and beyond what can be termed normal college work, Berry points out. "In order to deal wtih the complexities of environmental management, an individual will be asked to achieve broad cross-training in the physical and biological sciences, social sciences, and economics. Such a 'manager' will have to know and understand the operations of complex political arrangements such as a city; he will have to discern the relationship between science and industry in association with natural resources, and the fate of wastes; in order to deal with the health problems, he will have to gain insight in biology and public health; to understand the costs involved, he must achieve a firm background in economics; to comprehend the research and development aspects of the technology, he will have to develop at least a familiarity with engineering, which will also enable him to think in terms of realistic approaches and goals. For a basic acquaintance with the legal problems involved, along with necessary punitive actions or other legal steps required, he will have to be cognizant of the law and be able to initiate new approaches in this regard and recommend the sound legislation that will be required for the future. Of course, with problems of this sort there is the social element, therefore, a good background in social science, urban studies, population control, etc., will be of critical importance."

It is very important, now that widespread interest is developing in the problem of pollution, Berry feels, that we take the time to educate ourselves carefully and not rush into stopgap laws and legislation that don't really solve the problem. This has happened too often in American society. "We cannot afford to let this happen now," Berry says, "because we are dealing with something that is too fragile. There is a good possibility that we are approaching a point of no return."

According to one cataclysmic theory, the Greenhouse Effect, as the carbon dioxide concentrations increase, the atmosphere will become transparent to sunlight, but opaque to heat radiation from the earth, thereby resulting in an overall increase in temperature around the world. Berry says that there is a reasonable possibility that by the year 2020 there will be enough carbon dioxide in the atmosphere to create this Greenhouse Effect, which would cause the ice caps to melt and the oceans to inundate coastal areas, including cities around the world. Actually, he added, carbon dioxide concentration rises nearly one ppm per year, or about half of one per cent per year. It should also be remembered that this process may be quickened by increasing pollution of the oceans to the point that they are not as effective in removing the carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.

Another group of scientists have a theory that is to another extreme. They believe that as the amount of particulate matter in the atmosphere increases because of heavy pollution of the upper portion of the atmosphere, there will be increasing opacity resulting in the sun's energy being reflected back into space. This will cause the temperature of the world to drop, and ultimately cause a new ice age.

Berry's own favorite apocalypse is that which could be caused by increasing dosages of lead in the atmosphere. He said present levels supposedly are well below industrial toxic levels, but only by about a fraction of three. "One of the effects of chronic lead poisoning is making its victims stupid. I sometimes think we have more than passed that critical threshold."

THE ROLE OF ELECTRIC GENERATING UTILITIES

Commonwealth Edison made a policy decision several years ago that it would eventually go entirely into atomic power generation of electricity. Therefore, it did not make sense to its managers to maintain its conventional power generating plants in a highly efficient state, only in a state sufficient to meet operational requirements, on a daily basis, caused by the electrical requirements of its subscribers. Consequently, the pollution emitted from the conventional plants increased over the years until pressure from groups at the University and other interested citizens forced a change in this policy.

Thus, heralded and accompanied by many radio and television commercials, Commonwealth Edison has in recent years been attempting certain piecemeal open-ended measures against pollution. For example, Commonwealth Edison has been advertising that it is removing the sulfur dioxide and particular matter from the smoke flowing from its generating plant stacks; but what it does not say is that it is doing nothing to remove the fifty or more hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen in the same smoke. It is satisfied only to meet certain standards and not worry about the other pollutants. It wants proof that the other pollutants are causing damage before it will take steps to reduce them. In further proof of its concern for pollution, Commonwealth Edison has been making much of the fact that it is now bringing in low sulfur content coal from out of state. The public is not told that there is already enough low sulfur coal in Illinois to meet their requirements now and in the future, so the measure is meaningless.

In regard to its atomic plant at Zion Commonwealth Edison has fought the proposal that it construct water cooling towers. The company has stated that it had neither the necessary funds and technology nor the land on which to build the towers, and that the water would probably not essentially harm Lake Michigan. It *will* construct cooling towers, if forced to, but by then it may be too late for the lake; the environment may not be able to spring back.

THE CLOSED SYSTEM

The present open-ended or incremental approach to pollution that depends on the variously sluggish consciences of the polluters, has brought the nation to the pass it is in today. In all likelihood such an approach is not going to solve the problem in time, if at all. Dr. John R. Sheaffer and his staff at the Center for Urban Studies have been working on a plan which will not only eliminate pollution throughout the nation but offer tangible economic returns both to the polluter and the community. It is termed the "closed-system" approach. The closed-system concept is basically a simple one: instead of pouring the industrial wastes and sewage into the waterways and instead of puffing smoke into the atmosphere, the pollutants can be converted, chemically and/or mechanically, into other useful, rather than deadly, substances, and put back into the nutrient cycle.

Some years ago the Wisconsin Steel Corporation, one of the smaller manufacturers situated on the Calumet River, for example, switched to a partially closed-system approach. When the company changed over from the open hearth to basic oxygen method of production, the company spent $3 million on an electrostatic precipitator to catch the flue dust from the basic oxygen furnaces, which cost less than $1 million. The precipitator captures 100 tons of flue dust which had formerly gone into the air over Chicago. This dust contains almost sixty to sixty-five per cent iron units, as compared to the approximately thirty-five per cent iron units in the ore taken from the Mesabi Range and it is fed back into the furnaces. For Wisconsin Steel that was money as well as pollution that was going up into the air before the precipitator was installed.

Wisconsin Steel is also using the closed-system approach to water pollution. Because it now cleans, recycles and reuses thirty-eight million gallons of the sixty million gallons of water required for its operations, it has decreased outfalls in the Calumet River from thirteen to five. Total plant reduction of river water use is fifty-four million gallons a day, which compares very favorably to the previous ninety-eight million gallons per day pumped from the river in the north plant's one-through or open-ended system. Water used to cool furnaces is fed to cooling towers and used again. Iron oxide removed from the water is eventually fed back into the blast furnaces instead of into the river.

An excellent example of how industry can stop pollution and how it can utilize the closed-system approach without passing costs on to anyone was dramatically pointed out in the August, 1967, issue of *Coal Age* in an article that predicted that electric utilities will produce approximately forty-five million tons of fly ash per year by 1980. (Fly ash is common to all industries that utilize coal as a combustible.) Only about six per cent of the total fly ash being produced is being utilized to turn out useful products. The remaining ninety-four per cent is being disposed of in some manner at a cost to the producer of about two dollars per ton. But fly ash is a resource in disguise. It is rich in alumina (AL_2O_3), which can be made into high purity alumina, which in turn can be made into aluminum. In fact, out of the forty-five million ton fly ash pile that will be present in 1980, about ten million tons of alumina could be produced, or enough to make about five million tons of pure aluminum metal. (In 1966 the U.S. aluminum industry was producing about three million tons.) About nine million tons of oxides of iron can be obtained from fly ash and about eight million tons of high grade iron ore pellets. Other products that could come from fly ash would be bricks, blocks, cement, and all types of lightweight aggregates. In addition, these chemicals could be extracted: 500,000 tons of high purity titanium dioxide (TiO_2); 500,000 tons of potassium oxide (K_2O); 500,000 tons of sodium oxide (NA_2O); and 400,000 tons of phosphorous pentoxide (P_2O_5); and unknown pounds of uranium (U_3O_8), germanium, and vanadium.

The new closed-system approach is structured around three main concepts: (1) pollutants are resources out of place; (2) pollution management systems must be designed as closed systems; and (3) the environment is a total entity. The present open-system approach can be closed simply by recycling pollutants back into the productive cycle, thereby avoding direct discharges. The final concept is of the total environment as a unit with the elements relating and interacting with each other. The relationships tend to be in balance but are constantly changing; hence, the environment is described as a "dynamic equilibrium."

These three concepts were the basis of the waste water management programs that are being developed and implemented in a plan for Muskegon and Ottawa Counties, Michigan, by Dr. Sheaffer and his staff. The plan calls for a pipeline to be used to transport all wastes from an urban area to a site which environmental and geologic studies have shown to be safe for the operation of a waste water management program. A series of treatment lagoons are being constructed at the site, which will provide settling to remove settleable solids, aeration (oxygen), aerobic bacteria to consume soluble organic wastes, and photosynthetic cells to convert nitrates and phosphates into algal cell material that can be retained by the soil.

The lagoon facility offers several other distinct advantages over the secondary sewage treatment system. First, large amounts of storage can be provided in the treatment lagoon to hold and treat unusually large flows of water generally associated with storm-water run-off and combined sewer overflow. Second, because of the large volume of water held in the lagoon treatment facility, it has the capacity to assimilate toxic shock loads associated with industrial spills. Even if the bacterial colony is killed off by the toxic material, the incoming wastes are stored until another colony can be established. This is quite different from an activated sludge, where a colony kill results in the discharge of partially treated wastes for seven to ten days until a new colony is established. An analysis of a large activated sludge plant in the Midwest showed that such colony kills are likely to occur as frequently as six times per year.

The lagoon treatment is also more effective in virus removal. Research showed that thirty days retention in a lagoon produced seventy per cent negative samples (for viruses) in comparison to the ten per cent positive samples obtained from secondary treatment plant effluent.

After the waste water is treated in the lagoon system, it will be applied to geologically suited land areas. In the Muskegon-Ottawa County plans, these areas are glacial outwash plains, which were unproductive for lack of water and nutrients. The purified waste water will be applied to the land with large automated rotating-spray irrigation rigs and the land will be sown. The harvesting of crops from the irrigation site will complete the treatment process and close the system. In studies by the University of Pennsylvania where similar techniques were used, the corn crop in similarly poor agricultural areas was doubled in terms of bushels harvested.

The availability of land will not be a problem, according to Sheaffer. Only 130,000 acres of land would be required to accommodate a billion gallons of waste water a day. "Assuming the average daily per capita contribution of waste water to be 141 gallons," says Sheaffer, "the land area required for waste water disposal would be 0.0183 acres per person." A preliminary evaluation of the major metropolitan areas in the U.S. strongly suggests that such land areas exist within 100 miles of most metropolitan areas; and, these lands are now generally unproductive, adding little to the economic base of the region.

Environmental researchers at the University of Chicago are not wild-eyed Cassandras wailing in a wilderness of waste and pollution. They are working, like Berry, trying to educate, forming local Clean Air committees, urging measures upon the Chicago City Council, and bringing up legislation at the national level. Or like Shaeffer they are working on concrete proposals such as the closed-system. While a solution is in sight, results can only be obtained by sustained support of such programs, and demands by all citizens for a pollution-free environment.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE UNO—THE CFR, AND THE SOVIETS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, are the Council on Foreign Relations and the United Nations trying to incite a war in Southern Africa? In defiance of the ruling by the World Court that South Africa legally maintains the mandate over South-West Africa, the General Assembly of the United Nations on October 28, 1966, voted to take over Southwest Africa.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace had been commissioned 2 years earlier by the General Assembly of the UNO to prepare a war plan for the invasion of South-West Africa and in August 1964, began contacting prospective authors for the plan. The plan subsequently released under the title "Apartheid and U.N. Collective Measures" called for a blitz invasion and conquest. See my earlier remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, volume 113, part 8, page 10430; volume 113, part 8, page 10544; and volume 113, part 10, page 13140.

While favoring such an invasion, the Soviet Union until recently never consented to the use of her troops as called for in the plan of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. In February of 1970, the Soviets for the first time in the history of the U.N. indicated they would act to enforce a resolution of the Security Council to invade and occupy South-West Africa.

Writing on "The War in Southern Africa" in the October 1969, issue of Foreign Affairs, official journal of the Council on Foreign Relations, an organization instrumental in the creation of the United Nations, Mr. R. L. Howe called for a "swamp of blood" in that area. It should be pointed out that Howe wrote with the editorial imprimatur of fellow CFR members John J. McCloy, McGeorge Bundy of the Ford Foundation, and Henry Kissinger, adviser to President Nixon on foreign affairs.

Is this not strange behavior on the part of the UNO, CFR, and Soviets who purport to favor peace?

I insert in the RECORD remarks by Mary Davison of the Council for Foreign Relations and Susan Huck's article on this subject which appeared in the Review of the News:

BLOOD-SOAKED WAR AND BANKRUPT PROSPERITY

WHAT'S YOURS, IS EVERYBODY'S

An aroused Congress, facing a hot election campaign, has been operating in a situation of frenzy and turmoil. As the economic "depression" deepens, the Supreme Court and the Congress have collaborated in a scheme calculated to abolish property ownership in the United States. First the Court decided that non-property-owners can vote in bond elections—and so they can vote to levy taxes and debt on other people's property. Next, Congress voted to give the vote to 18-year-olds. These actions should assure the passage of all money issues to come before the voters.

WHAT SOME CAN DO—FOR THEIR COUNTRY

In another incident, Congress and the Federal Reserve System cooperated in activities which, taken together, would inevitably bring on an economic crisis. First, Congress enacted, under the appealing title of "The Kennedy Round" a program of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. This law called for a gradual elimination of the protective tariff and permits low-wage foreign imports to flood the American market—thus closing our own formerly lucrative world markets and producing vast unemployment with closing of mines and factories.

FORCE YOUNG TO PAY WHOSE DEBTS?

Next, the Federal Reserve System acted to furnish the second item in the distress package, by raising the interest rate. This has made it impossible for people to obtain mortgage money. Extremely high loan rates has added to unemployment in the building trades and their suppliers—thus spreading unemployment throughout the business world. As the expected increase occurs in the army of the unemployed, we hear more and more of a new draft law for "Public Service" and for "Non-Military Service". The young are told they owe a "service to the world". So United Nations devotees in Congress are seriously considering how to force these young people by law to pay their debt. Even as many Congressmen are screaming a demand for the return of their own Constitutional powers—which they themselves voted away to the United Nations super-government—they advocate for the young an unconstitutional draft law requiring involuntary servitude—in short, slavery.

When our readers contacted their Congressmen about the meaning of Article 25 of the U.N. Charter, many of the legislators sent the inquiries to the State Department for reply. This resulted in a flood of government form letters saying "We" are not bound by the Article to "accept and carry out" the decisions of the United Nations, but only the decisions of the Security Council! Most of the Congressmen relayed this absurd State Department "reply" to their constituents, apparently seeing nothing wrong with it. The fact that this commitment "to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council" (of the United Nations) is without reservation, seems to have escaped them.

HAS CONGRESS DECLARED U.N. WARS IN ADVANCE?

In approving Article 39, Congress already has delegated the power to declare war, and to determine when, where, why or with whom the wars shall be fought, to the Security Council. And they have been trying, for more than a year, to bluff the President into checking with THEM first before *he* commits our Armed forces further. It might be interesting to ask the Congressmen how they interpret their approved Article 39 which, minus some confusing, meaningless verbiage, says:

"The *Security Council* shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression . . . and shall decide what measures shall be taken . . ."

If any good could be said to have come out of the Viet Nam venture, it could be that the war has finally jolted Congress into a realization that it has thrown away Constitutional powers necessary for the survival of the nation, especially its young men. Before the political "Dealer" era, revisionist historians, carefully refuting the propaganda lies of the past, have shown that wars were never fought, in modern times especially, for the officially-approved reasons—in fact the real story would be ascertained long after the last shot was fired.

LIES CONCERNING VIET NAM WAR CAUSE SOON EXPOSED

In the case of Viet Nam, however, Congress has already learned how it was deceived into adopting the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, based on the false story that our destroyers had been attacked by the North Vietnamese. Repeated demands by Congress for an acceptable reason for our involvement in an Asian war have been met with studied evasion or outright refusal to discuss the matter. In a situation of this kind there is no justification for awaiting revision by future historians.

"REST IN PEACE"—UNO

Congress has already learned also that the United States is "committed" to become involved in wars of more than thirty other nations, if called upon to do so. Some members assert an intention to cancel some of those "obligations." Yet many Congressmen consistently pay tribute to the United Nations as a great "Peace-Keeping" agency despite its record of 25 years. The typical Congressman knows absolutely nothing of what takes place in the U.N. He will not examine the U.N. Charter. From the depths of wilful ignorance he will deny any relation between the Viet Nam "Ambush War" and the UN's activities there and access to confidential American military information.

From its first meeting in 1946, the General Assembly has condemned the racial policies of South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies. In recent years it has passed resolutions to drive out the condemned governments. A peace-keeping plan, perhaps, to UNOWHO. Then, on August 7, 1964, President Johnson bamboozled Congress into endorsing the Tonkin Gulf resolution which was to escalate the war, still raging, in Vietnam. At once the United Nations commissioned the Carnegie Endowment for International "Peace" to prepare a "war plan" (Apartheid and U.N. Collective Measures) for the invasion and occupation of South Africa.

U.S.S.R. AND U.S.A. GIVEN EQUAL BROTHERHOOD WAR RIGHTS BY WORLD GOVERNMENT

Recent ominous developments can only be understood by recalling vital facts previously mentioned. After holding debates the U.N. General Assembly in October 1966 voted in favor of invading and occupying South-West Africa. The peace-keepers' War Plan called for a "blitz" like the June 1967 Israeli attack on the Arabs—and the plan recommended that the military power be provided by *either* the Soviet Union *or* the United States. The President made a hurried trip to . . . the UN front office—following this the New York Times announced editorially: "The United States is committed as never before and could not reverse its direction." Congress learned of this and if the direction was not reversed, it was at least slowed down. (Under Article 43 of the Charter, before United States Forces could be committed, a "Special Agreement" must be negotiated between the UN and the sending nation.)

THE ARRANGEMENT: WHO GETS THE BLAME?

Shortly thereafter, a mysterious sea-air attack was made on the USS LIBERTY by the Israelis who made repeated efforts to sink the ship with all on board. Egypt had severed diplomatic relations with the United States a day or so before; with the ship located in Egyptian waters, and witnesses all murdered, Egypt would have to be blamed. Egypt is in Africa where "incidents" are easily arranged. (Which reminds one of the locale of the popular young U.S. President's tragic end in so-called "right-wing Dallas" during a Moscow-approved drive to destroy all "ultra-Conservative" American patriotic organizations).

Before the United Nations voted for the war in Southern Africa the UN's World Court rendered a long-awaited decision to the effect that South-West Africa belonged to South Africa. But, disregarding this decision of their own Court, the UN General Assembly continued to press for an invasion of the territory. Boycotts and sanctions have been repeatedly levied against both South Africa and Rhodesia in hope that the governments could be weakened or destroyed. But the governments did survive and so the demands of the Asian-African block controlling the General Assembly grew in intensity.

The vote to invade and occupy continue in effect as the Viet Nam war dragged on. The men and war supplies were several thousand miles closer to Southern Africa than to the U.S. mainland. And the Soviet Union, while playing a leading part in demanding an invasion, had never offered use of her Armed Forces as politely suggested by the War Plan of the Carnegie Endowment for International "Peace".

COUP SOON IN SOUTHWEST AFRICA AND NEW U.S. ROLE IN MIDEAST?

As time went on, the UN asserted a claim to South-West Africa, changed the name to Namibia, opened an office in Lusaka, Zambia, and, according to the UN Monthly Chronicle for June 1970 (page 41) a Committee of 24 was created, with the Columbian delegate as Council President. This man said he thinks "it important to keep in mind the special status of the Council which is, in effect, a Government in Exile rather than a Committee of the United Nations." Last February the South African "problem" was transferred from the General Assembly to the Security Council. A resolution was adopted calling for full sanctions against South Africa and expressing the intent of carrying out the decisions to invade and occupy South-West Africa. Immediately, for the first time in UN history, the Soviet delegate rose to say his country would act to enforce the Council decision. Subsequently, the South African Observer reported there was evidence that his country no longer needed to fear attack by the United States Armed Forces—since another plan had been worked out.

While Congress is debating and bewailing loss of its power over foreign policy, our real foreign policy is being worked out for us in the United Nations without the knowledge or consent of Congress.

BUT IS THIS PEACE-KEEPING OR PIECE-GRABBING? WORLD BROTHERHOOD OR CANNIBALISM?

The June issue of the UN Monthly Chronicle reports that, following the adoption of Security Council No. 276—which condemned South Africa and led to the Soviet offer to provide the military muscle for the invasion and occupation of South-West Africa—the American delegate Yost delivered a "very important policy statement concerning Namibia:

"In his statement, Mr. Yost, among other things, said that President Nixon had decided on the following steps:

The U.S. will henceforth officially discourage investment by U.S. nationals in Namibia;

Export-Import Bank credits guarantee will not be made available for trade with Namibia;

U.S. nationals who invest in Namibia on the basis of rights acquired thru the South African government since adoption of General Assembly Resolution 2145 (XX1) will not receive U.S. Govt. assistance in protection of such investments against a future lawful government of Namibia;

The U.S. will encourage other nations to take similar action.

While the directives of the President in implementation of U.N. sanctions will not seriously affect South Africa (applying only to a single state in South Africa) the importance of the move lies in the fact the U.S. has "bought a *piece of the action*" as the international racketeers, gamblers and vice lords would say. WWIII result?

Let us all take immediate action and demand that our Senators investigate the above actions of Mr. Yost and the President.

We know a U.N. General Assembly resolution does become a law mandatory for U.S. officials regardless of their constituents. Congerssmen have refused to "believe" or accept this or have professed not to believe the plain words of the U.N. Charter on the matter. But they signed approval of the Charter as we have noted.

Must they believe the U.N.? Do they want truth or UNtruth? Do they want reliability or UNreliability? Are they acting as servants of the American people—or servants of swarms of anti-Americans using Rockefeller's "former" property on the East River as headquarters for a worldwide conspiracy? They keep telling us the world gets smaller.

We did not invent the facts given above. We have done the research needed to get those facts from authentic sources. And we are not on any Congressman's payroll. All we wanted was the facts, ma'am. And now we want our elected officials to tell us why they have not had their won high-salaried employees get them these facts—and why they have not acted as true servants of the American people.

If our Congressmen (including Senators) want to give us a logical explanation of their negligence, we are glad to grant them a hearing, Ma'am.

For several years the Soviet position has been that the U.S.S.R. has been guaranteeing the peace in the Middle East. The question now is: If the Soviets now send their military to Southern Africa, who will assume the "peace-keeping" role in the Middle East?

Let us hope the role will not be assigned to the United States Armed Forces, regarding us as an ever-ready member of the apparently impartial supergovernment located at U.N. headquarters.

Let us write now and express our opposition to such a plan even before it is announced.

A NICE NEW WAR FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

(By Susan L. M. Huck)

Well now, who is keen to crank up a nice new war—say in southern Africa? Wouldn't you like to see "a swamp of blood" down there?

The purpose? Progress, of course. How else are you going to replace 20th Century Western Civilization with 19th Century (A.D. or B.C., take your choice) tribal warfare?

It would seem that, every now and then, such a bloodlust overwhelms even the pillars of the Establishment whose names decorate every one of the top editorial positions of *Foreign Affairs*, the quarterly house organ of the super-powerful Council on Foreign Relations.

Foreign Affairs seems to be a fixture in every library; it sits there, forbiddingly thick, drab grey, expensive-looking, and so unread that one must often slit the pages even on the back copies. The trade journal of the pipeline industry is probably more attractive to casual readers. Nonetheless, it is published by and for our ruling-class. Ambitious officials, especially in the State Department, comb its pages for the party-line thinking which can speed them upward, while foreign embassy officials are invariably familiar with articles in *Foreign Affairs* which deal with their own countries.

So it was with "War In Southern Africa," an article in the October 1969 *Foreign Affairs* by R. L. Howe. It is Howe who has called for that "swamp of blood."

Probably not since the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace [*sic*] laid out its military plans for the conquest of the Republic of South Africa in 1965 has the Establishment published anything so blatant in its hostility toward the peoples and nations of southern Africa. When the primitive chant for "Black power! White blood!" surfaces in *Foreign Affairs* under the editorial imprimatur of financier John J. McCloy, McGeorge Bundy of the Ford Foundation, and Henry Kissinger, the man detailed to tell President Nixon what to say and do about foreign affairs, the white blood they have in mind is not, of course, their own. And it would, of course, require a lot of black blood too, to create Mr. Howe's "swamp of blood" in southern Africa.

As for the resulting arrangements, one must look no further than the parts of Africa where our Establishment types have already spread their notions of progress. The banking and foreign trade of the black-ruled countries, where the real money is made, remain in the hands of *non-resident* whites, the international bankers and financiers. All else not vital to their interests is allowed to relapse into a sea of corruption and tribal rivalries, often breaking into vicious open warfare. Timeless though both the corruption and the rivalries are, it is fashionable nowadays to festoon them in the trappings of some swinging ideology or other. But it is the banking *Insiders* who run the show in Africa.

The net effect is to reduce the *number* of economic enterprises (or sources of economic decision-making), and to concentrate in ever-fewer hands, ever-greater economic and political power. This is the goal our "Liberals" share with the Communists. Independent-minded whites *or* blacks (or Asians) are largely wiped out of the game, as planned. Even African businessmen must either pay through the nose for political "protection," or be taxed or "socialized" out of business by unproductive but insatiably greedy politicians.

In most "independent" countries of tropical Africa today, the only whites found there are employees of some government or other, or of the giant monopolies. Among them are many whites born and raised in Africa, but probably *none*, now, who do not have in mind some contingency plan for getting out in a hurry. The *Insiders* they work for don't have to live like that, and their vaunted "humanitarianism" is such that their *Foreign Affairs* mouthpiece will publish articles *recommending* that whites, resident in black-ruled countries be regarded openly as hostages!

For example, the white skilled and technical workers from South Africa who keep the financiers' copper mines running in Zambia are referred to by Mr. Howe as Zambia's "five thousand South African 'hostages' working in its mines." Establishment favorite Howe also notes that nearly a hundred airline flights a week, bound for Johannesburg, stop in other African capitals as well, "putting hundreds of potential South African hostages . . . into the hands of African governments." Mr. Howe then nobly tries to prod African governments into *taking* the hostages!

Russell Warren Howe is white, but he has a black wife now, and lives in Senegal, associating as much as possible with anti-white "liberation" forces. He likes to offer suggestions to them, as we see. He told his *Foreign Affairs* readers approvingly that certain terrorist groups "will borrow Viet Cong techniques—such as mobile cages—to keep prisoners alive." Of course, Mr. Howe's remarkable access to the pages of *Foreign Affairs* as an outlet for his bloodthirsty notions suggests that he is more than just a demented enthusiast; he *works* for "our" Establishment. If his connection with, say, the Central Intelligence Agency, gained wider credibility, it is always possible that he might be in a position to do us an "inside story" on how the mobile-cage idea works out in practice! Out in mobile-cage country, there could be large numbers of lower-ranking terrorists who are understandably confused about whose side the C.I.A. is on.

Mr. Howe disguises himself as a "reporter," although he is so partisan as to make our most rabid TV commentators blanch to neutral grey. He speaks of a "war" in progress in southern Africa, engaging about 275,000 combatants, and deplores the lack of reporting on it. Admittedly, if that many men are in action, we should be hearing more about it. But, as we shall see, Mr. Howe's figures are largely foam. Certain other of his words appear to be largely foam as well.

Reporting over a New York radio station early in 1969 on his excursion to the "front," Mr. Howe stated that he donned a "guerrilla uniform," strapped on a "Russian pistol," and ventured across the Zambezi into Rhodesian territory in the company of the Communist-trained marauders he so admires. That was a very stupid thing to do, if he did it; he had a really excellent chance of being killed, either by Rhodesian police or the large, hungry animals which have patrolled the area since time began. (Mr. Howe can't get into Rhodesia by the *front* door because the Rhodesians, as well as the South Africans, know too much about him.)

Certain of our diplomats also wince at the thought of Mr. Howe being *captured* in that condition—dressed, armed, and accompanied by invaders, and then flapping his U.S. passport at the Rhodesians, demanding privileges and immunities.

But then, perhaps Mr. Howe didn't really cross the Zambezi into Rhodesia. It is quite possible to cross the Zambezi and still be in Zambia. Or to cross the Kafue and think you're crossing the Zambezi—yet still be in Zambia. In any case, when Mr. Howe claims to have crossed the Zambezi into "a land of fat corn cobs [*sic*] and jacarandas," what he is describing is a far cry from the nearly uninhabited, hot bush country of the Valley below Kariba, where he claims to have been. A bloated, ghostly baobab would be the only "fat" thing around, and if Howe was there he would have been more interested in looking out for *boomslangers* than admiring the odd jacaranda tree!

No, even the Rhodesians have their problems in the Valley—like being followed around by lions, or stomped by elephants, or (in the rainy reason) finding the only high ground already occupied by all the poisonous snakes of the neighborhood. And the Rhodesians don't have the Rhodesian police and army chasing them, to top it off!

All Mr. Howe's big figures to the contrary, not many terrorists have crossed the Zambezi line—and hardly any of those survived for long!

Well, then, who *is* fighting the Establishment's slow-fire holy war against those of our friends in southern Africa—against those of our own culture, so willing to be our allies against the Communists, and so potentially valuable?

Authorities seem to agree that Mr. Howe's total of 275,000 men in the lineup includes just about everyone who has ever received any military, police, or guerrilla training, on either side. By far the largest number of active-duty troops are in Portuguese Angola and northern Mozambique, the most exposed areas. Portuguese draftees and native African troops (often in "integrated" units) number fifty thousand or so in each territory. They have an enormous area to cover; it cannot be done by static defense. In Angola, for instance, there is nearly ten square miles of territory for every Portuguese soldier.

With a map and scratch-pad, it is possible to see that "liberation" organizations are accustomed to try to match the government, claiming about ten square miles of territory for every guerrilla they claim to control. What does this mean on the ground, in the bush? It means that a band of ten men—on either side—"controls" a hundred square miles. That is, until a band of *twelve* men comes along! And that's accepting all boasts at face value.

There is no "front"; there is only a great game of chasing around, seeking or avoiding each other, as the case may be. Numbers killed seem to range in the low hundreds per year. One could just *barely* call that a war, although heaven knows it's expensive enough, and it seems to bring out the beast in the propaganda writers. At least it provides a modicum of copy to the global news industry, whose dispatches "feed back" those claims of great and glorious feats of arms so necessary when rattling the can for contributions every year. Assorted leadership battles within the terrorist organizations, and rivalries over who taps which Sugar Daddy governments—or who's getting the World Council of Churches' $200,000 terrorist fund—appear to occupy a good deal of time and space.

Of course, just as a lot of Mr. Howe's supposed combatants turn (upon investigation) into traffic cops, or farmers enlisted in inactive militiatype units, a lot of his "guerrillas" evaporate as well. They very often disappear without a trace, and a prudent move it is, too. In so many cases, the tempting "overseas scholarships" turn into a few months in a foreign "boot camp," after which the lucky recruit is expected to do or die for his Chinese or Russian or Algerian friends. Especially when he discovers what he is up against, he may decide that the disappearing act is the shrewdest move of all.

Whatever the reason, Mr. Howe's phantasmagoric legions—two thousand in Rhodesia, two thousand for South West Africa—certainly aren't there, and if they had been done in by government force one might suppose that someone would have said more about it. Contrary to what might be imagined, the country under dispute affords practically no cover; thin bush stands bare and bone-dry most of the year, when even animals die of thirst—and not only scattered villages, but game waterholes are staked out by security forces. The short rainy season brings its own delights, but at least the bush sprouts cover. (The longer rainy season and thicker bush in the Portuguese territories may favor the guerrillas somewhat.) Certainly that Kalahari-Zambezi line is a tough one to crack by the methods now in use, although a professional army, backed up by modern logistics, would make short work of it. Traversing the country is one thing, living off it is another.

The countries under attack south of that line, Rhodesia and South Africa, have small but very efficient military and police forces in the field. And, they operate with the cooperation of the natives in the affected areas, which is always a source of disappointment to guerrillas led to believe differently. What is more, local support is not always a response to carrot and stick; many Africans, especially in Rhodesia, know from experience that the "nationalist" organizations were accustomed to expending their energies extracting onerous "party dues" from anyone with a job, or tossing gasoline-bombs into the homes of anyone who stood against them, or paying children a shilling apiece to throw stones at people. Most Africans do not prefer the goon-squad "democracy" of alienated young toughs to the venerable authority of their own chiefs.

Then, too, these countries of southern Africa realize that they are under attack. They are not afflicted with the notion that the government has an obligation to extend every privilege and courtesy to those who openly intend to create Mr. Howe's "swamp of blood." By and large, agitators can't do much agitating, activitists can't do much killing, looting, or burning—and cop-killers are *hanged*, period. (During my recent visit to Rhodesia, many people wanted to know how it happened that cop-killer Huey Newton was freed here in sixteen months. I had no rational explanation.) Communists are outlaws, and if they stay in the country they are asking to be locked up. As a result, there is an amazing amount of peace and quiet in southern Africa, despite the "arithmetic" of race. (I spent weeks in a rural area of Rhodesia, while there were 375 Africans and perhaps a dozen whites. Everyone felt perfectly secure at all times—although things were different before Rhodesia seized its independence!) And, while the reasons are mainly economic rather than political, the African border-crossing traffic is from the black-ruled countries into the white-ruled countries—in search of jobs. If this is "oppression," why do the "oppressed" run toward it, rather than away from it?

Naturally, Rhodesia and South Africa have to deal with the Surrender Now types infesting the mass media and the universities, as well as some Big Business circles. These people often willingly collaborate to destroy the host society, but they sometimes discover that espionage is still espionage, and treason is regarded as treason.

Mr. Howe, writing in the C.F.R.'s *Foreign Affairs*, deplores only that the Communists' interference in southern African affairs is more directly disruptive than our own. He points out the ways in which we *do* interfere, but considers them shamefully slight. He says we should abandon any investments there; he thinks $800 million isn't much, less than we lost when we put our hero, Fidel Castro, into the saddle in Cuba. And beyond *that*, Mr. Howe suggested to his betters of the Council on Foreign Relations that they work on southern African whites through "religion" and sports. His suggestions have meanwhile borne fruit in the form of the World Council of Churches terrorist fund, and the ban on South African participation in international athletic events.

As for our N.A.T.O. ally, Portugal, Mr. Howe makes friends for us abroad by writing:

"There are many American diplomats who talk of ridding NATO of its least useful member as a first step toward positive intervention in the area's crisis."

What America should do, he says, is to support the Comrade Hero Ax-Murderers with their alphabet-soup "movements," as we did our pets, Holden Roberto and Eduardo Mondlane. (Holden Roberto is mightily puffed by Mr. Howe, but now seems to be close to "nobody" status. Roberto was doing fine with his massacre until, among other things, Americans began to hear how the Methodist Board of Missions was helping him along. With his church support cut off, he hasn't been able to run even *one* person through the blades of a sawmill since the early Sixties. It's *cruel* to deprive a man like that of his little pleasures: "progressive" churchmen understand these things.) We should betray friends, stab allies in the back, abandon some four million whites to whatever measures the renegade Howe might suggest to his friends of the Council on Foreign Relations, and call it Progress. Maybe even Peace.

THE LATE LUCIUS MENDEL RIVERS

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Admiral Joseph J. Clark, U.S. Navy, retired, has requested that the January 11, 1971, issue of Counterattack be placed in the RECORD.

It speaks of the late L. Mendel Rivers, and I would like to make its message known to all.

THE LATE LUCIUS MENDEL RIVERS

It was with deep regret that we learned of the death of Lucius Mendel Rivers, chairman of the powerful House Armed Services Committee. Mr. Rivers served in Congress for thirty years and in 1965 succeeded his mentor, Carl Vinson of Georgia, as chairman of the House panel which raises and oversees tens of billions of dollars in defense spending each year.

Mr. Rivers believed that freedom in the modern world was tied inextricably to the military might of the United States. As an activist, he did not believe in waiting for the day of judgment. From the point of view of our defense posture, this takes place every day. An Administration achieves wisdom when it realizes that a government is judged by what it does not by what it says. The great Winston Churchill once said, "Democracy is the worst system of government with the possible exception of all the others."

Mr. Rivers was an indefatigable worker who labored long hours at his job. He studied and knew the details of military operations, installations, aircraft, ships, tanks, and other hardware. Although he never served in the Armed Forces, he championed the cause of the enlisted man and often challenged the brass in their cause.

We enjoyed a pleasant relationship with Mr. Rivers who at times published articles from issues of Counterattack in the Congressional Record. His unswerving objective was defense. He was a fierce advocate and never retreated from his convictions once he was convinced of their military necessity. He was unmoved and could not care less about anti-military and anti-war sentiments believing that the majority of Americans approved his judgments. Where Mr. Rivers was most vulnerable to criticism was in the overloading of his congressional district in South Carolina with military installations, such as an Army depot; a Navy base, shipyard, supply center, hospital, weapons center, and submarine base; an Air Force base; a Marine Corps air station and training center; and a Coast Guard station and mine warfare station. The combined government payrolls and defense plant payrolls in the Charleston area are said to account for nearly fifty per cent of the area's total earned income. Congressman Vinson once sagely observed, "You put anything else down there in your district, Mendel, its gonna sink.'"

What synthetic intellectuals of the right or the left often fail to recognize is that other people can disagree with them philosophically without being classified as bad guys. To most politicians and some writers, consensus means agreement with them. Their intolerance to dissent is part of their paranoia. There is many an egghead that houses a bird brain. Cynicism and disillusionment can destroy humanity just as definitely as bombs.

One of the best ways to judge a man's worth is by the enemies he has made. One of the most intellectually disruptable utterances on the passing of Congressman Rivers was published in the "New York Post" on December 30, 1970 under the by-line of one Pete Hamill. Mr. Hamill in the past has made it big by writing in a lachrymal vein on subjects of which he has some expertise, such as: canine feces in the streets of New York; the brutalization of the poor by an inept welfare system; the evils of racism, an advocacy of civil disobedience which has violated law but more often has enriched justice; a justifiable disenchantment with the Administration's economic game policies; a criticism of the newly acquired pseudo-conservatism of the Hard Hats; and support for the disenfranchised minority citizens of Northern Ireland. However, he now makes it small by showing that he has little to do other than to attack someone who can't strike back.

Like St. Francis of Assisi, Mr. Hamill seems to share the lives of his poorest downtrodden contemporaries. However, comparison to the charitable flair of antiquity has been brought to an abrupt stop with Mr. Hamill's eulogy of the deceased Congressman in which he ignored the traditional maxim, "De mortuis nil nisi bonum," by writing:

"Mendel Rivers will be safely tucked into the earth today, accompanied by the usual gushy salutes and the familiar lying rhetoric of death. There is a convention, rigidly adhered to by politicians and editorial writers, that says one must speak only about the nobility and goodness of the dead, no matter how rotten, dangerous or disgusting they were in the flesh; it's as if death and its attendant mysteries could suddenly cleanse a man's history....

"The truth was that Rivers was a common drunk and a nasty, willful, power-dazed man who obtained great power in Washington because of the vile anachronism of the seniority system. As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, he knelt before the admirals, generals and defense contractors for more than five years. He was such a great patriot that he managed to avoid military service through all his 65 years. . . .

"If there were ever a case for destroying the seniority system, this is it. Meanwhile, there should be no sad songs for the passing of Mendel Rivers. He's gone, and we're better off without him."

We do not believe that the editorials in "The Irish Echo" on the passing of David Lloyd George were as unfair as the foregoing diatribe, nor were the comments in the "The Jewish Daily Forward" as gleeful or vindictive on the occasion of the demise of the notorious Gestapo chief, Heinrich Himmler. While we understand Mr. Hamill's denunciation of the seniority system for selecting chairmen of standing committees in the

Congress, we don't believe that his senior colleague, Jim Wechsler, a responsible liberal journalist, would exhibit the poor taste of tendentious ridicule to vilify the reputation of a deceased, even if unlamented, office holder. Aren't there enough subjects to write about, especially when self-serving politicians are keying their economic and defense policies to the tempo of the 1972 elections?

We are inclined to doubt that Mr. Hamill personally knew the late Mr. Rivers, an honorable man, who did his job in keeping with his convictions. One of the Congressman's most hostile opponents on the committee once admitted, "Mendel's motives are the very highest; I have never ever questioned his motives."

It is our opinion that many of the procedural rules of the Congress are archaic and should be changed. In fact, in spite of tradition, if Congressional speech makers deleted the word "distinguished" from their rhetoric, they could get 30% more work done. While one doesn't need to be young to dislike institutions, we must remember that it was always institutions that have made society work. Notwithstanding the fears of the military-industrial complex, the world has a better chance of ending with a whimper rather than with a bang.

We invite the attention of Mr. Pete Hamill, a maverick Brooklynite, who is usually an objective writer, to the most ultimate advice left as an epitaph to his fellow human beings by the late Aldous Huxley, "Be kinder to one another." That's what the Sermon on the Mount and the Paschal ceremonies are all about in our Judaic-Christian tradition. If all human beings were to lose their sense of glory, wouldn't we be poorer?

CAN WE USE MAX SPENDLOVE'S TRASH MACHINE?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing realization that we must look upon solid waste as a resource rather than as material to be burned or buried.

The January 17, 1971, issue of the Sunday Star's Washington magazine carried an excellent article by John Morton reporting on a Federal research project currently underway at Edmonston, Md., which is giving substantial support to the concept that solid wastes can be profitably recycled.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article, I am inserting the text at this point in the RECORD.

CAN WE USE MAX SPENDLOVE'S TRASH MACHINE?

(By John Morton)

A quart jar of pickles brings together in one convenient package 16 pickles, a cup of brine, an ounce of metal in the cap, a bit of paper label and 12 ounces of glass. All of these facts do not fill the housewife's mind as she cruises the supermarket aisles. It's the pickles she wants, and that's what her family gets. The rest is thrown away.

A lot of everything else she buys is thrown away, too, after the edible contents are unwrapped from paper, squirted from aerosols, squeezed from tubes and poured from thousands of cans and nonreturnable glass bottles. Truly it is a disposable feast.

Americans throw away 150 million tons of household refuse annually, and the total goes up each year. The cost to collect and dispose of it is staggering—close to $4 billion annually. Some of the junk is burned, some is buried, some is dumped at sea, and a lot of it just blows across the land.

The harvest of refuse is a major headache for cities, which everywhere are plagued by a lack of new dumping sites and the high cost of building and running refuse incinerators. Yet this effluent of our hard-sell, super-packaged marketing system itself offers the answer to the problem of its existence. For if properly treated, all of this junk is worth money.

A federal research project quietly underway in Edmonston, Md., in Prince Georges County, has developed a recycling plant that takes refuse at one end and produces commercially valuable products at the other end—at a profit. The reason a profit can be made is simple: Household refuse is rich in all the materials that were thrown into it—aluminum, iron, copper, brass, tin, glass, paper and plastic. Indeed, for some of these materials, household refuse is a resource richer than ore that is profitably mined and processed in a mill.

A visit to the Edmonston recycling plant is a surprising experience for anyone accustomed to the dirt and obnoxious smell usually found in ordinary refuse-disposal plants. There is plenty of noise—the huge machines used in the recycling process chop, tumble, crush and shake the junk fed into them with an awesome racket. But the refuse is carefully contained along the chain of connected machinery, and water sprays used in the machines to wash out fine particles keep down the dust. The floor is spotless.

The man in charge is Max Spendlove, research director at the U.S. Bureau of Mines' Metallurgy Research Center at the University of Maryland. Spendlove, a serious-faced, orderly man in his 50s who looks as if he might be a high school physics teacher, has a matter-of-fact way of speaking that often harbors wit. Giving directions to his office on the University of Maryland campus, he advised: "Follow Campus Drive until you pass the Student Union Building—that's the one with all the trash out in front—and I'm in the next building on your left."

Spendlove's career as a government metallurgist devoted to getting something valuable out of what appears to be worthless goes back to 1940, long before the disposable explosion in American merchandising began overwhelming municipal trash systems.

His first job with the Bureau of Mines was to figure out a way to extract the valuable metal in the smoke and gases belched out by copper smelters near Salt Lake City, Utah. After World War II he was in College Park, developing techniques for reclaiming aluminum from thousands of scrapped military planes. When Congress enacted the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 with the idea of combating pollution and reclaiming lost resources, Spendlove was appointed to direct the bureau's research under the act. This led to the development of the Edmonston recycling plant, which first started processing refuse on an experimental basis in May, 1969.

So Spendlove is used to looking at the worthless, the discarded objects of America, in a different light. Thus he speaks of household trash with admiration, even a bit of affection, and with an absolutely straight face. To Spendlove, it's not trash, but "urban ore," and he likes to talk about how coat hangers and tin cans are "high" in iron, that broken toys and alarm clocks produce a lot of brass and aluminum, and that all of those throw-away bottles give off a nice quality of marketable glass, if handled right.

He even sounds a little protective of the qualities of his urban ore at the mention of banning throw-away bottles by municipal ordinance, a step recently taken by Bowie, Md.

"What good does it do to ban throw-away pop and beer bottles and not ban them for pickles, vegetables, ketchup, olives and everything else that comes in a throw-away container?" he asks. "What about the shoe box and all the other containers we throw away? Besides, the consuming public will always resist this. They'll just go buy them somewhere else."

Let the people buy and throw away, says Spendlove. Human nature is not easily changed, but recycling plants that make money can be easily built, and the profits can be spent on doing a better job of collecting refuse.

Trash disposal in the United States, for the most part, relies on the same basic processes used centuries ago—burn and bury. Nothing better was ever developed because, until fairly recently, land was cheap enough and plentiful enough to make burn-and-bury a sensible disposal system.

But suburban sprawl, the population explosion and the boom in throw-away packaging have combined to overwhelm existing municipal dumps and make sites for new ones hard to find. Fairfax County in Virginia, for example, is nervously seeking a new dumping site; in about a year, the county's landfill operation west of Fairfax City will have taken about all it can hold.

Similarly in Maryland, Montgomery County should have closed its overstuffed landfill near Rockville a year ago, county officials acknowledge. But land close in is expensive, and few communities farther out are eager to become somebody else's dumping ground. Alternatives being considered by some local governments include baling trash and shipping it elsewhere by rail. The District of Columbia may send its trash on barges 20 miles down the Potomac to Cherry Hill, Va., when its dumping site at Oxon Cove, Md., is filled up.

One method of reducing the sheer volume of refuse is to burn it in an incinerator, which removes the paper, plastic, wood, food, and anything else that will burn. There are now about 400 incinerators in use in the United States, and scores more will be built in coming years. The District has had at least one incinerator since the 1930s, and is planning to build its fifth soon. And there are several others in metropolitan Washington. But incinerators still leave an unburnable residue of metal and glass that must be buried in a landfill somewhere.

The Edmonston recycling plant developed under Spendlove's direction was designed to process this incinerator residue—extract the valuable materials in pure enough form to make them commercially valuable. Using residue collected from incinerators in suburbia, Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, Baltimore, Atlanta and New Orleans, Spendlove and his fellow researchers experimented with machines that chopped, chewed and separated incinerator residue. By November, 1969, six months after they started, they had perfected the process.

Perfecting the process achieved these financial results: The cost in labor, equipment and building to process incinerator residue is $3.52 a ton. The end products—commercial grade metals and glass—are worth $12 a ton. This means that cities with incinerators are burning and burying $77 million worth of resources a year—the recycled value of the 22 million tons of refuse fed to incinerators each year in the United States.

Attracted by reports in technical journals, representatives from the iron, aluminium and glass industries have visited the Edmondston project to see for themselves that the recycling plant can produce valuable material. Other visitors have included officials from several major cities in the United States and abroad.

If money can be made from household trash, and the Bureau of Mines has a plant that proves it, why aren't mayors and city councils all over the country plunging into engineering reports and making feverish plans to build their own recycling plants? Part of the answer is that the Bureau of Mines experiment was so recently completed that word of its successes has not spread out to municipal public works departments. Even in metropolitan Washington, which would seem to have the edge on the rest of the country because of proximity, checks with public works departments failed to turn up any officials who had actually visited the Edmondson project, although there were varying degrees of awareness of it.

Moreover, the public works officials tended to view the whole concept of recycling as something too experimental and far off to be of much use to them in their day-to-day struggles with collection, burning and burying. Says Norman Jackson, director of the District's Department of Sanitary Engineering: "Recycling is a very fundamental principle that we must observe in the future, but I think a lot of work remains to be done on it."

Others apparently were not acquainted with Spendlove's recycling techniques. Both Nicholas Stoliaroff, urban engineer with Prince Georges County, and Frederick Doe, Arlington County's utilities director, asserted that household trash is such a complex mixture of materials that sorting it out never would be profitable. "You can't tell from looking at a can whether it's aluminum or tin," says Doe. The Edmonston plant, however, does not rely on visual identification; it shreds all incoming materials and separates them with mechanical, magnetic and chemical methods.

Doe also refused to accept that tin cans and glass bottles could produce raw materials that would bring a profit, regardless of the cost-profit studies done by the Bureau of Mines. "For example, tin cans have fallen in value considerably because the tin coating on the iron contaminates the new types of steel furnaces being used," he says.

Spendlove acknowledges that the tin contamination problem remains to be solved, along with problems caused by solder from the seams of cans and copper that somehow attaches itself to tin cans during incineration. But the profit figures he cites for his recycling process are based on receiving the low prices that tin-contaminated iron brings on the market. "When we solve the contamination problem, the iron will be good enough to make steel, and then we can make more than $12 a ton profit on incinerator residue," he says.

Spendlove believes there will be two major barriers to overcome before very many communities will be able to put to work the recycling processes developed in Edmonston. "In many cities, just getting out from under the refuse-disposal problems that they have right now will put them off," he says. "And I am assuming that, whenever a recycling plant is built, it will be a combined effort—a combination of city and state or federal governments, and perhaps even some private interest. None of these relationships has been determined, and it will take time. But I'll be surprised if some serious proposals don't start coming in."

As for the recycling process itself, Spendlove emphasizes that no esoteric machinery or unusual new processes are involved "All the machinery we use is conventional," he says "We just use the basic minerals-processing techniques, but we've brought all the techniques together to work on urban ore."

There are three basic operations:

1 Shredding and grinding the incinerator residue into small particles.

2 Separating out different materials with magnets and screens of different sizes.

3 Washing to remove dust particles.

The first machine in the recycling chain is a trommel—a large, rotating cylinder full of 1¼-inch holes that normally is used to sort out gravel. The incinerator residue brought in at the unloading dock is dumped onto a conveyor, which carries it to the trommel; small particles drop through the trommel's holes as it rotates and feeds larger pieces to a shredding machine. In later stages, magnets pull out magnetic metals, and grinding mills crush glass into tiny particles and flatten pieces of nonmagnetic metals so they can be screened out of the glass.

Traditional refining techniques, such as acid leaches and filtration, further separate metals into aluminum, copper, zinc and brass. The glass particles can be used as is to make building bricks and glass wool, but more money can be made from glass that is separated by color, which is done both by magnetic means (color in glass is created by iron and chromium) and with an optical sorter.

The cost and profit figures cited above are based on a recycling plant serving a city of 250,000. A larger plant, say for a city of a million, would use the machinery more efficiently, reducing processing costs to $1.83 a ton. How much to build a plant for a city of a million? About $2.2 million, certainly not unmanageable, especially in view of the profit potential.

"Now that we know how to process incinerator residue and make money at it," says Spendlove, "we're setting up another plant to take refuse straight from the garbage can—no incinerator—because the paper and plastic refuse is valuable, too, and we hate to see it burned up." He expects to spend about a year perfecting the process for raw refuse. "We already know how we hope to do it, but there are always unexpected kinks to work out."

Processing raw refuse both eliminates and raises some problems. It would eliminate the need for an incinerator, which costs about $23 million to build for a city of a million. But it poses expensive difficulties in reclaiming paper and plastics and fabrics. To be separated from other trash, these lightweight articles must be put through what is called air classification.

Essentially, air classification is a stream of air into which the refuse is dribbled. The air blast blows out the paper, cardboard, plastic and other light materials, and in additional air stream can further separate the lightweight materials into distinct grades.

Adding air classification to a recycling plant (the heavier materials would continue to be processed just like incinerator residue) would raise the cost of a plant for a city of a million to about $7.2 million.

This more sophisticated, raw-refuse process is yet to be perfected, however. But Max Spendlove says it's just a question of time. Working on the mechanical problems involved is simple, compared to the obstacles in other phases of waste management—for example, taking almost invisible pollutants out of air and water. "Solid waste is easy to work on," says Spendlove. "You can put your hands on it. You can do almost anything you want with it."

ELI LILLY & CO. OF INDIANAPOLIS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in Nation's Business for January 1971, was most appropriate for inclusion in that magazine's series on "Great Moments and Great Men of American Business." Written by Mr. Henry F. DeBoest, vice president for corporate affairs of Eli Lilly & Co., I am happy to include it in the RECORD:

THE TRAIN TRIP THAT WAS A TURNING POINT

On Christmas Day, 1921, George Henry Alexander Clowes, Ph.D., a young chemist from England, skipped the traditional family festivities at his home in Indianapolis. Early that morning he packed a suitcase, said good-bye to his family, and boarded a train for New Haven, Conn.

His trip was to be a turning point for Eli Lilly and Co., the pharmaceutical firm that Col. Eli Lilly had founded in 1876.

Dr. Clowes, director of the Lilly Research Laboratories, had heard a few months before that insulin had been isolated at the University of Toronto by Dr. Frederick G. Banting and Charles H. Best. Dr. Clowes had been evaluating many theories that were current about the causes and treatment of diabetes, and had come to the conclusion that this pancreatic hormone might be the most promising approach to complete control of the disease.

A starvation diet was then the only medically acceptable treatment for severe diabetes. Something less stressful for the patient was needed.

With the words "Go to it!" Vice President Eli Lilly (grandson of the company's founder) gave his approval to Dr. Clowes' idea of contacting the Toronto scientists, who were in New Haven presenting a paper on their work.

For the diabetic, eating carbohydrates leads to overproduction of sugar, which the body is unable to use for energy because little or no insulin is available to facilitate its utilization. Dr. Banting and Mr. Best hypothesized that diabetes would be controlled if insulin could be supplied from another source, animal pancreas. But a way to manufacture a stable, standardized insulin product in large quantities would have to be found.

Dr. Clowes convinced the Canadians that Eli Lilly and Co. had the capability to develop a large-scale production method. Scientists worked day and night. Soon procedures for isolating insulin and purifying it in large quantities were discovered.

The purchasing department worked out a supply system with meat packers so animal pancreas glands that slaughterhouses had always discarded would be brought frozen to Indianapolis. Manufacturing facilities were designed and ready for use by the following year. Lilly insulin was marketed in 1923.

The Canadian scientists' discovery of insulin therapy, and its development, constituted one of the great landmarks in medicine, ushering in a new era of cooperation between pharmaceutical industry researchers and university scientists.

Years later, in 1941, Josiah K. Lilly Sr., son of the founder and at that time chairman of the board, wrote: "Insulin revolutionized our place in the industry."

Insulin was to be followed by many other outstanding products developed in the Lilly Research Laboratories. In the 1920s the company discovered the first in a series of barbiturate sedatives and hypnotics and, in association with Dr. George Minot and Dr. William Murphy, developed the first liver extract for control of pernicious anemia, a condition invariably fatal if it is untreated.

Among other contributions were development of a killed-virus poliomyelitis vaccine in association with its discoverer, Dr. Jonas Salk; discovery and development of erythromycin, one of the first of a new class of antibiotics; and development of the cephalosporins, a new family of broad-spectrum antibiotics, following a chemical breakthrough that permitted synthesis of a large number of derivatives of the original cephalosporin.

Early in the 1950s the company began to seek new areas where its research experience in the life sciences could be used.

It entered the agricultural market in 1954 with the introduction of a hormone for promoting growth in beef cattle. Today, Lilly agricultural products include herbicides, fungicides and growth regulators for plants; lawn and garden products; and veterinary medicines and other animal health products.

Throughout its 94 years, the company has made every effort to see that its products reflect the emphasis on quality set by its founder, who turned his back on the popular patent medicines of the day to produce quality products, honestly labeled, for physicians.

Col. Eli Lilly was a remarkable man whose concern for people was eivdenced by his community leadership and service. His view of human worth was reflected in corporate policies that attracted people of talent to his organization at all levels of responsibility.

J. K. Lilly Sr., who followed his father as president, put the Lilly philosophy into words when he said, "The people who make up this company are its most important assets."

That also was the credo of the colonel's grandsons, Eli (now honorary chairman of the board) and J. K. Jr. (who was chairman when he died in 1966), and it remains company philosophy today.

In 1914, when young J. K. Jr. joined the Lilly organization, he was assigned to study the establishment of a personnel department. Two years later, in a 154-page, typewritten report to his father, he recommended a personnel policy that was far ahead of the times:

"The greatest business problem of today is the human problem of labor and the wise handling of employees. . . . Fair wages, reasonable hours, working quarters and conditions of average comfort and healthfulness, and a measure of protection against accident are now no more than primary requirements in every factory."

In 1916 the company's first employment office was established. An industrial medicine department for employees was added the following year. In 1920 the company adopted a pension plan and paid the entire cost for employees. A company cafeteria was started in 1924. Three years later, a health insurance program was arranged.

Under the leadership of the Lilly family, the company has grown from its original four employees to more than 19,000 associates worldwide, and from an 18-by-40 foot building to a large complex of manufacturing plants in the United States and 15 countries abroad.

Its medicinal products have changed from "pills, fluid extracts, elixirs, and cordials" to the broadest line of pharmaceuticals and biologicals in the industry. Company price lists also include hundreds of other products.

In the last decade, annual sales of Lilly products have risen from $178.5 million to $537 million. Such progress is fulfilling the prediction of J. K. Lilly Sr. in 1946 that if the company follows the principles on which it was founded and built, "There are no limits to where we can go."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

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 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

PROBLEMS OF POLITICAL MEDICINE

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following report of the American Medical Association's Board of Trustees which was presented and approved by the AMA House of Delegates in Boston in December 1970, is an excellent commentary on the consequences of politically motivated medical care systems.

The article is well worth reading and I now include it in the RECORD for my colleagues information:

PROBLEMS OF POLITICAL MEDICINE: REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES AMA

A summary of priorities for maximum utilization of physician time in meeting the country's health service needs was adopted by the American Medical Association's House of Delegates during the Clinical Convention in Boston on December 4.

Known officially as "Report U of the Board of Trustees," the document is essentially the comments of AMA House Speaker Russell Roth, M.D. Dr. Roth's comments were presented to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare after the Board of Trustees discussed a national health program with Roger Egeberg, M.D., Assistant Secretary for Health.

The Executive Committee of the Florida Medical Association was particularly impressed by the report and recommended to the editors of the JOURNAL that it be reprinted in this issue. This very well expresses the views of Florida's delegates to the A.M.A.

The report is as follows:

Thesis: The principal resource for meeting the medical service needs of the nation is the existing supply of practicing physicians.

1st priority is for using effectively those practicing physicians we now have.

2nd priority is to do those things which may be done to increase the productivity of physicians.

3rd priority is to augment the number of physicians.

4th priority is to use the physician effectively in his role as a conservator of expenditures by and in behalf of his patients.

Considerations in respect to the 1st priority (effective use):

There has been a substantial "flight from practice," and especially from general practice, which has intensified our problems in the delivery of medical service. The factors which have caused this exodus from direct patient care should be recognized and, to the extent possible, eliminated. There has also been the disturbing fact that although new physicians are being trained at a rate well exceeding the rate of general population growth, these young doctors are not being motivated to enter into direct patient care in the areas of greatest need. If we wish to hold on to our current supplies of active practitioners and to increase them in a rational fashion there are certain things that we should do and a number of things which we assuredly should not do.

1.—In the existing climate of the United States efforts to regiment, conscript, or apply economic sanctions to the medical profession are destined to make matters worse rather than better. They have the effect of driving even more physicians from active practice into research, teaching, administrative medicine, more narrow specialization or premature retirement.

2.—Promises on the part of government that practicing physicians will deliver even more health service to beneficiaries than they are now able to produce under stress conditions force still more physicians to seek refuge from the pressures.

3.—The practicing physician is confronted with increasing costs of living and of doing business. In a generally uncontrolled economy measures which would freeze the income levels of physicians, eliminating their ability to adjust to the economic environment are discriminatory and lead to still further departures from active practice.

4.—The individual physician has limited opportunity or capacity to respond to overall societal demands. These responses are best made by physicians collectively, acting in concert through their professional associations. It is in the best interests of the nation that professional organizations be aided and abetted in their cooperative efforts. To denigrate them and to give them adverse tax treatment reduces their capacities and their resources for constructive input.

5.—It has been proposed in several legislative bills that bonus dollars will motivate physicians to establish practices in rural and urban shortage areas. The fact is that large numbers of physicians who have been providing service in those areas leave lucrative practices for less rewarding circumstances in which the offsets are such things as personal and family security, improved educational facilities, or a lessened pressure of patient demand.

6.—Prepaid comprehensive group practice has been "discovered" as a potential answer to most of the delivery problems. Rechristened "Health Maintenance Organizations," these arrangements for practice are offered as a panacea without recognition of the fact that such groups have been encountering serious problems of their own, that many patients do not wish to enroll in such plans, and that many physicians have no interest in practicing in them. The many variations of this approach deserve support as competitive mechanisms with a chance to prove such superiorities as they may develop in respect to quality, efficiency and economy, but to attempt to force all physicians into a rigid pattern of salaried group practice could be the most destructive move made by government.

7.—Plans which would base the entire delivery system of medical service upon "primary physicians" with responsibility for channelling patients and regulating payments to consultants, specialists and the like betray a lack of understanding as to how medicine is practiced.

8.—The willingness of physicians to participate in and to be subject to peer review in respect to the quality and quantity of their services and the charges made therefor are encouraging. This should be supported, not discounted. The prospect of evaluation by non-medical reviewers, or medical reviewers hired by non-medical agencies is a strong deterrent to cooperation.

In summary, to keep physicians in active practice, rather than to disperse them, government should abandon emphasis on prepaid comprehensive group practice although it may still support it. It should uphold the principle that a physician should be expected to charge his usual fees to all patients and should depend on a strengthened system of peer review to guarantee that such usual fees will conform with customary fees and be kept within the ranges of what can be defined as "reasonable." Mathematical formulae for freezes and arbitrary percentiles should be abandoned. It should probably be accepted that highly trained physicians cannot be attracted into practice in rural areas or in many slum areas, and alternative mechanisms for the provision of adequate medical service should be developed.

Considerations in respect to the 2nd priority (increased productivity):

1.—There is, in general, little opportunity to increase the productivity of the average practicing physician by simple extensions of his working hours. Actually current enthusiasm for group practice formulae seem to be retrogressive inasmuch as it is represented to the physician who is currently working 60–70 hours per week that under group practice arrangements he may reduce this to 50 or less hours per week. Scattered figures may be cited to support the idea that 100 physicians in solo practice actually provide service to more patients per week than do 100 physicians in group practice of any type.

2.—The multiple experimental programs of Medex, Duke University, the American Urological Association, and scores of others to develop support to the practicing physician deserve subsidy and assistance. At the same time serious attention must be paid to the medical practice acts of the several states, to factors of professional liability, insurance coverage, and the like.

3.—Restrictive provisions in such programs as Medicare and Medicaid which make it economically unfeasible for physicians to delegate to others—especially to interns, residents and office assistants—the provision of appropriate services should be eliminated or readjusted.

4.—Government has taken an unproductive and adverse position in respect to those physicians who have appeared to earn "too much" money from federal and state programs. Instead of the antagonistic approach of questioning the financial "take" by such persons, focus should be on requesting "peer review" of the quality of care offered by these mass producers. It may be good.

5.—Many physicians are dissuaded from, or become disenchanted with, efforts to provide medical service for federal and state program beneficiaries because of relatively low compensation, excessive paper work, and an exposure to adverse publicity because of payments received. This should be corrected. Physicians willing to devote themselves to this type of work in volume should be praised rather than denigrated for their efforts.

Consideration in respect to the 3rd priority (augmentation of physician numbers):

1.—Support to the educational roles of medical schools should be clearly separated from support to medical research so that the latter is not used as a subterfuge for the building of a medical school faculty, or the underwriting of medical school operations.

2.—As much attention should be devoted to keeping in clinical practice of medicine those physicians who we have as to the training of more physicians.

3.—A positive program of public relations dedicated to making the clinical practice of medicine attractive to oncoming generations of young Americans would be more productive than a campaign to picture physicians as entrepreneurs requiring regimentation and control.

4.—Serious attention should be given to the problem of professional liability insurance and the jeopardy in which the practicing physician finds himself today. It is no small matter that the new physician finds that he must pay from two to ten thousand dollars per year in malpractice insurance premiums before he feels safe to treat his first patient. It is equally important to recognize that many active practitioners are being forced from practice by the inability to purchase, at any reasonable figure, adequate liability insurance. The answer does not lie in finding new "carriers" for the insurance. It lies in legal reforms governing liability.

Considerations in respect to the 4th priority (conservator of public expenditures):

1.—"Peer Review" is the governing concept which requires support. To dilute it with lip service to consumer representation is not helpful. The medical profession needs to be supported in the outstanding progress which it has made in the past decade in the perfection of peer review techniques.

2.—Indoctrination in peer review should be looked upon as a proper role of national, state and county medical societies for incorporation into medical school curricula and hospital intern and residency training programs.

3.—Techniques of education for the practicing physician in the relationship between hospitalization, physician orders and prescribing practices and the expenditures mandated for patients or those who pay their bills should be advanced.

4.—Considerable attention should be given to the thought that when a physician is salaried, or otherwise divorced from the fee-for-service method of compensation, he is insulated from a specific interest in how his services or his authorizations for service have impact upon the economics of medical care.

CITIZEN GUN REGISTRATIONS ARE FLOP HERE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News on Thursday, January 21, 1971, on page 3, in an article by Michael Bernstein, came forward with a news article buttressing something which I have long held to be true, that the restrictive firearms laws do not work.

The District of Columbia statute, perhaps the most restrictive, onerous, burdensome, costly and repressive in the land, has just been characterized by officers of the Police Department of the District of Columbia as being ineffective in combatting crime.

As one officer, Lt. Samuel Wallace of the robbery squad put it:

> The only people who have registered guns are the honest citizens. Holdup men and criminal element don't register guns, they steal them.

Perhaps this belated recognition will cause elimination of some of the burdens on citizens in the District of Columbia and might create some mitigation in demand for further unworkable burdens to sportsmen and law-abiding citizens around the country. In the hope that some of my colleagues will benefit from the information in the article I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

CITIZEN GUN REGS ARE FLOP HERE

(By Michael Bernstein)

The District's nearly two-year-old gun registration regulations are not keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals, D.C. police say.

As Lt. Samuel Wallace of the Robbery Squad put it, "The only people who have registered guns are the honest citizens. Holdup men and the criminal element don't register guns, they steal them."

The main use of the licensing and registery of guns and rifles, he and other police officers said, is to trace stolen guns to other robberies and original owners. The original owners, however, rarely turn out to be law breakers.

Reacting to the statements, National Rifle Association spokesman said, "The members of the NRA have always opposed gun control because it won't reduce crime. We just don't see the criminal registering his firearm. Registration merely identifies the owner of the firearms. Registration is just another administrative burden on the owner.

Sgt. Fred Barber, head of the department's firearms control unit, had some kinder words for the regulations. "The main selling point of this registration is recovery. With this you have the best chance of returning the gun to the owner. A lot of people fail to see this. They don't place any value on it."

Originally, police estimated there were 75,000 guns in the city, but now they feel this total is high. "That figure was taken from old files and covered not only purchases by District, but Virginia and Maryland residents," he said. Nevertheless, he said, the 35,000 firearms registered so far don't really represent what we have in the city by far.

From 1969 to 1970 some 27,000 to 28,000 guns were registered with the four patrolmen and two police cadets in the firearms section at headquarters. In the last year 7,000–8,000 guns were registered.

In addition to registration, which costs $2 owners of shotguns and rifles must be licensed (have two photos and be fingerprinted) for an additional $2 fee.

The maximum penalty for having an unregistered gun is a $300 fine or 90 days in jail.

Sgt. Barber said in the first 11 or 12 months after the regulations were passed—no total was kept after that—more than 100 persons were charged with registration violations. These were almost always companion charges, with assault with a deadly weapon or some other offense, he said.

Occasionally, tho, the persons have been charged with and sentenced for failures to register firearms, he said.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL AT SEATTLE SHOULD NOT BE CLOSED

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, the Surgeon-General and representatives of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee admitting that consideration was being given to a plan to close down certain Public Health Service hospitals in the United States.

Now, the same idea is being proposed under the same argument that the objective is to consolidate facilities to provide better care.

In retrospect, had action been taken at that time the shortage of beds and the way health service would have deteriorated is beyond belief. Our veterans, especially, would have suffered.

A week ago, a study group from HEW conducted a hearing in Seattle without advance public notice. Dr. Robert Van Hoek, the head of the investigating team, was courteous and indicated he was not on the decision level, but he gave the distinct impression that it had already been decided to close the Public Health Service hospital in Seattle. This is contrary to the testimony of Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Richardson recently before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Meanwhile, there is no surplus of beds either in private hospitals in this area or in the Veterans' Administration hospital where there actually is a waiting list.

The facts will show there is no economic or other justification for phasing out this operation. It will deprive those entitled by law to health and hospital services.

And, finally, let me say there is considerable doubt as to whether or not the hospital can be closed legally without consent of Congress.

I am sure the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs will not sit idly by and see our veterans deprived of hospitalization because of any merger of the two institutions.

Finally, I am informed that medical research conducted by the University of Washington will terminate under the discontinuance of the Public Health Service hospital.

I trust all Members of Congress will unite in opposing the closure of Public Health Service hospitals throughout the country.

THE STATE OF THE UNION AND THE CONGRESS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, with the systematic withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam moving ahead of schedule, the new 92d Congress can direct more of its attention to the several domestic problems which have plagued our country for the past decade.

However, it becomes evident in these opening days of the Congress that partisan politics may deter positive action on proposals offered by President Nixon in his state of the Union address given on the second day of the current session.

In this address, the President outlined a domestic program with sweeping reforms that hold the promise of improving service of government at every level while streamlining the cumbersome and duplicatory process of bureaucracy. Although final judgment on certain of his proposals must be withheld until the details are clearly defined, the scope of the changes will provide major innovations in the organization of the Government programs dealing with: environmental protection, improved medical care, welfare, and revenue sharing with the States and cities. Significantly, many parts of the President's reform program provide for a redirection of national energies.

Beginning my 15th year as a Member of the Congress has given me the experience and pragmatism to foresee the inevitable pitfalls of trying to bring about major changes in Government organization. The last Congress delayed and dawdled through the longest session in history without acting upon major appropriation bills and even bypassed action on important measures dealing with social security and international trade which passed the House only to die in the Senate.

As several Senators groom themselves for the national spotlight of the presidential election in 1972, we can expect public rhetoric and legislative maneuvering which may obscure, delay, obstruct, and replace much of the President's program. While these activities would be regrettable, they would merely be an extension of what we witnessed repeatedly in the closing weeks of the last session.

If nothing else, Mr. Speaker, each Member of this body should try to make his position clear on the President's program of reform, not only before this body but in each congressional district. After all it is easy enough for any opposition force to divide its areas of disagreement as long as it does not have to agree on a single constructive alternative.

Although many of the details of the President's program are missing, my general impressions at this stage follow:

First. Welfare reform: Certainly, the present welfare system is in need of drastic overhauling. The family assistance plan as proposed gets the problem of requiring able-bodied welfare recipients to get off the relief rolls and on to the employment rolls. This legislation seeks to remove the inequity of paying a welfare client more to remain idle than the next fellow earns for pursuing steady employment.

Second. Expansionary monetary policies: Since the President did not outline in any detail what this policy will entail and because of my deep concern with habitual deficit spending by the Congress in the past I shall reserve my judgment accordingly.

Third. Environmental program: Very little of the present effort toward cleaning up the environment has been part of systematic planning. During the last Congress the President proposed a 37-point program to clean up the environment. He has now proposed further programs creating an expanded park system which would put recreation areas closer to large urban centers. I shall continue to enthusiastically support this program and its existence and shall reintroduce legislation to implement its goals.

Fourth. New health programs: I will give my full support to increases and a redirection of aid to medical schools to greatly increase the number of doctors and medical personnel who are so drastically needed. Again, however, the President's national health care plan was presented without the essentials needed to formulate a decision on it. We must have a plan to meet the real need where it exists without embarking upon a vast and costly program of socialized medicine.

Fifth. Revenue sharing: I have long favored a plan of revenue sharing with the States and local communities. In fact, I introduced legislation of this type long before the present administration took office. I am now hopeful that this Congress will take positive action in this field before the present financial crisis at the State and local level causes widespread breakdowns of essential services.

Sixth. Reorganization of the Cabinet departments: This proposal is the most sweeping reform of the Federal organization in the history of the United States. The President's blueprint for change calls for reducing the number of Cabinet departments from 12 to eight. This reduction would deeply cut into traditional reigns of power that control the bulging bureaucracy of Federal assistance programs and would greatly aid in dissolving the duplication that presently exists. Starting back in the days when I introduced legislation creating the Hoover Commission, I have been consistently opposed to the creation of wasteful and self-serving extensions of Government. As the President's proposal in this area is sent to the Congress, it will be interesting to see whether those who have preached economy in the past are willing to provide more than lipservice.

I will welcome correspondence from my district regarding the President's message. Please note my new address in writing: Congressman HAROLD R. COLLIER, Suite 1436, Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR—A TRIBUTE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today on his 91st birthday the Post Office Department issued a special postage stamp in honor of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

If the United States had heeded the wise suggestions made by General MacArthur at the time of the Korean war, we would not be tied down in the Vietnam war today. Prevented from bringing that sanguinary struggle to an end in the normal way with a "just and honorable peace" in the shortest time and with the least loss of American lives and treasure, he foresaw what would be the consequences of our failure and expressed in clear language what should be our policy.

What General MacArthur said during the Korean war in 1951 before a joint meeting of the Congress is even more applicable today. We ignore it at our peril. I quote one passage:

> The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector. You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to Communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe.

Following his immortal address before the Congress, General MacArthur appeared before joint sessions of the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, May 3–5, 1951, in which he covered every significant policy angle and warned that if the United States did not bring the Korean war to a "decisive and victorious end" it would have to accept "all the consequences of a disastrous defeat." The great number of casualties suffered by the United States after April 1951 and the extension of the Korean war to Vietnam have more than justified his fears.

The testimony of General MacArthur before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate, May 3–5, 1951, should be read and reread by all Members of the Congress and officials of the executive branch concerned with the formulation of policy.

At the close of his address, MacArthur made this much quoted statement: "Old soldiers never die, they just fade away." May Gen. Douglas MacArthur never fade away from the memory of the American people; may the true story of this great American be presented to students in their history texts and classes and may God continue to bless America with more men of the caliber of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

General MacArthur's 1951 address before the Congress summarizes his views that are now more applicable than ever. I recommend not only that it be studied but also that all persons concerned with the formulation of policy listen to a recording of it.

I insert the full text of General MacArthur's address to Congress in 1951:

ADDRESS BY GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

(From "Reminiscences")

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and distinguished Members of the Congress:

I stand on this rostrum with a sense of deep humility and great pride—humility in the wake of those great American architects of our history who have stood here before me, pride in the reflection that this forum of legislative debate represents human liberty in the purest form yet devised. Here are centered the hopes and aspirations and faith of the entire human race.

I do not stand here as advocate for any partisan cause, for the issues are fundamental and reach quite beyond the realm of partisan consideration. They must be resolved on the highest plane of national interest if our course is to prove sound and our future protected. I trust, therefore, that you will do me the justice of receiving that which I have to say as solely expressing the considered viewpoint of a fellow American. I address you with neither rancor nor bitterness in the fading twilight of life with but one purpose in mind—to serve my country.

The issues are global and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector, oblivious to those of another, is but to court disaster for the whole.

While Asia is commonly referred to as the gateway to Europe, it is no less true that Europe is the gateway to Asia, and the broad influence of the one cannot fail to have its impact upon the other.

There are those who claim our strength is inadequate to protect on both fronts—that we cannot divide our efforts. I can think of no greater expression of defeatism. If a potential enemy can divide his strength on two fronts, it is for us to counter his effort.

The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector. You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to Communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe.

Beyond pointing out these simple truisms, I shall confine my discussion to the general area of Asia. Before one may objectively assess the situation now existing there, he must comprehend something of Asia's past and the revolutionary changes which have marked her course up to the present. Long exploited by the so-called colonial powers, with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice, individual dignity, or a higher standard of life such as guided our own noble administration of the Philippines, the peoples of Asia found their opportunity in the war just past to throw off the shackles of colonialism and now see the dawn of new opportunity, a heretofore unfelt dignity and the self-respect of political freedom.

Mustering half of the earth's population and 60 per cent of its natural resources, these peoples are rapidly consolidating a new force, both moral and material, with which to raise the living standard and erect adaptations of the design of modern progress to their own distinct cultural environments. Whether one adheres to the concept of colonization or not, this is the direction of Asian progress and it may not be stopped. It is a corollary to the shift of the world economic frontiers, as the whole epicenter of world affairs rotates back toward the area whence it started. In this situation it becomes vital that our country orient its policies in consonance with this basic evolutionary condition rather than pursue a course blind to the reality that the colonial era is now past and the Asian peoples covet the right to shape their own free destiny. What they seek now is friendly guidance, understanding, and support, not imperious direction; the dignity of equality, not the shame of subjugation. Their prewar standards of life, pitifully low, is infinitely lower now in the devastation left in war's wake. World ideologies play little part in Asian thinking and are little understood. What the peoples strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, a little firmer roof over their heads, and the realization of the normal nationalist urge for political freedom. These political-social conditions have but an indirect bearing upon our own national security, but form a backdrop to contemporary planning which must be thoughtfully considered if we are to avoid the pitfalls of unrealism.

Of more direct and immediate bearings upon our national security are the changes wrought in the strategic potential of the Pacific Ocean in the course of the past war. Prior thereto, the western strategic frontier of the United States lay on the littoral line of the Americas with an exposed island salient extending out through Hawaii, Midway, and Guam to the Philippines. That salient proved not an outpost of strength but an avenue of weakness along which the enemy could and did attack. The Pacific was a potential area of advance for any predatory force intent upon striking at the bordering land areas.

All this was changed by our Pacific victory. Our strategic frontier then shifted to embrace the entire Pacific Ocean which became a vast moat to protect us as long as we hold it. Indeed, it acts as a protective shield for all of the Americas and all free lands of the Pacific Ocean area. We control it to the shores of Asia by a chain of islands extending in an arc from the Aleutians to the Marianas held by us and our free allies. From this island chain we can dominate with sea and air power every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore and prevent any hostile movement into the Pacific. Any predatory attack from Asia must be an amphibious effort. No amphibious force can be successful without control of the sea lanes and the air over those lanes in its avenue of advance. With naval and air supremacy and modest ground elements to defend bases, any major attack from continental Asia toward us or our friends of the Pacific would be doomed to failure Under such conditions the Pacific no longer represents menacing avenues of approach for a prospective invader—it assumes instead the friendly aspect of a peaceful lake. Our line of defense is a natural one and can be maintained with a minimum of military effort and expense. It envisions no attack against anyone nor does it provide the bastions essential for offensive operations, but properly maintained would be an invincible defense against aggression.

The holding of this littoral defense line in the western Pacific is entirely dependent upon holding all segments thereof, for any major breach of that line by an unfriendly power would render vulnerable to determined attack every other major segment. This is a military estimate as to which I have yet to find a military leader who will take exception. For that reason I have strongly recommended in the past as a matter of military urgency that under no circumstances must Formosa fall under Communist control. Such an eventuality would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan, and might well force our western frontier back to the coasts of California Oregon and Washington.

To understand the changes which now appear upon the Chinese mainland, one must understand the changes in Chinese character and culture over the past fifty years. China up to fifty years ago was completely non-homogeneous, being compartmented into groups divided against each other. The warmaking tendency was almost nonexistent, as they still followed the tenets of the Confucian ideal of pacifist culture. At the turn of the century, under the regime of Chan So Lin, efforts toward greater homogenity produced the start of a nationalist urge. This was further and more successfully developed under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, but has been brought to its greatest fruition under the present regime, to the point that it has now taken on the character of a united nationalism of increasingly dominant aggressive tendencies. Through these past fifty years, the Chinese people have thus become militarized in their concepts and in their ideals. They now constitute excellent soldiers with competent staffs and commanders. This has produced a new and dominant power in Asia which for its own purposes is allied with Soviet Russia, but which in its own concepts and methods has become aggressively imperialistic with a lust for expansion and increased power normal to this type of imperialism. There is little of the ideological concept either one way or another in the Chinese makeup. The standard of living is so low and the capital accumulation has been so thoroughly dissipated by war that the masses are desperate and avid to follow any leadership which seems to promise the alleviation of local stringencies. I have from the beginning believed that the Chinese Communist's support of the North Koreans was the dominant one. Their interests are at present parallel to those of the Soviet, but I believe that the aggressiveness recently displayed not only in Korea, but also in Indo-China and Tibet, and pointing potentially toward the south reflects predominantly the same lust for the expansion of power which has animated every would-be conqueror since the beginning of time.

The Japanese people since the war have undergone the greatest reformation recorded in modern history. With a commendable will, eagerness to learn, and marked capacity to understand, they have, from the ashes left in war's wake, erected in Japan an edifice dedicated to the primacy of individual liberty and personal dignity, and in the ensuing process there has been created a truly representative government committed to the advance of political morality, freedom of economic enterprise, and social justice. Politically, economically and socially, Japan is now abreast of many free nations of the earth and will not again fail the universal trust. That it may be counted upon to wield a profoundly beneficial influence over the course of events in Asia is attested by the magnificent manner in which the Japanese people have met the recent challenge of war, unrest and confusion surrounding them from the outside, and checked Communism within their own frontiers without the slightest slackening in their forward progress. I sent all four of our occupation divisions to the Korean battlefront without the slightest qualms as to the effect of the resulting power vacuum upon Japan. The results fully justified my faith. I know of no nation more secure, orderly and industrious—nor in which higher hopes can be entertained for future constructive service in the advance of the human race.

Of our former ward, the Philippines, we can look forward in confidence that the existing unrest will be corrected and a strong and healthy nation will grow in the longer aftermath of war's terrible destructiveness. We must be patient and understanding and never fail them, as in our hour of need they did not fail us. A Christian nation, the Philippines stand as a mighty bulwark of Christianity in the Far East, and its capacity for high moral leadership in Asia is unlimited.

On Formosa, the Government of the Republic of China has had the opportunity to refute by action much of the malicious gossip which so undermined the strength of its leadership on the Chinese mainland. The Formosan people are receiving a just and enlightened administration with majority representation on the organs of government, and politically, economically and socially they appear to be advancing along sound and constructive lines.

With this brief insight into the surrounding areas I now turn to the Korean conflict. While I was not consulted prior to the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic of Korea, that decision, from a military standpoint proved a sound one, as we hurled back the invader and decimated his forces. Our victory was complete and our objectives within reach when Red China intervened with numerically superior ground forces. This created a new war and an entirely new situation—a situation not contemplated when our forces were committed against the North Korean invaders—a situation which called for new decisions in the diplomatic sphere to permit the realistic adjustment of military strategy. Such decisions have not been forthcoming.

While no man in his right mind would advocate sending our ground forces into continental China and such was never given a thought, the new situation did urgently demand a drastic revision of strategic planning if our political aim was to defeat this new enemy as we had defeated the old.

Apart from the military need as I saw it to neutralize the sanctuary protection given the enemy north of the Yalu, I felt that military necessity in the conduct of the war made mandatory:

1. The intensification of our economic blockade against China;

2. The imposition of a naval blockade against the China coast;

3. Removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal area and of Manchuria;

4. Removal of restrictions on the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa with logistic support to contribute to their effective operations against the common enemy.

For entertaining these views, all professionally designed to support our forces committed to Korea and bring hostilities to an end with the least possible delay and at a saving of countless American and Allied lives, I have been severely criticized in lay circles, principally abroad, despite my understanding that from a military standpoint the above views have been fully shared in the past by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I called for reinforcements, but was informed that reinforcements were not available. I made clear that if not permitted to destroy the enemy buildup bases north of the Yalu; if not permitted to utilize the friendly Chinese force of some 600,000 men on Formosa; if not permitted to blockade the China coast to prevent the Chinese Reds from getting succor from without; and if there were to be no hope of major reinforcements, the position of the command from the military standpoint forbade victory. We could hold in Korea by constant maneuver and at an approximate area where our supply line advantages were in balance with the supply line disadvantages of the enemy, but we could hope at best for only an indecisive campaign, with its terrible and constant attrition upon our forces if the enemy utilized his full military potential. I have constantly called for the new political decisions essential to a solution. Efforts have been made to distort my position. It has been said that I was in effect a war monger. Nothing could be further from the truth. I know war as few other men now living know it, and nothing to me is more revolting. I have long advocated its complete abolition as its very destructiveness on both friend and foe has rendered it useless as a means of settling international disputes. Indeed, on the 2nd of September 1945, just following the surrender of the Japanese nation on the battleship *Missouri*, I formally cautioned as follows: "Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Various methods through the ages have been attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start, workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned; but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at the door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

But once war is forced upon us, there is no other alternative than to apply every available means to bring it to a swift end. War's very object is victory—not prolonged indecision. In war, indeed, there can be no substitute for victory.

There are some who for varying reasons would appease Red China. They are blind to history's clear lesson. For history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier war. It points to no single instance where the end has justified that means—where appeasement has led to more than a sham peace. Like blackmail, it lays the basis for new and successively greater demands, until, as in blackmail, violence becomes the only alternative. Why, my soldiers asked of me, surrender military advantages to an enemy in the field? I could not answer. Some may say to avoid spread of the conflict into an all-out war with China; others, to avoid Soviet intervention. Neither explanation seems valid. For China is already engaging with the maximum power it can commit and the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves. Like a cobra, any new enemy will more likely strike whenever it feels that the relativity in military or other potential is in its favor on a world-wide basis.

The tragedy of Korea is further heightened by the fact that as military action is confined to its territorial limits, it condemns that nation, which it is our purpose to save, to suffer the devastating impact of full naval and air bombardment, while the enemy's sanctuaries are fully protected from such attack and devastation. Of the nations of the world, Korea alone, up to now, is the sole one which has risked its all against Communism. The magnificence of the courage and fortitude of the Korean people defies description. They have chosen to risk death rather than slavery. Their last words to me were, "Don't scuttle the Pacific."

I have just left your fighting sons in Korea. They have met all tests there and I can report to you without reservation they are splendid in every way. It was my constant effort to preserve them and end this savage conflict honorably and with the least loss of time and a minimum sacrifice of life. Its growing bloodshed has caused me the deepest anguish and anxiety. Those gallant men will remain often in my thoughts and in my prayers always.

I am closing my fifty-two years of military service. When I joined the Army even before the turn of the century, it was the fulfillment of all my boyish hopes and dreams. The world has turned over many times since I took the oath on the Plain at West Point, and the hopes and dreams have long since vanished. But I still remember the refrain of one of the most popular barrack ballads of that day which proclaimed most proudly that—

"Old soldiers never die, they just fade away."

And like the old soldier of that ballad, I now close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty.

Good-by.

THE NIXON DOCTRINE IS WORKING

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial appearing in the San Diego Union provided a concise and realistic appraisal of President Nixon's efforts to withdraw U.S. forces from Vietnam. The article follows:

U.S. COMBAT ROLE IS ENDING: NIXON DOCTRINE IS WORKING

The recent announcement by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird that the United State of America will cease its offensive combat operations in Vietnam by May 1, is another clear commitment by the Nixon Administration.

Plainly analyzed, the announcement means that the ability of South Vietnam to defend and to govern itself—Vietnamization—is increasing as the Administration has estimated and hoped that it would.

The winding down of the American combat role in Vietnam also calls attention to the fact that the Nixon Doctrine is progressing according to plan. The doctrine promises material aid instead of manpower to friendly nations that are fighting aggression.

It is working. In two short years the United States has brought home 320,000 of its forces from the Pacific Ocean region. In addition to Vietnam, this includes 16,000 troops brought home from Thailand, 20,000 from South Korea, 12,000 from Japan, 5,000 from Okinawa and 6,000 from the Philippines.

All of this, of course, is visible evidence that the United States meant what it said when it set up the Nixon Doctrine as a means of helping our friends toward self-determination, while not dominating them. However, we do not hear applause from the Communists, nor do we see them making meaningful responses to our peaceful efforts.

In carrying this project forward, the United States literally is fighting for time—the time needed by South Vietnam to become even stronger. The Communists of North Vietnam are also fighting for time even more desperately because they are losing the military war, because they can see South Vietnam becoming self-sufficient, and because they are facing economic, social and agricultural deterioration at home. They want us out of Southeast Asia before it acquires stability.

Thus, as we take calculated risks in withdrawing our troops, the Communists attack us with every propaganda weapon because their time is running out and they want the withdrawal race to accelerate.

President Nixon, therefore, is eminently correct in playing his cards as he sees them, not as the Communists want him to play them. Our withdrawal from Southeast Asia must be directly related to the accumulation of power and confidence by the South Vietnamese.

It often is said that Southeast Asia is slowly defusing—becoming less and less of a political issue in the United States. This certainly is so, and it is so because President Nixon has fulfilled his promises to the American people.

ALASKA OIL PIPELINE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the oil industry, with the apparent cooperation of the Department of the Interior, is endeavoring to give the American public a snow job with regard to the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline.

The Christian Science Monitor of January 18, 1971, carried a full-page advertisement of the Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., the entity created by the group of oil companies seeking to exploit the North Slope oil discovery, which asked the question, "Will a pipeline ruin their Arctic?" Pictured in the advertisement is a herd of caribou trekking across an unspoiled mountain grassland. Another photograph shows a mother caribou nursing her fawn. Both scenes are very touching. And, the text of the advertisement seeks to leave the impression that the proposed pipeline would do little damage to the caribou habitat.

The same issue of The Christian Science Monitor carried an editorial which places the pipeline issue in a somewhat different perspective. The editorial makes the point that "the Alaska pipeline is as dubious a venture as ever. It will still harm the environment, in many places perhaps disastrously."

Taking note of the Department of Interior's contention that the pipeline should be built because of national security considerations, the Monitor stated:

> From a national security standpoint, the pipeline will be exposed and easily vulnerable to attack. As to America's not wanting to depend on the troubled Mideast for oil, one could as easily argue the other way—that our involvement there perpetuates American presence and pressure for peace.

The Department of the Interior, in response to section 102(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, has filed an environmental impact statement concerning the proposed pipeline. The Department, in marked contrast to the propaganda contained in the advertisement sponsored by the Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., agrees that the pipeline would do great damage to the Alaskan environment. Nonetheless, the Department recommends that the pipeline be built.

I believe the Department to be in gross error as to the national security aspects of the pipeline and with regard to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. In adopting the National Environmental Policy Act, the Congress intended that its provisions should protect the environment from ecological disasters such as that which would be perpetuated by the proposed pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following text of the advertisement and the text of the editorial alluded to above, to appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WILL A PIPELINE RUIN THEIR ARCTIC?

The discovery of North Slope oil three years ago came as very good news for the American economy. But it also triggered enormous concern for the Alaskan ecology. Could a pipeline be built without irreparable damage to the fragile Arctic environment?

Since that time, we and our shareholder companies have conducted basic research in a number of disciplines affecting both the pipeline itself and the Arctic environment. Geology and engineering are our areas of basic competence. Aided by outside experts, we have now added significantly to our understanding of the biology, botany and zoology of the Arctic. In fact, as a result of these efforts, man's knowledge of the Arctic has been significantly increased in a remarkably short period of time.

What we have learned is highly reassuring to every citizen who is concerned about ecology, conservation and environment. The pipeline *can* be built without ruining the Arctic environment.

The route—In most other parts of the world, planning a route of a pipeline is simply a matter of finding the shortest distance between two points. Planning a route in Alaska is different.

Two physical phenomena have played a crucial role in determining the route of the pipeline: oil pumped through a pipeline stays warm because of energy input from the pumps and surface friction with the interior of the pipe, and, of course, ice melts when exposed to warmth.

To begin with, therefore, both oilmen and ecologists were aware that a warm pipeline couldn't be built through ice-rich permafrost (permanently frozen subsoil) without melting the ice, weakening the supporting strata, and permitting the pipe to sag.

The solution was a route from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez which passed through much terrain that was not ice-rich permafrost. What we sought was dry permafrost—gravel or rock with low moisture content. In this kind of subsoil, the 48" diameter pipe can be safely buried. Although the rock or gravel will thaw in the immediate vicinity, there will obviously be no melting of the rock, no weakening of support, no danger to the natural environment. Of the route we propose, most passes through terrain in which the pipe may be underground. Ground disturbed by trenching will be carefully reseeded to prevent erosion.

As a result of our studies, we have also determined that the pipe can be safely built above ice-rich permafrost so long as the heat from the pipe is isolated by any of a number of proven insulating techniques.

A barrier to wildlife?—Many have been concerned that the aboveground pipe would be a barrier to the normal migration of the caribou herds. In studying the habits of the caribou, it was determined that the animals migrate 25 miles, and frequently up to 40 miles, in a single day's normal grazing—which far exceeds the length of any anticipated barrier caused by an aboveground line.

What we have learned about the Arctic leads us to believe that there is nothing inherently dangerous to the environment providing the line is designed, built and operated in a manner that is considerate of and responsible to the environment. In truth, what's good for the environment is also good for the safety and security of the pipeline. On this you have our pledge: The environmental disturbances will be avoided where possible, held to a minimum where unavoidable and restored to the fullest practicable extent. And we can assure you that the pipeline will be the most carefully engineered and constructed crude oil pipeline in the world. If you would like further information, please write: Public Affairs Division, Alyeska Pipeline Service Company, 2805 Denali Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99503.

HERRING IN THE PIPELINE?

It seems odd the Interior Department's conclusion on the Alaska pipeline issue was based not on ecological grounds—the area of expertise of the geological and environmental specialists who spent two years preparing the report—but on the grounds that developing the North Slope was "essential to the strength growth and security of the United States."

Surely there was nothing in the Environmental Policy Act, which requires all government agencies to prepare reports on the environmental impact of projects, that should have led the Interior Department to attempt to strike a balance between the nation's ecological and security interests.

This is particularly troubling because "national security" is one of those emotional arguments raised to shut off debate, not sharpen it, in the search for truth.

One wonders whether it was brought into the Interior Department's report to do just that, whether it reflects a preset, oil-industry-favoring cast to the present government's thought. This suspicion will confuse the public over the objectivity of the otherwise exhaustive and in many areas constructive report.

Pipe-laying regulations specify that only half the 800-mile length of pipe could be laid underground, instead of the 90 to 95 percent the oil companies proposed. And safeguards against spills, crossovers for animals—such requirements could help mitigate the environmental impact of the permafrost-melting line.

But the public will want to know still more. What level of profitability were the requirements based on? If the nation's welfare and not the oil companies' is at issue, should not the requirements, before a pipeline is permitted, be even stiffer—say, requiring an ample insulating sheath for the pipe?

Frankly, in our view, the Alaska pipeline is as dubious a venture as ever. It will still harm the environment, in many places perhaps disastrously.

From a national security standpoint, the pipeline will be exposed and easily vulnerable to attack. As to America's not wanting to depend on the troubled Mideast for oil, one could as easily argue the other way—that our oil involvement there perpetuates American presence and pressure for peace.

And so on. Perhaps the Alaska pipeline decision will be made intuitively by Americans, for arguable immediate reasons. If so the likely eventual judgment on building the pipeline would be that it was wrong. For the progressive line of thought in the country is toward less, not greater impairment of nature for industrial advantage.

THE RUN ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL BANK

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, although the Congress enacted the Air Pollution Control Act in 1959, and the Federal Water Pollution Act the following year, the dangers to our environment against which both acts were directed have become matters of national concern only in recent years.

Pollution today certainly represents one if not the most important domestic issue confronting the Congress and the Nation. It is important, therefore, that the views of those who speak with authority in this area be heard and heeded.

One such authority on the environmental situation today is Mr. Grady Clay, of Louisville, Ky., editor of Landscape Architecture. Last year, Mr. Clay, in an address to the University of Kentucky Systems Building Seminar entitled "The Run on the Environmental Bank," outlined the history and development of many of the current dangers to our health and well-being.

So that our colleagues may benefit from Mr. Clay's wisdom and experience in this critical area, I include the text of his address at this point in the RECORD:

THE RUN ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL BANK

(By Grady Clay)

The first one died that Saturday at 2 am. Doctors' telephones had been flooded all night with emergency calls. By midnight Saturday, 17 persons were dead. Two more died Sunday before the rains ended what came to be called "the unusual smog episode" in the small industrial town south of Pittsburgh on the Monongahela River in October, 1948. The town was called Donora.

Later, it turned out that 5,910 persons, 42.7 percent of the population of Donora, Pennsylvania, were affected. The "severely affected" numbered 1,440, or 10.4 percent.

Only once before in the world history had there been such an episode, in 1930 in the Meuse Valley of Belgium. Donora became a cause celebre. It was the object of the most thorough study of smog epidemiology in the history of the U.S. Public Health Service.[1]

Some fifteen years earlier, an apparently unrelated series of events took place across the Great Plains of the United States.

In late February, 1936, red snow fell in New England. The Dust Bowl was on the move in the West. It swept across eastern skies, darkened the sunlight over the Capitol in Washington, influenced the vote that created the Soil Conservation Service, and produced one of the greatest internal migrations in American history.

Thus began a retreat from a vast manmade environment. Thus it became apparent in the 1930's that the US contained a large sub-region that could no longer support the civilization built within it. We had pushed the land too far.

Most Americans found the lessons unpalatable. At first, most refused to believe it and preferred to reject the bearers of ill tidings.

"When the young editor of the Dalhart *Texan* finally decided in the summer of 1933 to tell his readers that the sand dunes they used for necking parties and picnics were crawling tides which might destroy the city, he lost $1,000 worth of advertising in a week."[2]

These were new unsetting, unpleasant facts. For, after all, the environment had *made* America. A generation of environmental determinists had said so. Frederick Jackson Turner, the historian, had "proved" that the unique American character was the product of a unique American environment, and a unique experience of "conquering the west." The poetry of America was filled with emotional, vague notions of land mystique, of unlimited horizons, rolling plains and rivers forever, a national character somehow different from all others in the world.

And then . . .

Something quite peculiar began to take place in the 1950's. A slow and at first imperceptible "run on the bank" of land supplies in the United States gradually began. No longer, as Garrett Eckbo tells us, could we view it as a "bottomless pit" on an inexhaustible gold mine.[3]

No one can say exactly when the run started. But gradually, the prices paid for farmland in the U.S. began to exceed the capitalized value of income from crops and livestock off those farms.

At first, the rise was attributed to the federal government's acreage allotment and/or Soil Bank programs. Ownership and control of land was the only way farmers, investors and speculators could get at the federal subsidies. Millions of acres were withdrawn from the farm market—the total is now around 50,000,000 acres held out of production, and therefore artificially limiting the supply.

Beyond that, the average investor in land—and this included hundreds of thousands of city people, doctors, small businessmen, little three-man syndicates taking a flyer—began buying land, prompted by the gradual realization that the stuff, especially the good stuff, was hard to find. Nobody was making any more of it.

Of course it was still "there," But larger and larger chunks of it were in bad condition, or was getting out of reach, bought up for purposes that had little or nothing to do with farming.

Gradually, the idea spread: "Better git while the gittin's good." Prices were pushed upward, just as during the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain, by the flow of surplus capital out of the cities, outbidding dirt farmers especially around metropolitan areas. Those farmers who chose to continue raising crops instead of capital gains moved further away from cities, bidding up prices in that outer ring. The ripple effect spread outward.

One effect was to drive more small farmers off the land, increase the size of the average farm, discourage younger farmers, and turn farming into an old man's occupation.[4] An economic farm unit began to cost something approaching a quarter-million dollars in many parts of the US, and much of this value came from the land itself.

Until fairly recently, it was generally agreed that increased land prices were a good thing. Everybody benefitted—or so it was assumed.

But gradually the question began to be raised: How long could this process continue? Did not rising prices eventually drive up food costs? And if good land was so valuable, was there really enough to go around? Shouldn't more be saved "for a rainy day" when the skies would fall from over-population?

All this was very disquieting to a people accustomed to think their land supply was unlimited. But the evidence piled up. Land itself was the environmental currency easiest to trace—and the prices continued to be bid up as scarcity value became apparent to more buyers.

Gradually, other environmental balances began to be called into question. There was a gradual withdrawal of investor confidence in the larger environment—in water, clean air, a sense of spaciousness, in a healthy outdoors that gradually came to be recognized as one Ecosystem.

By the early 1960's, therefore, the stage had been set for a *substantial run on the American environmental bank.* The conditions for that run were:

First: there had to be dramatic evidence to prove that the supply of environmental currency in the bank was inadequate.

Secondly, there had to be reliable channels for distributing the evidence.

Thirdly, the supply of evidence had to be steady, and continuous before it could affect national policies.

And fourthly, the evidence had to be verifiable by most Americans, first hand, out of their own daily experience.

Only when these four conditions had been met could there be a drastic change in public thinking that is now producing the "run on the bank of the environment," and its after-effects.

Until the 1950's, *any* warning that the US might someday "run out of land" had been dismissed as silly rumor, communist propaganda, or at least as an un-American lack of faith in our ability to create new frontiers within the same old borders.

But in 1953, agricultural zoning came to California.[5] This was a device thought to be strictly for city folks. But it took hold in Santa Clara County where within 7 years, 26 square miles of some of the world's most fertile irrigated cropland went into subdivisions. Karl J. Belser, the county planner, made a national reputation as the leading advocate of zoning to protect the limited agricultural base of good land. A front-page headline in the Santa Clara *Valley Farmer* in February 1950, said:

"It's a Nip-and-Tuck Race to Preserve Some of the Valley's Prime Land; City Boundaries Run Like Wildfire; Cultural, Water, Tax Problems Rise."

In this, as in many other developments, California offered the rest of the U.S. evidence of the political and social impact of a limited environmental base—of a growing "run on the land"—based on a growing distrust of its condition.

Further evidence came from a small-scale but nation-wide phenomenon during the building boom of the 1950's—the disappearance of the familiar vacant lot in most neighborhoods.

Families all over America began to realize that the last vacant lot in their block was gone; the last open-field in the old neighborhood had been subdivided; the last creek or spring had been piped underground or simply bulldozed away (until the next wet spell); the last open view to the hills was now full of houses.

They responded in the classical manner of European and American families for centuries: as soon as they could afford it, they bought more domestic space around their homes. In 20 years, the average lot size for houses built with FHA mortgage insurance increased 50 percent.[6]

During this period, the nation's homebuilders discovered that *they* were running out of land. Hundreds turned themselves into developers, and began bidding up suburban and far-out lands for future building sites. The National Association of Home Builders discovered "cluster development" and began an education/propaganda cam-

Footnotes at end of article.

paign for clustering housing into Planned Unit Developments.

By 1960, the U.S. Census confirmed the disturbing trends:

1. The U.S. population was now predominantly urbanized. It had reorganized itself into 173 "daily urban systems" or urban fields linked by commuting patterns. Practically noplace in America was now outside such urbanizing fields.[7]

2. The heart of most large cities had *stopped* growing. One of the few certainties in urban economics—that you could depend on a steady increase in downtown real estate values—was no longer true. Not all the urban renewal in Christendom (or Johnson-dom) could reverse the process. Cities no longer performed their expected jobs. The old friend was broke and all his rich friends had moved to suburbia.

3. Evidence began to pile up that air and water, once thought to be inexhaustible, were no longer so. Environment, like the supply of housing credit, began to be viewed as a "limited pool." Within the two decades from 1950 to 1970, river after river went dry, caught fire, silted up, flooded worse than ever before, or, in September began to stink. The Potomac, one of our least industrialized rivers, turned green with algae. To everybody's horror, it developed that farmers, with their thousands of tons of fertilizer washing downstream, were a major contributor. If you couldn't trust the farmers, whom *could* you trust? Lake Erie was said to have died. Although the announcement of the death was premature, it scared hell out of the public, and when dead alewives by the billions piled up on the Chicago beaches in 1967, the word "ecological balance" began to creep into cocktail conversations in the Midwest. Something drastic was clearly afoot, or awash.

The channels for distributing all this new flood of information had been gradually enlarged. Back in 1958 the Rockefeller Foundation financed the first Conference on Urban Design Criticism at Rye, New York. It was the first to bring together a cross-section of professional worriers about the deteriorating environment. As one of the principal moaners at that bar, I recall our unanimous conclusion that it was virtually impossible to get consistent critical evaluation of the environment into the newspapers of 1958. It was a "jonah" subject. Afterwards, I recall Lewis Mumford saying that the journalism of critical evaluation was like poetry—you had to do it out of love and devotion, or not at all. Nobody would pay for it. And there wasn't much of it.

But in the late 1960's, the floodgates opened. Hundreds of journalists discovered the environment. By the late 1960's every major magazine had a Special Issue, or a Special Editor or a new "Ain't It Awful" section devoted to The Environment. Top people in journalism and education, sensing a new trend, jumped on the bandwagon; new publications entered the act; the Environmental Surveillances Services Administration took over the Weather Bureau and the Coast Guard hurricane scouts, and began churning out press releases about every seismic tremor. Hurricanes got named for girls, thus qualifying for entry into headlines. Foundations gave money to other foundations, and obscure newsletters on "conservation" turned overnight into nation-wide journals for viewing-with alarm. The concept of "irreversible damage" became acceptable.

Thirdly, as I suggested earlier, the evidence that there was a run on the environment had to be steady, continuous and reliable. *And that it was*—discounting the usual quickie headline grabbers, and doom-shouters.

By 1968 a Gallup poll showed 85 percent of Americans to be concerned about the "evils" of air and water pollution.

By 1970, a steady increase in environmental reaction and reporting was underway. The environmental crusade, promoted to the same status with Mother and apple pie, was becoming respectable. Little old ladies in tennis shoes, scoffed at and scorned when they tried desperately to stop a highway through the park in the 1950's, now came to public hearings armed with environmental lawyers, foundation grants, and even an occasional grudging assist from the Chamber of Commerce. President Nixon, who showed he could hardly care less about "ecology" in 1968, was moralizing about our duties to the environment in 1970. The Audubon Society, with an assist from the Ford Foundation, quick-shifted from bird-watching to environmental guardianship. Hundreds of scholarly studies of specific environmental conflicts began getting into print. Cost-benefit ratios moved out of the confines of the U.S. Corps of Engineers dam studies into more complex areas. The idea of "least-social-cost, maximum social benefit" began slowly to find acceptance in the placement of highway routes.[8]

The American language, ever-ready to take absorb a new cause and tempo, responded quickly. An interesting case recently came before the Federal Communications Commission which slapped a fine on an educational FM station in Philadelphia (WUHY-FM). The fine was for allowing what the FCC called "patently offensive" language broadcast from a taped interview with Jerry Garcia.[9] The subject was ecology. The tape goes like this:

"For example, I have friends who I've known like since they started college, you know, and like now it's eight years later and they're all PhD's—stuff like that. It's just coming out in those terms. . . . I know quite a few of these people who have switched their major in the last year to Ecology and that kind of ———, because it's like really important right now. It's a big emergency going on."

The evidence was clear. Ecology had "arrived."

By 1970, environmental surveillance has become a vast enterprise. The moon landings, and above all the view of Spaceship Earth from the moon, had wiped clean the old attitude that we could solve earth-bound problems by escape to the moon. Everybody who watched the landings, and saw that fragile, distant cloud-bound earth off in the vast emptiness knew, for once and for all. that the earth indeed had limits.

Environmental surveillance of this limited domain took on new dimensions:

Satellite photography of the world;

ESSA and improved weather predictability;

Orbital sensing mechanisms;

Jet-flying land speculators;

The Urban Observatory network;

The rise in urban study centers and their research;

Earth Day as a training-event for environmental observers;

New School and University programs in ecology and environmental affairs; and

The heritage of the Natural Beauty program of the 1960's.

All these were being reinforced by new polotical institutions, already making their impact, which now include:

Governors' Councils on Environmental Quality;

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission;

Connecticut's new conservation act and its town conservation boards;

Hawaii State constitution with its emphasis on environmental quality;

Scores of new decisions in the higher courts, including the Hudson River case which allows parties once considered "outsiders" to have standing in court in environmental damage cases;

And the Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as we shall see.

John Osman of the Brookings Institution recently testified to Congress that "the environmental era will produce a revolution in the policy-making process . . . a reordering in the policy sciences . . . placing new intellectual demands upon the policy-makers and the people."[10]

Given this new and invigorating climate, old facts gave off new voltage, and forced most Americans to begin looking at environmental change from an altered set of assumptions:

(1.) The American standard of living, envied by much of the world, was in fact achieved at fantastic costs, creating debts now coming due. With 6% of the world's population, the US was using up 40% of the earth's non-replaceable resources, including copper, iron, petroleum.[11] How long could this last?

(2.) Freedom to move everywhere cheaply by automobile was being achieved only at the high cost of dangerous air pollution and highway death and damage. These costs were now having dollar signs attached. Hidden costs were being exposed—such as penalties put on poor inner-city residents left with few buses, lousy rapid transit, stinking air, and no escape.

(3.) Our marvelous machines and chemicals were, it turned out, being used to defoliate in Viet Nam an area the size of Massachusetts;[12] and to kill and damage civilians in ways which even the Czechoslovaks overrun by Russians consider barbarous.

(4.) Gradually, our capacity to produce has come to be seen as a dangerous capacity to overproduce. Cars, bottles, sewage, waste of every sort, gave evidence that the US had over-invested in thing-production, and under-invested in the ability to create environments in which people and things could live in long-lasting harmony.

As more Americans began *withdrawing their trust in the environment*, Congress began to stir itself. In 1969 it passed the National Environmental Policy Act (Public Law 91–190). The President then appointed the new Council on Environmental Quality.

Go back to the depression of the 1930's and the widespread failures of banks for a parallel. It then was the practice to set up creditor protection committees, who tried to see that creditors didn't get wiped out by a run on the bank's resources.

This appears to be the function of the new Council on Environmental Quality; to help "restore faith in the currency" by promising to discover wrong-doing, and sounding environmental alarms. Nobody knows whether it can work or not. I do not see that it has any power.

But the Act itself *has* power. Consider items:

Item: On February 5, a federal district judge in Texas issued a temporary injunction stopping the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture from granting a loan to a recreation association to build a golf course on state park land. The basis for the decision was the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Item: On March 3, Secretary of Transportation John Volpe announced he had refused to approve construction of Interstate Highway 93 through scenic and historic Franconia Notch in New Hampshire's White Mountain Forest. The decision was based on the National Environmental Policy Act and the Transportation Act.

Item: On March 13, Volpe said he would not approve use of any federal funds for additional runways at John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York pending an environmental study by the National Academy of Sciences, and would not consider any applications for federal aid for additional

Footnotes at end of article.

runways at airports in the New York area without assurance that there would be no unacceptable environmental or ecological impact. The Department of Transportation said the decision was in conformity with the National Environmental Policy Act.

Item: On March 26, Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel announced he would fight construction of a petrochemical plant near Hilton Head Island on the South Carolina coast unless the company guaranteed "non-degradation" of the coastal waters. He said he would oppose a project that did not meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Item: On April 13, in Washington, D.C., a federal district judge issued a temporary injunction forbidding the Interior Department to grant a permit to a group of oil companies to build a road across federal land in Alaska. The road is needed for construction of an 800-mile pipeline across the Alaska tundra. The injunction was based on the National Environmental Policy Act and the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

While time and further court tests will determine if these early experiences under the new law mark the beginning of a new era of environmental awareness, the law does indeed seem to offer great promise.

For the first time, a law makes concern for environmental values a part of the charter of every agency of the federal government and requires them to consider the environmental impact of their actions.

For the first time, the law set forth a broad and pervasive national policy of environmental protection, proclaiming that "Congress recognizes that each person should enjoy a healthful environment."

For the first time, the law gives the nation an independent body—a three-member Council on Environmental Quality—to oversee environmental problems. And the Council reports to the highest official in the federal establishment—the President himself.

The law gives the public an unprecedented right to information on the environmental impact of proposed federal legislation and actions *before* the fact. This right to know, in turn, gives the public an opportunity to apply pressure to make the system responsive to environmental values.[13]

What this means to the building industry should, by now, begin to be clear.

No longer are the producers of the built environment automatic White Hats. No longer is the subdivider cast in the role, although he dresses in the broadbrimmed hat, boots, and chino britches, of the western pioneer or cowboy—Good Guy.

As in parts of the undeveloped Third World, the word "development" has become synonymous with imperialism, so in much of the United States, "development" has come to stand for, or to warn about, environmental degradation.

This is a climate for the construction industry vastly different from the one that greeted it in 1950. *Then,* the nation was barely getting out of its worst housing shortage in history; the postwar baby boom was creating new business at a fantastic rate; Congress was willing to risk, and got, severe housing scandals through its FHA–608 program, in order to get housing built anywhere anyhow, just built.

Today, there has been a massive withdrawal of confidence in the physical environment itself, and in its capacity to absorb the punishment a high-production, high-technology society can produce.

There is a great and growing residue of distrust in the old environmental bank, its technology and its managers.

There is a growing distrust of large-scale organization; of bigness-for-bigness sake.

And there is a new and potent counterculture of the young people, radicalized by a hideous, needless and still-continuing war in Vietnam and Cambodia. There is new demand for zero population growth.

This is the new climate, in which the building industry must exist in the next decades, and short of a fascistic Agnewvian-George Wallace type repression of all dissent from the accepted cliches, one should expect this climate to be maintained for a long time to come. It is a climate of distrust. The environment and its traditional developers and managers have shown their limitations. Anyone who proposes to develop, remodel, renew and reconstruct the environment does so at greater risk than in the past. His "exposure" is not merely financial.

All environmental changes in the coming decades will take place in an atmosphere conditioned by "Eco-Logic," the current framework of radical environmental thought.[14]

Eco-logic has set up a tension zone within which all discourse will be affected; it sets new rules of debate, a factual and assertive framework that must be dealt with wholly, and not piecemeal. As the Ecology Action journals and recycled papers say, "Everything is connected to everything else."

The new Eco-logic embraces these beliefs, holding them to be both self-evident, and increasingly supported by scientific evidence:

1. The earth is a delicate, closed life-support system that cannot tolerate unlimited growth and its wastes. Nothing really goes away.

2. All environments have a "carrying capacity . . . an erosive tolerance which, like any bank credit, cannot be exceeded without dire penalty."[15]

3. Some environments are inviolable and must not be altered by man.

4. The quality of life is more important than the quantity of things produced. Technology and its productivity threaten human survival. The question is how we survive—not survival alone.

5. Western civilization as we know it has developed anti-survival tendencies. For the environment to survive, society as a whole must be changed by radical solutions—getting to the roots of the problem.

This is the climate into which Operation Breakthrough[16] has been thrown. The building industry may take moral comfort from being likened to Christians thrown to the lions in the Roman arena; but it is certainly a different arena from that of the 1950's. The environment for survival is a tough one, not to mention the environment for producing the current Administration's goal of 2,500,000 dwelling units per year.

What are the environmental shifts since the 1950's that set new conditions for the 1970's?

1. The shift of the United States back toward becoming a nation of apartment-dwellers. (The dominance of single-family home ownership only came during the past two decades. Apparently it may never come again.)

2. The rise in self-determinism among tenant groups, neighborhood organizations, and other new power groups.

3. The increase in "environmental protectionism."

4. The growing national network of federal information systems.

What happens as we continue the shift toward a predominance of apartment-dwellers?

An increasing percentage of Americans will have little or no control over the exterior spaces that go with their interior dwelling space. In 1969, between 40 and 45 percent of the new dwelling units were apartments. For most of these occupants, their privacy was limited to the walls of their apartment, rather than to the outside dimensions of their lot.

This is a significant reduction in a family's freedom to use space as it chooses. As noted earlier, most Americans in the past have bought more space around themselves whenever they could afford it.

What will they buy in its place? Mobility, a car for each member of the family; vacations and second homes? What other repercussions follow this shift into apartment living?

There's growing evidence that tenants are demanding "extras" to make up for the lack of a private outdoor yard for each family. We see the patio-and-pool combination in new garden apartment clusters; the putting greens, lakes, greenways, community clubhouses, etc. installed around the new apartments. This shift to apartment-building is forcing builders to become "community developers," even when this means no more than adding a heated swimming pool, and free beer on Labor Day to stay ahead of the competition.

What happens when developers run out of the cheap-and-easy pool-beer-patio combinations? How many developers can produce state parks next door to their developments, or guarantee the kind of open landscape which only universities, municipalities, and new-town corporations can produce?

What happens when the articulate majority of the public come to view the environment as a fragile, closed system, almost out of control?

The pronouncements of Earth Day give us some clues, as does the growing public withdrawal of confidence in environmental managers. The radar image of this future is not difficult to read:

There is a growing militancy about the future. Future-watching, once confined to Rand Corporations, Hudson Institutes and World Futures Society members, has permeated a suddenly wider public.

There is growing self-determinism among wider segments of the public. The rise of tenant unions in the early 1960's has been followed by increasing militancy among neighborhood organizations, ethnic clusters, and minorities once kept outside significant public debate. As Rex Garrett has observed, "They want their share of the project" and a voice in its design and management.[16a]

Large-scale developments of every sort are distrusted, if not actively opposed. This puts large-scale developers on collision course with interest groups they once could disregard or buy off. It would not be surprising if developers, preferring not to risk encounter with activist groups, flock to the best-located new-town developments strictly in the interest of faster construction time and lower costs.

Side-effects of environmental change are more predictable than ever. More people than ever now assert "there's no such thing as a *side* effect; that's just the developer's dodge to avoid responsibility."

All development is now subject to question and possible attack. Development proposals must show costs as well as benefits, and it can no longer be assumed that all developmental results are beneficial. Look at the proposal by the German dye/plastics firm BASF to build a $100 million plant on Port Royal Sound in Beaufort County, South Carolina. The County and State "had wooed BASF with a passion" and the BASF officials were "treated so well that Senator Fred Hollings later explained, 'You would have thought they were returning astronauts.' "[17] On March 26, Interior Secretary Walter Hickel announced he would fight the construction unless BASF guaranteed "non-degradation" of the coastal waters.

Present limits on development almost invariably follow ownership and political boundaries. But ecosystem thinking jumps such boundaries; it is a way of dealing with all the processes at work within an ecologically coherent area.

Thus in the coming decade, *public discourse on environmental matters "must take into account whatever lands are included in* *particular ecosystems, regardless of who holds title to them."* [18]

Finally, there is a growing necessity to redefine the whole construction process, and include feedback as an essential component. How well does the man-made environment work? What satisfactions does it offer its users, what does it cost its neighbors, what are the downstream effects which are too often concealed?

To these questions, the federal government's new "Operation Breakthrough" has insufficient answers. Speeches at this conference by Messrs. Albert Weinstein and Ralph Warburton [19] show Breakthrough to be a highly skillful, articulated and detailed mass-production program—straight out of the 19th century.

Breakthrough is wholly product-oriented. All its processes concentrate on getting new end-products into place. It sets aside practically no funds or sets up practically no procedures to ensure orderly, systematic review and evaluation of the future environments it produces. All research is front-ended. None guarantees that six or twelve months or 5 years later, there shall be careful and systematic evaluation to see how these environments work. What are the real user-benefits, and how do they compare with the stated intentions of the sponsors/developers before they began? Without such provisions, it is footless to talk about "systems."

In summary, the American public now sees its environment as a limited resource; it perceives that all environment is subject to man's management and influence. The Ecology Action movement is only the latest evidence that the public has begun a long-term run on the environmental bank. It sees all land as invested with the public interest; and that the quality of the environment no longer should be left to whoever happens to own a piece of it. And the public is determined to have increasing voice in decisions about its environment.

There have been few shifts in public attitudes to compare with these. It has become the fundamental pre-condition of all physical development in the coming years.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Air Pollution in Donora, Pa.* Epidemiology of the Unusual Smog Episode of October, 1948. Public Health Bulletin No. 306, 1949, Government Printing Office.

[2] Article in *Fortune* magazine, quoted by Stuart Chase in Rich Land, Poor Land, 1936, pp. 113–114.

[3] Garrett Eckbo, at University of Kentucky, Systems Building Seminar, May 27, 1970.

[4] Marion Clawson, New Policy Directions for U.S. Agriculture, *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation,* January–February 1970.

[5] "The Conservation of Agricultural Land" by Karl J. Belser, May 3, 1955; "Planning for Land Use and the Zoning Tool as an Implementing Mechanism," speech to San Joaquin Council of the California State Chamber of Commerce Nov. 18, 1955.

[6] William Losoncy of Spindletop Research, Inc., Lexington, Ky., in study of housing supply and demand for the 1970's, for Columbia Gas Company, 1970.

[7] Brian Berry, Professor of Ecography, University of Chicago, in address to the Ohio Valley Assembly, Feb. 27, 1970, Shakertown, Ky.

[8] Ian McHarg, "Where Should Highways Go? Comprehensive Route Selection Gets Most Social Benefit at Least Social Cost," LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE Quarterly, April 1967.

[9] ROLLING STONE, April 30, 1970, report by Ben Fong-Torres.

[10] Testimony of John Osman, Senior Staff Member, Advanced Study Program, The Brookings Institution, before the Select Committee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings on HR 14753, April 21, 1970.

[11] Footnote 11 omitted.

[12] George Whiteside, Defoliation, Ballantine Books, Inc., New York, 1970.

[13] Conservation Foundation *Letter,* April 1970.

[14] This summary of Eco-Logic is derived in part from late 1969—early 1970 issues of *The Whole Earth Catalog, Rolling Stone,* newsletters of Environmental Action, Washington, D.C.; Ecology Action in Boston and Berkeley, *The Mother Earth News,* et al.

[15] Patrick Horsbrugh, Notre Dame University, private communication, 1970.

[16] "Operation Breakthrough," Dept. of HUD, 1969.

[16a] Speech to the University of Kentucky Systems Building Seminar, 1970.

[17] "Battle of Beaufort: Conservation Collides with the Jobless," by Arthur Simon, *The New Republic,* May 23, 1970.

[18] "The Ecosystem as a Policy Criterion," by L. K. Caldwell, in *Natural Resources Journal,* p. 205, April 1970.

[19] Albert Weinstein, Assistant Director for Research Planning and Coordination, Department of Research and Technology, HUD, Washington, D.C.

Ralph Warburton, Special Assistant for Urban Design, HUD, Washington, D.C.

THE NATION'S EMERGENCE INTO THE OCEAN AGE

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 27, 1971

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD an article entitled "One League Past the Crossroads," which appeared recently in the Manager, a Department of Commerce publication.

This article, authored by an outstanding public servant, Under Secretary Rocco C. Siciliano, deals with the functions and responsibilities of the newly created National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce. It is well written, informative, and deals with a fascinating subject. As Mr. Siciliano well states:

One of our greatest adventures—the Nation's emergence into the Ocean Age—lies ahead.

I have been closely associated with the developments in marine science over the years, as a member of the President's Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources and, of course, as a member of the Senate Committee on Commerce which devoted immense amounts of time and energy to the NOAA legislation. It is from more than casual knowledge, therefore, that I invite the Under Secretary's excellent article to the attention of the public at large. It reflects his usual skill in making a complex subject understandable and readable.

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

ONE LEAGUE PAST THE CROSSROADS

(By Rocco C. Siciliano)

One of America's most exciting and challenging prospects lies in the oceans, our waiting and perhaps our final frontier on Earth.

Our economy, our security, our ability to provide food for a hungry world and raw materials for industry—even our ultimate environmental condition—all are deeply involved with the oceans and the uses we make of them.

Our seas are global hotbeds of enormous problem and potential. On the one hand, as a major portion of the earth's surface, they are being endangered by our ignorance. Our coastal zones, where much of our national wealth and activity are concentrated, are becoming arenas of drastically conflicting, and often dangerous uses. On the other hand, the oceans and their seabeds are one of the great untapped repositories of living and non-living resources remaining to us. And, as a keystone of that part of environment we call the weather, they hold secrets which may one day enable us not only to predict it better, but to exercise some degree of control over it.

The oceans have been much on man's mind over the last generation. There has been a dynamic thrust into the sea in terms of exploration and development. With it has come the sobering realization that man does not begin to know enough about this part of his environment to use or even understand it well, let alone manage it intelligently. He is a David, facing Goliath without a slingshot. The extent and seriousness of our need for more knowledge, a coherent approach, and some degree of management, have come sharply home.

Our Nation has just emerged from more than a decade of Congressional deliberation on how best to tackle the problem. Our National Academies of Science and Engineering, the President's Science Advisory Committee, and many individual groups have considered it at length. Most recently, the prestigious Presidential Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, headed by the Ford Foundation's Dr. Julius Stratton, has issued a comprehensive blueprint describing our marine needs and recommending a Federal focal point for meeting them.

That focal point now exists. On Oct. 3, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration came into being within the Commerce Department as the result of a reorganization plan proposed by President Nixon.

With the formation of NOAA, the Nation took a right turn at a critical crossroads. At last, a potent governmental mechanism had ben fashioned with the mandate and the capability to undertake an organized marine effort.

NOAA, which will be headed by an Administrator at the Under Secretary level, is composed of elements from several Federal Departments. From Commerce has come the Environmental Science Services Administration with its Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Environmental Data Service, National Environmental Satellite Center, and Research Laboratories. From the Department of Interior have come the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Marine Game Fish Research Program, and the Marine Mineral Technology Center. Elements of the Army Engineers' U.S. Lake Survey and the Navy's National Oceanographic Data and Instrumentation Centers have come from the Department of Defense. The National Sea Grant Program from the National Science Foundation, and the ocean data buoy development program of the Transportation Department's Coast Guard are part of the new organization.

These elements, now in the process of reorganization into a potent scientific, technological and service force, bring together some 13,000 scientists, engineers, technicians and others. Their facilities include esoteric research laboratories, some 50 vessels, including the Nation's largest and most sophisticated ocean research and survey vessels; aircraft instrumented to probe the mysteries of the atmosphere, and much more. NOAA is the only agency outside of NASA and the Department of Defense which operates earth-orbiting satellite systems to observe environmental conditions. Its people will be stationed literally from Pole to Pole and will girdle the earth.

NOAA will explore, map and chart the global oceans, their geological cradles, their geophysical forces and fields, and their mineral and living resources. New physical and biological knowledge will be translated into systems capable of assessing the potential yield of the oceans, and into techniques which industry can employ to manage and conserve those resources. It will also monitor and predict the characteristics of the physical environment—the changes of atmosphere and ocean, sun and earth, gravity and geomagnetism. It will protect us against impending environmental hazards. It will monitor and predict such gradual, but important, changes as those of climate, seismicity, marine life distribution, earth tides, continental position, the planet's internal circulation, and man's own effects upon the environment which shelters and sustains him.

Curiosity has been shown by some at the selection of the Commerce Department as the home for this environmental effort. Actually, the Department is one of the government's principal scientific and technological agencies. More than half of our people are engaged in scientific and technological efforts which have critical importance to the economic growth of the Nation. In addition to NOAA, the Department is responsible for the National Bureau of Standards, the Patent Office, and the Maritime Administration.

In administering NOAA, the Department will also have the benefit of extensive and highly capable advice. In proposing the formation of the agency, the President indicated his intention of asking the Secretary to establish a National Advisory Committee for the Oceans and Atmosphere, reporting directly to the Secretary. It will be composed of distinguished representatives of industry, commerce, conservation, universities—all vitally interested segments of society. The Committee will provide advice and counsel on the organization, content and direction of the NOAA program.

With all its information gaps, ocean industry is still an enormously complex and diverse affair. It is estimated by the Battelle Memorial Institute that the total value of our national effort in coastal waters and on the continental shelves exceeds $20 Billion. The annual value of resources taken from waters adjacent to the United States is estimated at well over $2 billion, of which one-half is derived from petroleum and about one-fifth from fishing.

There is an air of excitement about the oceans today. Our daily press and the trade magazines tell us of new and wondrous ventures on, in and under the seas. The Tektite experiment showed the world that man is on his way toward living and working on the ocean floor. There are novel underwater dredges for acquiring sand and gravel from our coastal waters; there are modern vessels for collecting the minerals that lie on the floors of the deep oceans. There are spectacular oil finds in the Arctic Ocean Basin.

Our youngsters are as interested in oceanography as in space. Industry is eager to make its mark on the new frontier.

But the job ahead is tremendous. Overcoming our problems and realizing our potential in the seas are tasks which will test both industry and government. They are tasks which demand a high degree of cooperation among industry, government, and the non-governmental scientific and technological communities—or they will never be accomplished.

The support and services required from the Federal Government by our industrial, commercial and recreational activities are as diverse as the activities themselves. Some marine industries, such as those involved in the development of offshore oil and gas deposits, are mature, healthy, and growing. Others, such as aquaculture, are in the early stages of their careers. Many of our ocean efforts are not as strong as we would wish, such as certain segments of the fishing industry.

Essentially, there are three ways in which government and industry must interact.

The first rests squarely upon government: provision of a range of services such as maps and charts for navigation, resource development and recreational boating; forecasts of ocean and weather conditions; and more and better facilities for providing for life and safety at sea.

The second, involving contributions by government and industry, is the creation of policies and procedures, regulatory and otherwise, encouraging private investment so that industry can meet our national needs for ocean products and, in the process, remain self-sustaining. These industries all depend on the clarification of legal conditions which are changing rapidly in many parts of the world, with nations extending their jurisdictions in varying degrees. The whole question of legal regimes governing oceanic resources is under discussion in the United Nations, and President Nixon has proposed that all nations adopt a treaty renouncing all national claims over the natural resources of the seabeds past the point where the high seas reach a depth of 200 meters.

It is a governmental obligation to negotiate the international arrangements necessary to conduct marine industrial and scientific activities, to conserve resources, and to prevent pollution. The adoption of such policies will give industry guidelines without which it cannot operate well, and will provide encouragement for industry to generate the ideas, capital and methods required to develop ocean resources.

The third area, and one in which industry and universities must play major roles, is the development and building of a truly formidable base of new technological and scientific capabilities, one that will allow us to operate with efficiency and effectiveness in the marine environment.

In encouraging the development of marine industry to constructive growth, the government has other basic obligations: It must, for example, make sure that common resources are used as rationally as possible, and that ways are found to resolve, for the common good, conflicting uses of those resources.

Government also must initiate, support and encourage marine education and training programs so that our Nation will always have sufficient, and sufficiently-trained, manpower to do our work in the oceans.

Government and industry jointly share another, and a vital obligation—to make sure that in developing, using and managing ocean resources, we guard against the kinds of exploitation that once ravished our woodlands and even now menace our coastal zones. We cannot afford another Santa Barbara; we cannot deplete our fishing grounds. Let us remember that, contrary to popular belief, the oceans are not teeming with fish everywhere; great portions of the deep seas are vast, watery deserts. Where we go, let us work cleanly. When a plant is taken, let new seed be sown. Our huge, seemingly-limitless seas are, like the rest of our environment, fragile and vulnerable. The Department of Commerce is deeply committed to effective development of marine resources—but development without ravaging the marine environment.

The road ahead is long, expensive, difficult and often, I am sure, it will be frustrating. But the challenge of our seas is the kind which Americans, and American business and industry in particular, have a history of meeting brilliantly.

We have a tremendous amount of exploration to do—scientific, technological, industrial and conceptual. The essence of exploration is that it deals in the unknown. Americans—and again, American business and industry in particular—are explorers by nature; it is part of the fabric of our national zest for adventure.

One of our greatest adventures—the Nation's emergence into the Ocean Age—lies ahead. In NOAA, *and* in the vitality and genius of our business, industrial and scientific communities, we have a partnership which, I am convinced, will undertake that adventure with distinction.

THE HONORABLE JAMES RUDDER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a resolution which was presented by my two good friends, Representative William Heatly and Representative William Presnal in the State Legislature of Texas and subsequently adopted relating to the Honorable James Earl Rudder, deceased president of Texas A. & M. University:

HOUSE SIMPLE RESOLUTION—NO. 23

Whereas, On March 23, 1970, the State of Texas and the United States of America was saddened by the passing of one of Texas' most distinguished educators, statesman and citizen, the Honorable James Earl Rudder; and

Whereas, This famous Texan was born on a small farm in Eden, Texas, on May 6, 1910, one of six sons of Dee Forest and Annie Powell Rudder; and

Whereas, His early education was in the public schools of Eden and after graduation from Eden High School in 1927, he enrolled at John Tarleton Agricultural College. In 1930 he transferred to Texas A&M where he majored in industral education and so excelled in football that in 1956 he was named to Sports Illustrated Magazine's Silver Anniversary All American Football Team. He was graduated from A&M in 1932 with a Bachelor of Science degree and was commissioned a Second Lieutenant of Infantry in the Army Reserve; and

Whereas, In 1933 he met Miss Margaret Williamson and they were subsequently married in 1937, after which they returned to John Tarleton Agricultural College in 1938 where Rudder coached football and taught until 1941 when he was called to active duty as a Second Lieutenant; and

Whereas, In June 1943 he organized and trained the 2nd Ranger Battalion which was given the mission of scaling the 100-foot cliffs at Pointe du Hoe during the D-Day invasion of Normandy. To accomplish this mission, Rudder's Rangers suffered over 50 percent casualties and with Rudder being twice wounded during the battle. On December 8, 1944, Rudder took command of the 109th Infantry Regiment, and eight days later the Germans began their last great counter-offensive of the war, now known as the Battle of the Bulge. Led by Rudder, the 109th was credited with a major role in repulsing the German attack. His military decorations at the end of the war included the Distinguished Service Cross, Legion of Merit, Silver Star, Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, French

Legion of Honor with Croix de Guerre and Palm, and the Belgian Order of Leopole with Croix de Guerre and Palm. He was released from active duty with the rank of Colonel in April 1946. After the war, he remained active in the Army Reserve until his retirement in 1967 with the rank of Major General; and

Whereas, On January 4, 1955, Rudder was appointed Commissioner of the General Land Office of Texas and during his three-year tenure significantly increased the financial foundation of Texas' educational system through sound management of Land Office resources which enured to the benefit of the Permanent University Fund and the Permanent School Fund. In 1958, Rudder became Vice President of Texas A&M and was named President in July 1959. On September 1, 1965, the Board of Directors of Texas A&M named him President of the Texas A&M University System, consolidating the office of Chancellor with the office of University President. During his period of inspired leadership, the college of 7,526 students expanded to a university of approximately 14,000 students from all sections of the United States and 75 foreign countries; and

Whereas, During his lifetime, many high honors were bestowed upon this extraordinary man in recognition of services to his state and nation, the impact of which is still unfolding. These honors include the Distinguished Service Medal, the nation's highest award for peacetime service; the Good Citizenship Gold Medal for outstanding service in war and peace; the Exchange Club's Outstanding Citizen Award; and the Texas Heritage Foundation's Distinguished Service Medal; and

Whereas, The House of Representatives of the State of Texas wishes to officially recognize a unique and extraordinary career and to acknowledge a debt of gratitude to the services performed for the citizens of the State of Texas by General James Earl Rudder; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in tribute to a man who could serve as a model of true excellence to any Texan or American when the House of Representatives of the State of Texas adjourns today, it do so in his honor; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution, under the Seal of the House, be prepared and mailed to his wife, Mrs. Margaret Williamson Rudder; his two sons, James E., Jr., and Robert; his three daughters, Mrs. Anne Walton, Mrs. Edward P. Wollenman and Linda Rudder; his brother, John Rudder; and his two grandsons, Marc and Bradley Walton.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S GOALS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 27, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in its issue of Monday, January 25, the Richmond Times-Dispatch published an excellent editorial on the goals outlined in President Nixon's state of the Union message.

The editorial points out that many obstacles lie between the announcement of these goals and their achievement; that some of the goals need close examination; and that the prospective budget, termed "expansionary," is by any name a budget with a deficit.

The editor of the editorial page of the Times-Dispatch is Edward Grimsley.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, entitled "Six Goals," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SIX GOALS

It was an ambivalent speech, President Nixon's state of the Union address, simultaneously depressing and inspiring.

Few would question the desirability of the six alluring goals Mr. Nixon outlined. His proposals to return more power and money from Washington to the states and their localities, to reform the nation's welfare program, to improve the nation's health care programs, to increase the administrative efficiency of the federal government, to stimulate the nation's economy, and to improve the environment are all laudable objectives.

But how does President Nixon propose to get the nation from Here to There? That is the depressing question. History shows that the route from thought to deed, from proposal to fruition, can be long, steep, twisting and treacherous. Before the nation can decide whether to take the journey, it must wait until Mr. Nixon takes out a road map and marks the route he intends to follow.

Take Mr. Nixon's revenue sharing plan, for example. Anybody who favors the federal system must applaud the general principle of returning federal funds to states and localities. Theoretically, revenue sharing should mean more freedom and greater responsibility—and thus more vigor—for state and local governments. But there are nagging questions. Exactly how "unrestricted" would federal revenue sharing funds be? Would state and local governments tend, through the years, to increase their dependence upon the federal government for funds? And if they did, would they tend to develop more irresponsible spending habits? The less dependent a locality became upon its own local taxpayers for revenue, the less cautious it might become in embarking upon new or expanded programs.

Welfare reform is another troublesome point. As Mr. Nixon said, the existing welfare system is a "bad program." But the proposal he submitted to the last Congress did not seem to promise to improve matters. Does he have a new and better plan to suggest?

That the President intends to submit an expansionary budget is disquieting, to say the least. Stripped of its fancy designation, an expansionary budget is a deficit budget: Mr. Nixon intends to recommend that the federal government spend more during the coming fiscal year than it takes in. The President insists that the deficit spending he proposes will rejuvenate the economy wtihout rekindling the "fires of inflation." Maybe so, but the prospect of having to swallow such bitter medicine is not the least bit cheering.

The President's message, to repeat, aroused hopes and stirred doubts, and we really won't know whether to laugh or to cry until the details of his proposals emerge.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY A TIMELY REMINDER

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 27, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, last Sunday it was my privilege to be the principal speaker before nearly 1,500 Americans who are members of Greater Detroit's Ukrainian community. The occasion was the 53d annual observance of the Declaration of Ukrainian Independence.

The event was a moving tribute to the people of the Ukraine for their valiant stand against tyranny on January 22, 1918.

Presiding was Jerry Duzey, chairman of the Organizing Committee of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. I was introduced by Bohdan Fedorak, chairman of the East Detroit-Hamtramck branch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from those remarks be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

Chairman Duzey, Mr. Fedorak, Reverend Clergy, distinguished guests, fellow Americans:

It is a privilege to be here with so many American friends of Ukrainian background to join in this observance of an important moment in history—the Declaration of Ukrainian Independence on January 22, 1918.

This is both a solemn and an inspiring occasion—an occasion which serves in a significant way to remind all Americans—of whatever origin—how precious is that spirit of freedom which motivated Shevchenko, Hrushefsky and Petlyura, as it did Washington and Jefferson.

Among the many ties which bind Ukrainian-Americans to this Nation is a moving passage from Shevchenko's poetry, written some 114 years ago:

When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we *will* some day!

While that passage may suffer a bit from the process of translation, the thought is poignantly expressive of the American dream. It is steeped in a powerful faith—a faith that the Ukrainian destiny is to live in freedom, however tortuous may be the path to that destiny.

In his poem, *The Dream*, Shevchenko accused Peter the First of "crucifying" the Ukraine and Catherine the Second of "finishing off his victim." Even the Ukrainian poet laureate may have underestimated the staying power of the crucified victim.

It was Peter's army that dropped a curtain of oppression on the Ukrainian people which lasted for two centuries. Incidentally, the world's literature is the loser because Shevchenko lived only 47 years into the second century of that long, dark Ukrainian night. He spent 24 years as a serf, 10 in the Russian army, three and one-half under strict police supervision, and only nine years in freedom.

More than half a century after Shevchenko's death the Tsarist rule finally crumbled in 1917. A few months later, another generation of Ukrainian leaders seized the opportunity to establish an independent state in January 1918. The new Ukrainian nation led a precarious, but courageous existence until 1922.

What a remarkable period of independence that was! We all could take lessons, for example, from the guarantees for minorities which were provided by the freely-elected Ukrainian Assembly.

What statesman today would propose a separate ministry for the Jewish minority? The independent Ukrainian State did that.

What country today would issue its currency in three languages so as to accommodate the diverse tongues in the land? The independent Ukrainian state did that.

Unhappily, in 1922, this interlude of independence came to an end. The Bolsheviks imposed a new brand of despotism on the

Ukraine—and another long, dark night has followed.

It is interesting to speculate on how history might have been altered if, after World War I, the Western powers had been more sensitive to that spirit of freedom which existed in the Ukraine. That spirit has survived—and it will continue to survive until freedom and independence are achieved.

The story of the Ukrainian nation is very important to all Americans, particularly young Americans. As Abraham Lincoln said:

"Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms.

"Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism around your own doors."

By renewing our awareness of the plight of more than 45 million Ukrainians, and that of other captive peoples throughout the world, we strengthen our own determination to preserve liberty at home and to help, each in his own way, to bring a brighter day for the oppressed everywhere.

REVENUE SHARING—WITH THE TAXPAYERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot these days about revenue-sharing proposals and I am happy to announce that I have reintroduced in this 92d Congress three revenue-sharing bills.

My revenue-sharing proposals offer an honest solution to the money problem; not promising to give money back to the people, but by not taking it from them in the first place.

House Joint Resolution 23 is the Liberty amendment which has already been enacted by the legislature of my State. This resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens.

H.R. 351—formerly H.R. 17140 in the 91st Congress—provides for a revesting in the Government of the United States the full, absolute, complete, and unconstitutional ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

H.R. 428—formerly H.R. 19973 in the 91st Congress—authorizes deduction of social security contributions from income taxes.

I include each of these revenue-sharing bills at this point in the RECORD:

H.J. RES. 23

H.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"SEC. 1. The government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

"SEC. 2. The constitution or laws of any state, or laws of the United States shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

"SEC. 3. The activities of the United States Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of three years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

"SEC. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the sixteenth article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

H.R. 351

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is hereby authorized and directed forthwith to purchase the capital stock of the twelve Federal Reserve banks and branches, and agencies thereof, and to pay to the owners thereof the par value of such stock at the date of purchase.

(b) All member banks of the Federal Reserve System are hereby required and directed to deliver forthwith to the Treasurer of the United States, by the execution and delivery of such documents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, all the stock of said Federal Reserve banks owned and controlled by them, together with all claims of any kind or nature in and to the capital assets of the said Federal Reserve banks, it being the intention of this Act to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the said Federal Reserve banks.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

H.R. 428

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 164(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for taxes) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) Taxes described in subsection (g)."

(b) Section 164 of such Code is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h), and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES PAID BY THE SELF-EMPLOYED OR BY EMPLOYEES.—There shall be allowed as a deduction (for the taxable year within which paid) taxes imposed by section 1401 (tax on self-employment income) or section 3101 (tax on employees)."

SEC. 2. Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) Social security taxes paid by employees and by the self-employed."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (1) of section 275(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain taxes) is amended—

(1) by striking out so much of such paragraph as precedes subparagraph (B) and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) Federal income taxes (other than the tax imposed by chapter 2), including"; and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to amounts paid after December 31, 1970.

OKLAHOMA LEADER POINTS "A WAY TO WALK THE LINE"

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the 1970 chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. W. W. "Bill" Keeler, is a longtime friend and constituent. In addition to his duties and responsibilities as chairman of the NAM, Bill Keeler has faithfully served as both chairman of the Board of Phillips Petroleum Co., and as principal chief of the Cherokee Indian Nation of Oklahoma.

On January 22, before the Executives' Club of Chicago, Chief Keeler delivered one of the most thoughtful and timely speeches I have had the privilege of reading in quite some time.

The theme of Chief Keeler's speech is that in order to avoid both anarchy and repression, the citizens of our society must approach each problem or incident in the most careful and well-reasoned manner. We must maintain reasonable limits on protest, without imposing repressive measures which curtail our freedoms of speech, thought, and association.

Chief Keeler wisely points out that "throughout history, dissent has frequently been the forerunner of freedom." Yet he also emphasizes the corollary—that when dissent takes the form of mocking our institutions, intimidating our law enforcement agencies, and defiling national symbols, then it becomes the duty of each citizen to "tune out" the source of illigitimate protest, and not fall prey to the "action-reaction" syndrome upon which such propagandists must depend for their publicity.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chief Keeler on his very thoughtful and perceptive analysis of this very serious national problem, and I include the text of his speech at this point for the benefit of all my colleagues:

A WAY TO WALK THE LINE

(By W. W. Keeler)

I am pleased to be here in Chicago today. With its strength and vitality, Chicago has always appealed to me as a city representative of the American spirit. Carl Sandburg, who knew the heart of this city better than anyone, called Chicago "Stormy, husky, brawling; City of the big shoulders."

A prime reason behind Chicago's forceful personality has been its stormy heritage of conflict and dissent. From the Haymarket and Pullman riots of the late 1800's to the battle of Michigan Avenue in 1968, Chicago has learned first-hand the immence power of dissent. In the past, Chicago and the nation generally, have been able to refine conflicting ideas and backgrounds into a fuel for progress. But now we seem to have lost this ability to use dissent constructively.

A free society—if it wishes to remain free—must walk a perilously thin line in the way it regards and reacts to dissent. Today I would like to discuss a way to walk this line without veering off into anarchy on one side or repression on the other. Both seem unthinkable. Yet, unless we find ways to deal intelligently with dissent, we may suddenly awaken to the fact that the unthinkable has happened. I imagine many Canadians felt the unthinkable had happened last fall when martial law was declared in their country following two political kidnapings. Canada, like the U.S., has always maintained an atmosphere of free and open dissent. Yet in a matter of a few days, that atmosphere was transformed into a climate of suppression. The Canadian experience poses a sober question for all Americans: "Can it happen here?"

I believe it could happen here. Recent acts of dissent in the U.S. that have destroyed lives and property have driven many Americans to conclude that strong-arm tactics are the only alternative to social chaos. In fact, I think many people feel our society would be a lot better off without dissent or dissenters.

We see dissent everywhere. Between the college student and the college administrator. Between the black and white. Between the businessman and consumer crusader. Between the supporter of the Vietnam war and the opposer. Between the parent and the child.

We seem so threatened by this flood of dissent that we wonder whether our nation can keep afloat without prohibiting dissent altogether. We are frightened, and a frightened people often act irrationally. There is an imperative need for Americans to put dissent into its proper perspective—to stand back and take a long look at what is happening.

Throughout history, dissent has frequently been the forerunner of freedom. When people have lost control of their own destinies, and their grievances have gone unheeded, a dissenter has risen in protest. Martin Luther before the Diet of Worms in 1521 declared, "Here I stand, I can not do otherwise." Five hundred years later another Martin Luther—Martin Luther King—wrote from a Birmingham jail, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

These were dissenters of the highest order. Men of courage and conviction who dreamed bold dreams of a better tomorrow; men challenging society to right itself, to give freedom a chance to grow and flourish.

Our nation was founded by dissenters willing to trade their lives for liberty. It is important to remember that these men were dissenters not only in the eyes of the king, but in the eyes of many of their own countrymen. According to John Adams, only one third of the people in the colonies actually favored the revolution.

For nearly 200 years, America has grown great because it has learned not only how to cope with dissent but how to nurture and use it as well. America has opened its gates to the dissenters of the world, and they answered the call to help shape one of man's noblest experiments.

Now, we suddenly find dissent emerging with an ugly face. It mocks our judicial system, intimidates our law enforcement agencies, defiles our national symbols, and wantonly destroys public and private property. Unfortunately, modern technology and communications have given this ugly side of dissent an exposure far beyond its merits.

This was underscored by a comment made by Chancellor Laurence Chalmers of the University of Kansas. Following the appearance of Abbie Hoffman on his campus, the Chancellor said: "Having him here was the best thing we could do to persuade the students that a guy like Hoffman has nothing to offer. Two hours of Abbie Hoffman and you see right through him. But what happens? The media presents Hoffman blowing his nose in the American flag and the people who see that are thrown into a frenzy and blame the university for having him here in the first place. He's a farce . . . but one minute of the media and he's a celebrity who is taken seriously."

There isn't any question that televised episodes of this kind of obnoxious dissent further polarize those who are repelled by what they see. A vicious cycle of action and counter-action is set in motion.

Television by its very nature makes a perfect stage for political showmen. Too often, the sound, reasoned argument doesn't stand a chance against the emotional or the spectacular.

Thus it is up to us as individuals to judge for ourselves what expressions of dissent are legitimate and which ones are not worthy of our attention. The art of "tuning in" those who dissent legitimately and "tuning out" those who do not, will be difficult to learn. But some guidelines may help and I'd like to suggest a few.

First of all, we should not make the mistake of "tuning out" a dissenter simply because of such factors as age, color, dress, hair style, speech background or sex. It is well for us to keep in mind that the President of the United States in the year 2000 may today be about 20 years old, have long hair, prefer Ringo Starr to Bart Starr and the Led Zeppelin to Lawrence Welk, and be a she instead of a he.

However, our criteria must go much deeper than these external factors. We must look into what the dissenter is saying and why he is saying it. Is he sincere, or is he putting us on? Does he appeal to reason, or does he play on emotion? Can he be constructive as well as critical? Does he have a plan with concrete goals? Of special importance, does he recognize the right of others to disagree with his goals? Can he listen as well as talk? When all the facts are in, and it's clear there's room for more than one point of view, is he capable of compromise?

If he meets these criteria, then he is a dissenter in the great tradition of healthy protest in America. We had best hear him out because what he is saying may be important.

In evaluating what the dissenter is saying, we need to maintain an objective approach. We have a tendency to over-react to both the rhetoric and the actions of some dissenters. We need to "keep our cool."

Some good advice was given in the Wall Street Journal following the Kent State incidents of last spring. The Journal said: "When you feel the emotions rise from the riots and burnings on television, turn the blasted thing off, go out in the fresh air and take a walk around your own block. You will make a comforting discovery that you are not personally threatened at all."

I want to make clear that such a viewpoint does not condone violent incidents of dissent. But it does help us keep our perspective. Even widespread incidents on many college campuses do not mean that our educational system is collapsing or that the nation as a whole is gravely threatened.

I believe that if we "keep our cool" and take the right actions, we can maintain a climate that encourages responsible dissent and at the same time limits the destructiveness of irresponsible dissent.

Let's examine what actions should be taken *on the college campus* to achieve this end. I believe that the responsibility for maintaining an atmosphere of creative dissent on the campus rests with both the students and the administration. Therefore, my suggestions involve a continuous working together of these elements.

I suggest that the students and administration of colleges cooperate in drafting guidelines for expression of dissent on their campuses. These guidelines should clarify the kind of conduct that is considered legitimate dissent.

An administrative-student discipline committee should be set up to enforce these guidelines. Violators should be promptly punished by sanctions agreed upon by this committee. If dissent reaches a point which is beyond control of the administrative-student group, then the college should be shut down temporarily and civil authorities relied upon to protect life and property. When it is necessary to resort to outside forces, it is important that they are trained to properly defuse volatile situations. Depending on the length of the shutdown, the administrative-student group should determine how students can make up the time lost and finish their courses.

I believe the alumni also have a role to play in connection with campus dissent. Alumni must realize that college life today is different from the life they knew on the campus. The students themselves are far more concerned about important social and political issues than previous generations of students. And because they feel so deeply about these issues, today's students are impelled to speak out on them. Therefore, the role of the alumni should be to help the colleges maintain a climate for *free* and *responsible* discussion.

Now let's get closer to home, and look at what *businessmen* can do to respond constructively to dissent aimed at the business world.

As many of you may know, some of the chief critics of business are the young people business must have to run the system in the years ahead. One of their principal criticisms is that businesses repress ideas and individual expression, that they make people into robots.

We who have been in business many years know that businesses offer young people great opportunities for creativity, expression, and self-fulfillment. The numerous young executives in our nation's business firms testify to this fact.

However, we must realize that many businesses, like government, have become such bureaucracies that they inhibit the free flow of ideas and information. We businessmen must carefully review our organization's structure and policies. And we must make changes that will allow free flow of ideas and information from the top to the bottom, and from the bottom to the top. This two-way pipeline will not only help the company by tapping the creative ideas and incentives of all its people. It will also help by allowing the expression of legitimate and often valuable dissent within the organization.

The so-called "consumer movement" is another aspect of dissent businessmen must respond to. Many of the young people business must rely upon in the future are sympathetic with this movement. But what is immediately important is that the movement is drawing the support of millions of customers. They are demanding better and safer products, finer service and more reliable warranties.

You and I know that businesses seek to serve the consumer. In the long run, there is no profit in a shoddy product or questionable promotion. The best way for business to respond to dissent coming from the consumer movement is by running hard in the competitive race to meet legitimate consumer demands. If we do not respond in this way, consumers will ask government to intervene even more into the free market. Our customers will be far better served by the constructive results of our own initiative than by the restrictive results of federal regulation.

Still another aspect of dissent which confronts business is reflected in the often heard criticism that business is not really concerned about today's social problems.

This criticism may have been valid 25 years ago but it does not hold water today. I wish I had time to discuss the ways business is applying its strength and resources to help solve the problems troubling our nation. These ways include providing low-cost urban housing, developing complex and often costly methods to curb pollution, improving international relations by trade agreements and by sharing of technology with other nations, and, perhaps most importantly, training and hiring of minority people.

We do not need to justify these actions on the basis of a lofty sense of mission. The reasons behind them are very pragmatic and they are nothing to be ashamed of. A business located in a decaying urban area gets dragged down with the rest of the neighborhood. The industry that pollutes the air despoils the community it helped create. The firm that establishes an overseas operation opens up new markets and develops new customers.

Our training and hiring of minority people is also based on sound business principles. The productive worker is a good customer and a tax payer rather than a tax burden. Let me emphasize that our training and hiring programs are aimed at making people productive workers. Business does not hand out welfare checks—people must earn their pay.

We can best respond to the criticism that business is not concerned with social problems simply by getting the message to the American people that we are sensitive to these problems, but we have sound business reasons to be involved in them, and that we will continue seeking ways to solve them.

I have been encouraged that companies have been publishing articles and booklets and using their advertising space and time to tell the public about their efforts to attack social problems. More of this kind of communication is needed to answer the criticism of the dissenters.

Communication can also be a key aspect of our response to another type of dissent—the dissent between the younger and older generations.

Dissent between the generations of course is not new, nor is it necessarily harmful. It becomes destructive when, instead of being objective and selective, it becomes emotional and all-emcompassing. This is the way dissent between the generations seems to be going today. Too many young people are condemning nearly everything the older generation believes in, and to many of us older people are placing blanket disapproval on nearly all values of the young. The truth is that each of the generations has many values which are worthy guideposts for living.

We in the older generation must realize that many of the new values coming from the young are fine ones which should be nurtured rather than ridiculed. These values may indeed jolt us out of our comfortable assumptions. Perhaps one reason why we have so many social and economic problems today is because we have not questioned the validity of some of our beliefs.

By the same token, many of the established values the older generation believes in are admirable ones, which should be recognized rather than rejected. Young people need these time-proven values to give them stability and a sense of history as they bring change into the world.

What is needed to respond to dissent between the generations, and bring about understanding and acceptance of all worthy values, is an open, continual two-way communication.

On our part, this means viewing young people as allies not as aliens, and establishing contact with them. I suggest we talk with that high school youngster we are training. Talk with the teenager next door. Find a college-age youth—student or not—and spend some time with him. Talk with your own kids. And notice I say "talk with" not "talk to." We need to listen to these young people. This communication can be the first step toward making dissent between the generations a bridge to understanding and constructive change, instead of a chasm of conflict.

Walking the line of dissent without veering off into anarchy or repression is a tough challenge. But it is not an impossible one. And it must be mastered if our nation is to remain free and strong. You are leaders in a great city which knows the power of dissent. You, therefore, have a special responsibility to take actions which will show others the way to walk the line.

WILLIE GEORGE

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 27, 1971

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on New Year's Day, one of Idaho's most colorful and most noted Indian leaders died at a small home on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation. His name was Willie George and his life was a bridge between the closing of the frontier and the space age.

I counted it a privilege that Willie George was a friend. Among many others who did so was Perry Swisher, a talented newsman who now writes a column for the Intermountain Observer in Boise.

In the January 15 edition of the Observer, Mr. Swisher writes that—

Willie George was a romantic figure and if the value of his example is immeasurable it is also unquestionable, to the quite young and the quite old, to the fierce and the gentle, the reawakened and the dreamers for whom he embodied the dignity of a race.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Swisher's column to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WILLIE GEORGE

(By Perry Swisher)

The braids of Willie George were thick as tow ropes. Long, lustrous, tight-plaited muscles of hair. His face was strong-boned like that of a Great Plains calendar warrior though softened by the slightly flared Shoshoni nose.

His chest was deep; Willie's shoulders sat wide and squarebladed across a torso wedged solidly in a frame of six feet plus.

Strikingly pleasant to look at, to watch, he possessed a privacy and, in unity with it, a directness in the motion and expression and composition of eyes and face and body. Gene by gene, this son of a chief of the central Shoshonis and a Crow mother was meant from conception to be handsome.

But it was his demeanor, his way of regarding himself, and it was the quietly expert ease with which he threw and dropped and tightened and snubbed his loop on the object of his attention—it was the style of Willie George you noticed most of all as the years went by.

The years went by. One illness, when he was about 50, grabbed him almost mortally by the liver and held on until that chest flattened and the show of power was gone from his shoulders. He recovered. Willie reached his 70's; the braids became thin, gray, shorter; his head remained erect but he was no longer tall and in the eyes, still direct, there was little combustion and much reflection.

No big talker even when in his prime as a leader, Willie accepted age by narrowing his circle from the tribe to the neighborhood and his interests to those of the traditional Indians and to the few surviving whites who had known him in the promising years when the tribe was united behind one leader and that man was Willie.

The times were no longer his times, but for the traditional Indians Willie continued to do what he had done when he was tribal chairman and an active stockman: Be an example. Bound to share what they had with their extended families, including the most prodigal captives of the car and the bottle and impetuous spending, traditional Indians couldn't contend with the monthly payments that attend lights, telephones and contract purchases. As a youth, a showpiece roper and rider and actor in the 101 Wild West Show, Willie twice toured Europe and knew most of the great cities in America. Till his death, in meeting scholars and travelers, Willie was a sophisticate. But as an Indian and a leader, till his death he lived in a small unpainted house without electricity or phone. The traditional Indian can survive most peacefully this way, he was saying. From the time he returned to the reservation he would not drink. Drink is an unmanageable enemy, he was saying.

One September morning in 1969 Willie lay asleep in his orchard when a low-flying plane, trailing a green cloud, throttled back and banked to turn above his home. The spray, to kill potato vines on the white-leased reservation land, fell thick and Willie was wretchedly ill. His pets and chickens and a horse died; a son-in-law who innocently ate plums from the orchard later in the day became sick. For this and other outrages, the council has banned the sprayers from the reservation skies. But Willie was never well again and on New Year's Day at 77 he died.

It took a backhoe to dig his grave in the frozen Gibson cemetery. In the crowd at his burial in subzero weather, I saw six young Indians pile into the battered cab of an old pickup with a broken aerial. I recognized them. They were students, all freshmen, at the university nearby in Pocatello. I looked at the mourners again. Except for dignitaries most were quite young, or quite old.

An anthropologist who has studied the language and descent of the tribe for 30 years became a good friend, but even as death approached, he did not ask Willie for his genealogy. I was a scant acquaintance, but I do write, yet I never managed to ask Willie to describe his "101" days and nights with Will Rogers and Tom Mix. Whatever it was that instilled such restraint was worth the loss of whatever it was we didn't learn. I suspect my view of being romantic, but Willie George was a romantic figure and if the value of his example is immeasurable it is also unquestionable, to the quite young and the quite old, to the fierce and the gentle, the reawakened and the dreamers for whom he embodied the dignity of a race.

PRAYER FOR GUIDANCE IN OFFICE

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 27, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the board of the Bethany Covenant Church of Lyndhurst, Ohio, has sent me a copy of "Prayer for Guidance in Office" by Herman Garst. As those of us in elected office reflect upon our responsibilities perhaps the prayer may be of guidance. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

A PRAYER FOR GUIDANCE IN OFFICE

(By Herman Garst)

Dear Lord, the people have elected me
To speak for them in things
Of state; to Thee
I come for help
I shall be tempted by

Those men whose goal
Is gain; may I
Be true to country, self, and Thee.

And give me courage to defend
The weak; to work to ban
All things that would destroy
The dignity of man.
Knowing, Lord, that
Thou answeredst prayer when
Humble knee is bent; I ask these things—
But only by Thy will. Amen.

COMMERCE TAPS GRADUATE BUSINESS STUDENTS TO ASSIST NEW EXPORTERS

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 27, 1971

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD an article which appeared in the January 11 issue of Commerce Today, entitled "Commerce Taps Graduate Business Students To Assist New Exporters."

This program appears to be a sensible and inexpensive approach to helping our manufacturers, particularly smaller businesses, market their products abroad. I think Secretary of Commerce Stans is to be commended for giving it his personal support.

Moreover, I am pleased to note the role played by the New England Regional Commission in this undertaking. As I understand it, the commission recognized the value of a project initiated by Dr. Robinson at MIT invested a relatively small amount of seed money, broadened its impact in New England and, in effect, brought it to national attention. It seems to me that this clearly demonstrates a productive function of the New England Regional Commission. Here the commission played a catalytic role in identifying a problem and finding a workable solution which was adopted at the national level. I would consider that innovative efforts of this kind reflect real credit on the commission and its staff.

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

COMMERCE TAPS GRADUATE BUSINESS STUDENTS TO ASSIST NEW EXPORTERS

A new U.S. export program designed to boost foreign sales by small American companies and at the same time give students of business administration practical training in the field of international commerce has been announced by Secretary Stans.

More than 200 graduate students at 21 universities across the United States will research world trade leads for U.S. exporters interested in new foreign markets and for businessmen seeking their first overseas sales.

"This new program has been developed primarily to help small U.S. businesses that feel they lack personnel, know-how or resources to become exporters and, in many cases, are unaware of the profit potential in exporting," the Secretary said.

Referring to a goal set by the Administration to reach an annual U.S. export total of $50 billion by 1973, Secretary Stans said, "This new program is an important part of our national effort to reach that goal. I hope every manufacturer who is not exporting today will join us by taking advantage of this service."

The project will be known as the "MBA Export Expansion Program" because the graduate students involved are working toward masters' degrees in business administration (MBA), specializing in international business. The program will be administered jointly by the universities and Commerce's Bureau of International Commerce.

Universities invited to take part are Boston University, University of California at Berkeley, Columbia, Cornell, George Washington, Georgia State, Harvard, Indiana, Massachusetts, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Michigan, City University of New York, New York University, Northern Illinois, Northwestern, Pennsylvania, San Francisco State College, Southern California, Syracuse, Thunderbird Graduate School of International Management, and Wisconsin.

Commerce and the participating schools will invite U.S. firms to take part and will compile a list of firms that are interested. (Manufacturers also may get in touch directly with nearby Commerce field offices.) The schools will assign graduate students in business administration to work with each company.

In cooperation with company officials, the student will examine the firm's capacity to begin or expand export operations. The student then will research international business data gathered by the Commerce Department indicating foreign sales opportunities for the firm's product, and will prepare a formal report with recommendations for action.

The study will include such information as estimated size of a foreign market, expected gross margin on sales, extent of competition, data on end-users, and best ways to enter the market. Names and addresses of potential foreign customers, agents, distributors and licensees will be included.

Students will have full access to data at Commerce Department field offices near their schools. BIC personnel in Washington will be available for consultations. Each student will receive $50, jointly contributed by the Commerce Department and his assigned firm, for research expenses on his assignment. Students will be under supervision of an international business faculty member and will receive academic credit for the project.

The program was sparked by the success of a project launched in 1966 for the New England States by Dr. Richard D. Robinson of the Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Last year, in cooperation with the International Center of New England and under sponsorship of the New England Regional Commission, the Sloan School program was expanded to include the Harvard Business School, Boston University and the University of Massachusetts.

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE M. LOW, ACTING ADMINISTRATOR OF NASA BEFORE NATIONAL SPACE CLUB

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable George Low, Acting Administrator of NASA addressed the luncheon meeting of the National Space Club on January 26, 1971, on the international aspects of our space program. I trust that it will be read by every Member of this body, as Mr. Low has just returned from meetings around the world dealing with our cooperative efforts in this field.

The address follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF OUR SPACE PROGRAM

(By George M. Low)

I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity today to speak about the international aspects of NASA's space programs. The timing is most appropriate: we are actively engaged with the European nations in defining possible major cooperative efforts for the post-Apollo period; and only last week, we completed discussions with the Soviet Union concerning significant cooperation between the U.S. and the USSR in the exploration of space.

Greater international cooperation in space is one of the six specific objectives of President Nixon's space program, enunciated on March 7 of last year. The President stated: "I believe that both the adventures and the applications of space missions should be shared by all peoples. Our progress will be faster and our accomplishments will be greater if nations will join together in this effort, both in contributing the resources and in enjoying the benefits."

In my discussion today, I will first address cooperation with the Western Nations; then I will discuss our relationship with the Soviet Union.

COOPERATION WITH WESTERN NATIONS

In this area, we have a background of a decade of successful international space projects. These have involved 70 countries, 250 specific agreements, over two dozen joint satellite projects, and a run-out cost in excess of $400 million, with more than a 50 per cent share borne by other nations. The greater part of this work has been with the nations of Europe, although other western and neutral countries are included. This type of rewarding and cost-effective program, worked out in the 1960's, is, of course, continuing.

In the 1970's, however, the opportunities exist for cooperation on a significantly larger scale. In line with the President's emphasis on international cooperation in the exploration of space, we wish to build a foundation for important benefit- and cost-sharing in the major space programs of the future. With this objective in mind, we have invited substantial Western World participation in our post-Apollo projects, the space station.

For over a year, we have made unusual efforts to give the European countries, Canada, Japan, and Australia—the countries having the most obvious potential for post-Apollo work-sharing—every chance to become fully acquainted with our plans and studies. Our purpose has been to provide these countries a proper basis for deciding, at the right time, whether or not they wish to commit their own resources to working with us.

We have been pleased by Europe's initial response in this informational phase. The European Space Conference, in particular, has put several million dollars of its own into studies of post-Apollo program possibilities. Some of its leading member countries have invested still larger amounts in related studies. And British, French, and West German firms, funded in Europe, are working with our prime contractors in the space shuttle design studies.

The problem for the potential participants is a serious one. There is little question that participation in major post-Apollo development tasks would be most rewarding in terms of technology. But Europe considers that it cannot now fund significant participation in the shuttle and fund an independent European booster program at the same time. A choice will most likely be necessary even if

Europe funds only 10 per cent of the shuttle's price tab.

Naturally, if Europe is to give up the development of an independent launch capability to work with us, it wants to know what assurance there is that we will sell launch services for European satellite projects—some of them, perhaps, involving competitive commercial applications. Europe wants to know what the other conditions of its participation might be; for instance, what sort of voice it might have in post-Apollo program management and what access it could expect to program technology. Such questions are entirely understandable.

For us, of course, the detailed answers depend in some degree on the character and extent of European technical participation. This has not yet been defined. Realistic management and political conditions must in the end be fitted to a specific technical program. Nevertheless, when a delegation of the European Space Conference came over here last September, we, with the other agencies concerned, provided the basic answers to the major questions troubling Europe—such as those I mentioned with regard to launch services, technology access and management roles.

We gave positive and generous answers, especially in the absence of even preliminary indications of Europe's potential participation. In summary, we said that we would sell launch services for projects consistent with peaceful purposes and existing international agreements. We said that general technical acecss to the entire program would be available, but that technology at the level of commercial know-how would be transferred in either direction only where one side required it to complete its commitments to the other. We promised broad association in program management, but—since Europe is talking only of a 10 per cent share—we said that we would retain decision-making responsibility except where European costs were directly affected, in which case decisions would be joint.

It seems clear that the next moves are up to our European friends and other interested Western Nations. Our invitation to participate has been clear. Well over a year has been available for information and study. We have provided very broad access in this process, and we have given generous answers to questions regarding the conditions for participation. The urgent needs now are, first, that Europe develop a preliminary expression of its technical interests as quickly as possible. Second, that European personnel sit down with our project personnel to develop this preliminary concept into a joint technical proposition. Third, that we should together apply to this technical package the management and political conditions which are appropriate to it. Finally, the total package would be open for commitment by those nations prepared to go ahead with it.

Whether such a procedure will in fact begin and how far and fast it might then go remain to be seen. These matters must be resolved on the basis of national and international, short-range and long-range interests. If Europe wishes to proceed, we are prepared to do so on any basis consistent with our national program objectives and the requirements of good management. If Europe concludes that its interests lie elsewhere, we will, of course, continue our own programs by ourselves.

We believe that this program, or some other program involving new technology, should become the subject of a Western World joint enterprise: it is important that we in the West learn to work together, soon, on major techincal projects. Our security, in the broad sense, depends on this. Increasingly, the problems of the modern world and its environment require large scale technical solutions along with political solutions. It is important that we learn to cooperate in such matters, so that, in President Nixon's words, we can share both the benefits and the costs of progress.

RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION

In the case of the Soviet Union (so far as space efforts are concerned), it is particularly important that we give clear recognition to *both* elements of the relationship: competition and cooperation.

We are *competing* with the USSR in the exploration of space, because accomplishments in space represent a measure of the state of our technology; and in today's world, the level of our technology is of first importance, strategically, economically, and politically.

We are striving to *cooperate* with the Soviets in the exploration of space, because we both live in a vast universe that must be explored, where important new knowledge is to be gained, for the benefit of all men, everywhere. It is in the United States interest to cooperate with all nations, including the Soviet Union, to share our resources in gaining this knowledge, and to share the results for the betterment of mankind.

And even though the words "competition" and "cooperation," at first glance, appear to be incompatible, the USSR and U.S. space programs are indeed developing along both of these lines: we were competing in technology, when they first put a man in space, or when we first landed a man on the moon. We are cooperating, for the sake of science, when we exchange lunar samples.

Competition in Space Technology: In 1957, and in the years that followed, we were challenged, publicly, dramatically, and most successfully: Sputnik, Gagarin, and Luna demonstrated that the Soviet system could produce technological results that visibly gave the appearance of leadership.

We accepted that challenge—we decided to compete, to build a strong and powerful space capability for the United States. We built Gemini and Mariner and Saturn V and Apollo. By July 1969, we had clearly established and demonstrated our leadership.

But our leadership is under continual challenge by a capable and determined competitor, as evidenced by Luna 16 and 17, by a continuing Soviet manned flight activity, by the reported development of a new giant Soviet booster, by an R&D expenditure rate that exceeds ours, and by an increased Soviet launch rate while ours is decreasing: in 1970 alone, they placed 88 payloads into space to our 34.

Today the demonstrated lead is still ours, but it will not be an enduring lead without major new initiatives on our part—initiatives like the space shuttle and the exploration of the outer planets proposed in the President's space program for the 1970's.

Cooperation in Science and Applications: We now come to my last subject, one that is particularly timely: cooperative efforts with the Soviet Union. On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of last week, we held detailed discussions, covering a broad spectrum of space research, in Moscow. On Thursday, we jointly initialled a document summarizing the results of these discussions—a document that is to be confirmed by both sides within 60 days and then made public.

The Soviet delegation was headed by Academician M. V. Keldysh, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences. His delegation included 15 top Soviet scientists. I headed the United States delegation and was accompanied by Dr. John Naugle and Mr. Arnold Frutkin from NASA, Mr. William Anders of the Space Council, Mr. Arthur Johnson of NOAA, and Mr. Robert Packard from the Department of State.

At the opening session of our talks, I conveyed President Nixon's desire to expand international cooperation in space with the Soviet Union as well as with other nations.

Our discussions were frank, open, and to the point. The document we prepared, jointly, is quite specific. It spells out certain areas of agreement, and it presents a detailed list of proposals for further discussions, including the following:

Joint consideration of the objectives and results of space research;

The improvement of existing weather data exchanges;

Coordinated research with meteorological sounding rockets;

Techniques for studying the natural environment using space and conventional means;

The expanded exchange of data on space biology and medicine; and

The exchange of lunar samples.

In this last area, we specifically agreed, initially, to exchange three grams of sample obtained from Luna 16, for 3 grams each from Apollo 11 and 12. These relatively small amounts are sufficient for detailed scientific examination of a comparative nature.

We did not, during last week's discussions, hold additional meetings on compatible docking arrangements. This item was not on our agenda, because the docking discussions are well underway, and the planned exchange of information is taking place. We, therefore, merely took note of the fact that those talks were proceeding well.

While in Moscow, we were also invited to visit STAR City, the training area of the cosmonauts. We were welcomed by Cosmonauts Beregovoy, Nikolayev, Leonov, Shatalov, and Valentina Tereshkova. We were shown the Soyuz mission trainer, and were invited to attempt to dock two Soyuz spacecraft in their docking trainer. While there, I also presented a plaque in memory of Yuri Gagarin from the U.S. astronauts. The visit was warm and friendly.

In my remarks in Moscow, after we finished our discussions, I noted that I was pleased with the results. But I also noted that this is only a beginning; that we have now set the framework for cooperative efforts, but that much remains to be done.

Nevertheless, the results of the discussions so far met my hopes and exceeded my expectations. With the framework that has been established, and particularly with the attitudes exhibited and desires expressed by both sides, we have set the stage for substantial cooperation in space research with the Soviet Union, for the benefit of all.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

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 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?