United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, May 6, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Abraham B. Shoulson, Franklin Square Jewish Center, Franklin Square, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Ovinu Shebashamin, Heavenly Father, we are grateful for the opportunity to gather here in this hallowed sanctuary of Thy law. We lift up our hearts in prayer unto Thee, guardian of our destinies, to thank Thee for the manifold blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us.

We ask Thy blessings upon our country, on the Government of this Republic, the President of these United States, and all who exercise just and rightful authority so that they may administer all the affairs of state in justice and equity, that peace and security, happiness and prosperity, right and freedom may forever abide among us. Endow our legislators with a right understanding and a pure purpose; enable them to rise above all self-seeking and party zeal into the larger desire for public good and human brotherhood.

Unite all the inhabitants of our country, whatever their origin and creed, into a bond of true brotherhood to banish hatred and bigotry and to safeguard the ideals and free institutions which are our country's glory. Thus shall we summon the power to overcome adversity, to survive hardship, and to share in the joy of the triumph of righteousness, justice, and the enthronement of universal freedom and peace for us and for all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1204. An act to amend section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, to allow certain service to be credited for purposes of civil service retirement.

EMANUEL CELLER: OUR DEAN AND DEAR FRIEND

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of our distinguished colleague and dean of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER). He is one of the few men in this body about whom one can say in truth that he is universally loved and respected. His record of achievement as chairman of the Judiciary Committee is monumental. Under his leadership the House has passed the following major pieces of legislation of great importance to the country:

The Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950;

The Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1968;

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Amendments of 1970;

Three constitutional amendments;

A fourth constitutional amendment giving 18-year-olds the right to vote which is now before the States for ratification;

The Immigration Act of 1965; and

Court reforms.

That Chairman CELLER involves himself in the most controversial legislation and yet retains the affection of his adversaries is due to his keen wit, great sense of humor and his unfailing fairness. In the 3 years that I have known him and worked with him, I must confess to having fallen under his spell as has every Member of the House. "MANNIE" CELLER is more than the dean of this House, more than a great chairman, he is a dear friend. Today "MANNIE" CELLER is 83 years young.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in extending birthday greetings to our colleague from New York (Mr. CELLER). As a members of the House Judiciary Committee, I am aware of the great talents of the fine gentleman—who is dean of the House of Representatives. To those who would suggest a mandatory age for retirement, I would cite our colleague from New York as an example of both useful and desirable service to the Nation which he performs regularly as Representative of the 10th District of New York, as well as in his capacity as the distinguished chairman of the prestigious House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to count the gentleman from New York as a friend and colleague. Both my wife, Doris—who is a New Yorker—and I join in wishing him a happy birthday.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD at that point in the RECORD where reference is made to the birthday of the dean of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CRITICISM OF SUPPORT OF CAPITOL DEMONSTRATION

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I learned at my mother's knee long before I came to the Halls of this body to respect the opinion of others and to give them credit for being sincere whenever they voice a point of view different from my own. This, I too, in a sense of fairness must be. I must at all times be sincere.

I, therefore, assume that when Members of this body—or anyone else—express a point of view which differs from mine they follow the dictates of their conscience.

What I am going to say now is a matter of conscience with me. I could not go again to my apartment and go to sleep tonight, I could not look my fellow Americans in the eye, if I did not say as a matter of conscience that those Members of this body who participated yesterday in the demonstration which was held here on Capitol Hill, in my opinion, whoever they were—and I only know that the news media have reported that some participated, because I saw no part of it—performed a disservice to this body and a disservice to this country, and I am critical of it. They have broken their oath of office. Members of Congress stood alongside demonstrators yesterday, who completely disrobed to advocate vulgarity, they gave their support to those in the

crowd who carried Vietcong flags and to those who boasted they would bring this Government down. Call it what it is my friends. It is anarchy, pure and simple. It is anarchy on the part of such demonstrators and it is anarchy on the part of Members of the House who joined them and supported them. I commend the police for their arrests and handling of the matter. I believe, however, the participating Members of Congress should have been arrested, too. They asked for it.

PRAISE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

(Mr. DANIEL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my voice to those who have been praiseworthy of the law enforcement agencies of this area over the past few days. Their performance reflects credit not only upon themselves but also upon the institutions of government.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, order is the first responsibility of government, and without it none of our other goals are attainable. No man is an island of virtue and no man must be permitted to obey only those laws with which he agrees. This can only lead to anarchy.

There is room for dissent in our country. Dissent is neither good nor bad of itself. Its value depends upon the offering of desirable alternatives; its propriety on the form of its expression.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no room in our society for the lawless, for the seditious and for the obscene.

DEMONSTRATIONS AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am one Member of the Congress who has opposed this tragic war since its escalation started in 1965. There has been a suggestion that the mothers of the world will rise up to smite the male warlocks. My conscience will not permit this obvious attempt to generate a male hawk-female dove syndrome. I am myself a mother of two sons; it would require a tremendous amount of arrogance to suggest their father has ever been less concerned about their physical safety, their well-being than have I. And I can say without fear of contradiction, as a mother, that men and women, young and old, black and white—have consistently and doggedly opposed this war for much the same reasons. There simply is no sexology at the foundation of opposition to this tragic entanglement. In fact, of the seven of us who voted against that supplemental appropriation clearly marked for Vietnam in May of 1965, the other six were men.

Moreover, I am one woman Member of the Congress who will not go on record in support of so many of the busy crazies racing about the Federal city this week. I do applaud the moratorium of April 24. It was a wholly peaceful, almost majestic display of the sacred right in this Nation to assemble for a nonviolent demonstration of dissent.

However, the right to attempt to persuade is one thing; the right to coerce is another. Or, as one of our colleagues observed:

> Your right to demonstrate ends at the tip of my nose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not have the authority.

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the minority leader very, very much. Of this week's group, let me say that I deplore their tactics and their avowed aim. They are as different from the previous marchers as Cain is different from Abel. They were a mob, bent upon exercising a wholly unacceptable method of civil disobedience and violence—to express an oversimplified, nihilistic hate for some imagined "establishment."

In fact, I am one mother, I am one woman Member of the Congress, who wishes to go on record with congratulations for the police throughout this chaotic period. They demonstrated as well: they demonstrated remarkable restraint, patience, and respect for the delicate balance of rights and the law.

We were really asking our individual policeman this week to be wiser than a Confucian, more restrained than a Victorian, more aware of the limits of the law than a Roman, and more protective of the physical safety of society than all of them. We owe them a greater debt of gratitude than we may now fully realize: we demand that each of them be a Renaissance man, and they have been.

In fact, I want to go on record firmly convinced that the police, the District of Columbia National Guard, and the FBI stand between us and anarchy in this Nation.

STEEL PRICE INCREASES

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, while national attention was focused on the antiwar protestors in Washington and their supposed threat to internal security the leadership of United States Steel Corp. delivered a far more dangerous action against the people of this country. Their third such action—with price increases of 30 percent—in less than 3 years.

In a decision which makes a mockery of any attempt to reverse inflation and remove this threat to domestic well-being, this corporation proclaimed a 6¼-percent increase on prices accounting for one-third of its steel sales.

As the largest steel producer and a proven leader in price hikes, United States Steel has in 1 day done more damage than the hundreds of thousands who have marched to this Capital in the past 3 years asking for an end to the war.

Can there be any doubt that this increase will reverbrate throughout the economy, contributing to the general malaise if not, in fact, aggravating the mounting sense of rage over the deterioration of the economy?

Even worse, the Washington Post reports this morning that yesterday's increase confirms the pattern of earlier steel hikes and lends credence to the suspicion that the industry will now seek a 6- to 7-percent increase across virtually its whole product line. Astoundingly, these projections persist despite the announcement on Tuesday that steel imports so far this year have set a first-quarter record and are running 62 percent ahead of 1970. If United States Steel has no regard for the national interest, has it not some semblance of concern for its own future?

If the Members of this House want to stop this attack on the American dollar from within, we should reestablish a joint committee of Congress to end the concentration of economic power, now so arrogantly wielded by those who take too fat a profit at such a dangerous time.

BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE EMANUEL CELLER

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would join in the tribute paid to the distinguished dean of the House MANNY CELLER in recognition of the great contribution he has made to this body over the years.

As I listened to the interesting 1-minute speeches, I thought of an expression of Mr. CELLER's that might apply to all in this body, except him:

> When the Lord makes a fool, he first makes him unaware of it.

HANDLING OF DEMONSTRATORS HERE IN WASHINGTON IN THE LAST SEVERAL DAYS

(Mr. BURLESON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Congresswoman from Oregon has expressed my sentiment ably and eloquently. I wish to associate myself with her statement.

Mr. Speaker, amidst critical voices heard here in Congress, in some of the courts and in the press, of the handling

of the demonstrators here in Washington for the last several days, I commend the way the entire thing has been handled.

I compliment those who planned the tactics in meeting the threat to our Capital City. I think those who planned from the Justice Department, the local police and the military, did so with care and foresight. The conduct of Chief of Police Jerry Wilson and the Metropolitan Police Department, in my judgment, has been exemplary under the most provocative circumstances. Likewise, Chief James Powell and the Capitol Police have done an excellent job.

While those who complain of civil liberties being violated, I wonder if they forget that the civil liberties of all Americans would have been grossly violated if the rabble had been permitted to disrupt any more seriously and to injure property which belongs to all Americans.

Again, I express my admiration and deep appreciation for what those responsible have done in these circumstances.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Bow reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CAPITOL POLICE SHOULD RECEIVE OVERTIME PAY

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, from the March 1 Capitol bombing through yesterday's May Day tribe misconduct on the House steps we have endured a train of anti-Government demonstrations.

Throughout this 66-day period the men of the Capitol Police force have demonstrated pro-Government loyalty and dedication, at personal inconvenience and risk.

As April ended, an average officer had accrued about 110 hours of overtime with no provision for payment for that overtime. As the May Day period began, all personnel were ordered to a 12-hour minimum day. And they performed magnificently.

I am, therefore, introducing a House resolution expressing appreciation to the U.S. Capitol Police force and providing payment for overtime services by House policemen during this 66-day period.

I would hope and trust that the Senate will do likewise for policemen paid by that body.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for prompt consideration of this resolution.

COMMENDATION FOR HANDLING OF DEMONSTRATORS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Federation of Women's Clubs, in convention in Seattle, Wash., May 5, 1971, commended our Government for the action that was taken to stop the demonstrators in their expressed desire to shut down Congress.

In a telegram to me today, the clubs' commendation stated that action was taken "to stop the revolution in our Nation's Capital by organized dissidents in their attempt to halt the Government of our United States of America."

Mr. Speaker, it has been an incomprehensible week of confrontation during which the goals of these dissidents were never reached. And the commendation truly goes to our police for the magnificent way in which they handled an explosively dangerous situation.

I join the commendation of the Washington State Federation of Women's Clubs.

SECURITY OF THE CONGRESS MUST BE PRESERVED

(Mr. KUYKENDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by many visitors why it is that any time security measures are in force at the Capitol, Members of Congress are waved through the lines with no checks of any kind.

It has been historically true that regardless of deep differences of opinion among Members on most matters, there has never been any question about the loyalty of all Members of this body to Congress and to the Capitol and the sacred principles they symbolize.

As of yesterday, it appears to me the time may be approaching when Congress may have to impose upon its own Members the tight restrictions which apply to all other citizens in time of emergency. At least two Members yesterday took it upon themselves to invite people onto the Capitol Grounds with utter disregard for the security rules imposed by the House and the Capitol Police, whose sworn duty is to protect the Congress of the United States and its employees.

In the past, congressional immunity has not been based on any idea that we are above the law, but solely on the assumption that all of us are dedicated to upholding the democratic procedures of this House, including our right to deliberate without coercion by mobs outside our doors.

I regret to say that the overt action of several Members yesterday, creating physical danger for all of us, may force us to place restraints upon the Members and our conduct in the best interest of maintaining the safety of this body.

DANGEROUS PROPOSAL TO INCREASE SIZE OF TRUCKS

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am very disturbed to have to report to you that the House Committee on Public Works this morning voted to report out the bill H.R. 4354. This bill calls for an increase in the permissible width of vehicles on interstate highways from 96 inches to 102 inches. It is identical to H.R. 11619, which was introduced in the 91st Congress.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, was opposed by the Department of Transportation, and the National Transportation Safety Board. Faced with the opposition of these two prestigious safety agencies it is simply inconceivable that the committee would take favorable action on the bill.

The arguments against its enactment are overwhelming, and especially when coupled with the opposition of the Department of Transportation and the National Transportation Safety Board.

This subject is so important, and so controversial, Mr. Speaker, that every Member should be fully advised of the issues involved in the event the legislation does reach the floor for action. To this end I am today inserting in the Extensions of Remarks a rather comprehensive discussion and history of the size and weight range of vehicles, and of decisions of the National Transportation Safety Board.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not in the public interest and I shall fight it with every bit of the capacity at my command.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I pay tribute today to the thousands of congressional employees who performed their jobs in a usual manner this week.

These men and women were often subject to duress and great provocation with vulgar, dirty, filthy obstructors, giving aid and comfort to the enemy of everything we hold dear. The Capitol Hill office employees were subjected to even greater threats as they drove to work each morning.

There were many tense moments for these people, but I think they were determined that they would not be denied the right to perform the jobs for which they had been hired. I heard some comments that went along this line. "These protestors are not just denying me access to

my job nor the Congressman access to his office, but they are denying the taxpayers of our State the right to representation. After all, the taxpayers are the voters who sent the Congressmen to Washington and who foot the bill for the operation of this Government. Stopping the Government is an attack on all citizens, not just those who earn a living by holding Government jobs."

Throughout the days of the demonstrations the office personnel remained calm, objective and carried out their jobs efficiently despite great distraction and disruption. This is professionalism at its height, and I think each of us in the Congress owe our staffs a thank you for a good performance.

DEMONSTRATION ON CAPITOL STEPS

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to devise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks made earlier by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) and to express in my own behalf the utter humiliation and the disgrace that befell this House of Representatives on yesterday when a mob gathered on the steps of the Capitol.

It seems to me in the application of our rules of conduct in this House, and in observing the traditions of decorum in this Chamber, there are definite limitations which we place on public attendance here, and with regard to assembling on the House steps. It has always been recognized that these should be observed in a manner which bring honor and respect to this body and to this symbol of our democratic system—and not disgrace upon our country. The mob violated these rules and traditions, and abused the constitutional privilege under which their offensive conduct has been explained by one Member of the House.

Many of us saw the Vietcong flag being waved from the House steps and we have heard about a person standing in the nude in front of the entrance to the House.

Those Members of this House who supported this mob that came and disgraced our Capitol themselves should answer for bringing this disgrace and humiliation upon this body.

LEGISLATION PROHIBITING DISPLAY OF VIETCONG FLAG

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to prohibit the public display of the flag of the Vietcong or the flag of the Government of North Vietnam, so long as hostilities continue in Southeast Asia and so long as either the Vietcong or North Vietnam hold any American prisoners.

The bill would make public display of these flags a Federal offense, with penalties of a fine of not more than $1,000 and a prison sentence of not more than 1 year, or both.

These are the same penalties provided in the United States Code for defiling the flag of the United States.

In my opinion, it is an act of treason to display these flags at a time when the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese are fighting, wounding and killing young Americans.

To see these flags on the grounds of the Capitol of the United States yesterday, with one of them flying above the Peace Monument, must infuriate any loyal American. I can understand the motives of those who are sincerely striving for peace. I can understand those who feel emotionally and spiritually drained by this long conflict. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand any citizen of this country who wishes to see the armies of the United States defeated and the United States humiliated in Southeast Asia, and I cannot understand any citizen who would humiliate his own Government by the display of enemy flags.

I hope that my bill will be given prompt consideration.

PROTEST ACTIVITIES IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have all had first hand opportunity to view the protest activities in our Nation's Capital during the last weeks.

We all know that the true facts and circumstances have not been fairly reported to the American people.

We have some responsibility to speak and comment.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we report for consideration and vote a "sense of the Congress" resolution to the affect that the officials responsible for maintaining the security and safety of our Capital and the persons who live, work, and visit have performed superbly under circumstances of extreme provocations.

The executive branch, the President, the Justice Department, the Attorney General, the Police Department, Chief Wilson, Commissioner Washington, the policemen, the National Guard, the U.S. Army, the Capitol Police, the federal employees, all performed in an extraordinary commendable fashion.

They are, individually and collectively, entitled to our gratitude and to great personal and professional credit.

The "protestors", although predominately students of one sort or another, were mostly scurvy, dirty, unkempt, vulgar, obscene, sick, inferior, revolutionaries.

They were selfish, exhibitionists, bent on destroying our system, bringing down our institutions, encouraging victory by the North Vietnamese—with no alternative other than communism or "democratic socialism."

I believe Members of the Congress who exhort and excite the violation of law, the victory of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, or the promotion of anarchy or revolution should be censored by the Congress and by the citizens of this great Nation.

HAS OATH OF OFFICE BEEN VIOLATED?

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues who have expressed disgust with the spectacle presented to the American public and the world press yesterday on the steps of the U.S. Capitol.

What I find particularly appalling is the fact that Members of this body, who have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution of these United States, would participate in a mob action which had as its avowed purpose the "closing down of government."

An effort to disrupt government is nothing less than an attempt to create anarchy.

One cannot equate peaceful assembly and petition with mob action having anarchy as its purpose. The two concepts are antithetical to each other.

The question exists in my mind as to whether or not the Members of this House who participated with the mob are not in flagrant violation of the oath which each of us was required to take on admission to the Congress. If such a violation of oath is found to have occurred, then the further question is raised as to whether or not those Members have forfeited the privilege of sitting in this body. At the least, they are inviting censure.

Aside from the questionable activities of some of the Members of this body, the actions of the mob itself were reprehensible. To convert the steps of the U.S. Capitol, which has served as a symbol of free men and free government in the finest traditions of democracy, into a platform for the display of a flag which itself is a symbol of brutality, ruthless repression, and iron totalitarianism is the most nauseating mockery of all.

Let those who organized and participated in yesterday's outrageous scandal be aware that their activities are being observed in Hanoi. They are giving comfort and encouragement to Hanoi to continue the war where meaningful negotiations might be possible. The leaders in Hanoi, when observing the actions of yesterday, know that if such demonstrations were occuring in Hanoi, the Government there would soon topple and further military activity terminate. By reason of the demonstrations yesterday, the leaders in Hanoi will be misled into drawing the same unfounded conclusion relative to this Government.

Let me take this occasion to state to the Government in Hanoi and the people they rule that the great bulk of the American people stand stronger today behind their Government—partially as a result of yesterday's activities—than at any time in many years. The sensible,

law-abiding and loyal citizens of this country recognize that their Government is following the only honorable and realistic course now available in Vietnam.

Let my views be heard in Hanoi that the interest of the people of North Vietnam would be best served if the troops of North Vietnam, now outside the borders of North Vietnam, were being withdrawn into the borders of that country at the same rate that American troops are being withdrawn into the borders of this country. Such a display of sincerity on their part, combined with an exchange of prisoners, would quickly terminate the terrible toll in lives and limbs now being exacted in Vietnam. It would allow all of our people to return to the more satisfying aspects of building a sound economy and a happy life free from war.

Once again, I say to the leaders in Hanoi, Do not be misled by the abuses of the freedoms cherished in this country by a handful of sick and badly misled individuals.

DEMONSTRATION ON CAPITOL STEPS

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of this Nation both by being present and viewing it on television witnessed the most despicable conduct that has ever been publicly displayed not only in this Nation but anywhere in the world.

All you have to do is to look at the front steps of the Capitol to find the obscene writings put there with spray paint. If you had been present, you would have seen the defecations that were taking place in public, heard the obscenities being mouthed in chorus, and seen a nude male standing on the pedestal in front of the House of Representatives. Then you would have seen and heard the rabble applaud and sanction this despicable person.

The thing that disturbs me more than anything else was to find—and I heard some of the comments with my own ears as I stood at the curb—to find Members of this House of Representatives openly advocating what was being done yesterday and supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I took an oath in this House to uphold the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. So did you. This is one thing that we cannot deny. It is about time this House took some action in that respect.

TRIBUTE TO THE LEADERSHIP OF THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE

(Mr. McKAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my commendation to the leadership of the House and the Senate in light of what happened yesterday. Although we dislike some of the things that took place because they were not within our concept of social propriety, this is the only nation on earth where a situation as volatile as that could be handled on the scale it was without bloodshed. We have not always been so fortunate.

I would like at this time to offer my thanks and my appreciation, and I would hope the rest of the House would extend their appreciation for the coolheadedness of the leadership of both the House and the Senate, particularly the Speaker of this House.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 412 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 412

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 213 of the Ninety-second Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries within its jurisdiction regarding:

(1) the circumstances surrounding the production in foreign nations of goods which are subsequently sold in the United States in competition with domestically produced goods, welfare and pension plan programs in such countries, and the operation by the Federal Government of elementary and secondary schools, both at home and abroad, with a view to determining means of assuring that the children of officers and employees, and members of the Armed Forces, of the United States will receive high quality elementary and secondary education, in the following countries: Italy, Germany, Austria, Yugoslavia, Greece, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Kenya, and Ethiopia;

(2) postsecondary education, including vocational and technical education, in the following countries: Austria, Germany, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Israel;

(3) laws and practices relating to labor-management relations in the following countries: United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Germany;

(4) educational research, development and innovation and early childhood development and education in the following countries: Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

For the purposes of carrying out each of the investigations, studies and inquiries enumerated above, the Committee is authorized to send not more than fifteen Members (nine majority and six minority) and five staff assistants (three majority and two minority) to those countries within which such investigation, study, or inquiry is authorized to be conducted.

The Committee on Education and Labor is further authorized to send not more than ten members of the committee (five majority and five minority) to the International Labor Organization Conference to be conducted in Geneva, Switzerland, between June 2, 1971, and June 25, 1971.

Notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 213 of the Ninety-second Congress, first session, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties for the purpose of carrying out the authority, as set forth in this resolution, to travel outside the United States. In addition to any other condition that may be applicable with respect to the use of local currencies owned by the United States by members and employees of the committee, the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(1) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

(2) No member or employee of such committee shall receive or expend an amount of local currencies for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs.

(3) No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of such committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(4) Each member or employee of such committee shall make to the chairman of such committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Admin- period of time in any other country, irrespection.

(5) Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, strike out lines 20, 21, and 22 and insert in lieu thereof: "authorized to send not more than eleven Members (seven majority and four minority) and three staff assistants (two majority and one minority) to those countries within which".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Alexander	Brasco	Cleveland
Anderson, Ill.	Brinkley	Cotter
Anderson, Tenn.	Brooks	Davis, Ga.
	Broyhill, Va.	Davis, S.C.
Annunzio	Burton	Delaney
Ashley	Celler	Dellums
Badillo	Clancy	Dent
Baring	Clark	Diggs
Barrett	Clausen, Don H.	Donohue
Biaggi		Dorn
Blanton	Clay	Dow

Dowdy	Kee	Pirnie
Drinan	Kemp	Quillen
du Pont	Kuykendall	Rangel
Edwards, Calif.	Landgrebe	Roe
Edwards, La.	Lennon	Rostenkowski
Eilberg	Link	Roybal
Erlenborn	Long, La.	Runnels
Flynt	Lujan	Ruth
Foley	McCloskey	Saylor
Fraser	McCulloch	Sisk
Fulton, Tenn.	McDonald, Mich.	Smith, N.Y.
Gallagher	McEwen	Snyder
Gaydos	McKevitt	Staggers
Grasso	McKinney	Stanton, James V.
Green, Pa.	McMillan	Stephens
Grover	Madden	Teague, Calif.
Gubser	Mailliard	Teague, Tex.
Hanna	Mann	Ullman
Hansen, Idaho	Metcalfe	Ware
Hansen, Wash.	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Harrington	Mink	Wilson, Charles H.
Hathaway	Moorhead	Wright
Hawkins	Morgan	Wyatt
Hays	Murphy, Ill.	Yatron
Hébert	Nix	Young, Fla.
Henderson	Pelly	Zion
Hillis	Pepper	
Howard	Pickle	
Jacobs		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is enough controversy on this matter so that I believe Members would like to be informed about the details of the resolution.

This is a supplementary, a second, travel resolution for the Committee on Education and Labor. The Committee on Rules, a long time ago, at the request of the then leadership of both parties, began to insist that all committees of the House of Representatives except a very few which clearly had foreign jurisdiction, such as the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Committee on Government Operations—which has very wide and broad jurisdiction and a committee that has never been in the category of other committees—and the Committee on Appropriations, which funds its own travel from within, as best I know, and never requires a travel resolution—that all committees except those I have mentioned and a few others specify the purposes for which they sought travel. Over time we have gradually adopted the practice of requiring specific limitations. This came about because up until the time a number of years ago when we were requested by the leadership to tighten up on the resolutions we reported, they had been strictly pro forma. Every committee that came and requested it got a general resolution which allowed them to travel as they pleased. And there were few abuses of that opportunity. Since that time the Committee on Rules has tried to see to it really that the House had an opportunity to know in some detail what the committees proposed to do. In other words, this resolution is a great deal more specific than the resolutions used to be, and I propose to list what is involved in the resolution now before the House as amended by the committee amendment which has already been adopted.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution involves four subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor. The subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), is the one covered under the subparagraph 1 of the resolution. Mr. DENT is the chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor, and the jurisdiction that his investigations will pursue is outlined in that subparagraph.

Subparagraph 2 deals with the Special Subcommittee on Education chaired by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN). What it proposes to examine is listed therein.

The third subparagraph is the one dealing with the subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON), the Special Subcommittee on Labor, and the same applies there.

The fourth is the Select Subcommittee on Education chaired by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Now, the Rules Committee and the House has adopted an amendment which reduces the number of members which may go on each of these trips from 15—nine and six; nine majority and six minority—and five staff assistants, three majority and two minority, to 11—seven majority and four minority—three staff assistants, two majority and one minority.

Furthermore, there is the provision that the Committee on Education and Labor may send 10 members of the committee, which is a larger number than heretofore authorized, to the International Labor Organization conference. In the past I understand a smaller number has always gone on that trip, but I understand also that there are people on the Committee on Education and Labor who feel strongly that this is the right number and there are others who feel strongly that it should be a lesser number.

This resolution in my judgment is fair. It was supported by an overwhelming majority of the Committee on Rules, after it was amended.

It is fair I believe in terms of the mission of the Committee on Education and Labor. It has, I understand, the bipartisan support of the members of the committee. It is fair to the House. It makes it explicit as to what the committee is being authorized to do. It is fair to the people of this country whom we all represent because it provides for investigations and studies which are of importance to the legislative function of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; if the gentleman volunteers to yield.

Mr. BOLLING. I always volunteer to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I just wonder whether the gentleman has had any experience with the climate in Geneva in June—from June 2 to June 25? Is the climate pretty good over there at that time?

Mr. BOLLING. I have not been in Geneva at that particular time. I, like the gentleman from Iowa, travel very little. I do not like it. I find it very strenuous and tiring. But I do not know what the gentleman means. If this is a vacation trip I am not so informed. I understand that the Department of State and the executive branch of Government want the Congress represented at this International Labor Organization meeting. I understand that it is so that our Members may be treated in the same way that other Members are treated that we have this provision.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say in answer to the question posed by the gentleman from Iowa, my good friend, that probably being over there is not as nice as being in Ohio, but it is much better than being in Washington.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not know what to make of that, but it still leaves something to be desired one way or the other. Apparently it is a pretty good place to be in June.

The State Department has sent other Members of Congress to other meetings, but they severely limited the number. I doubt that more than two would go, if the State Department sent them to Geneva.

Mr. BOLLING. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that I tried to make clear one of the reasons that this provision is contained in this resolution. We felt that the Members of Congress attending this particular function should receive the same treatment as other Members of Congress from any committee traveling on official business of the Congress.

They will be treated more generously under this provision than they would be under the State Department, and there is no attempt to conceal this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was only alluding to the statement that the gentleman made that it is his understanding that the State Department wants them over there.

Mr. BOLLING. I do not wish to get into an argument with my friend, the gentleman from Iowa. This is simply a semantics discussion at this point. What I was trying to say is that if they went I thought they should be treated, and the Committee on Rules thought that they should be treated as we treat other Members when they travel.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would merely say to the gentleman that in my experience it is not so much what the State Department wants as what is good for our Government; what is good for our policy. We have representatives from the Department of Commerce, we have representatives from the Wage and Hour Division, we have representatives from the Department of Agriculture, all vitally interested in matters that relate to labor. The American delegation is composed of many different aspects of our

Government, not just the State Department. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that I would probably agree with the gentleman if it was just the State Department that was involved, but there are many other branches of our Government who are represented, and I think properly represented.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me. I know that the gentleman knows that I do not often engage in semantics. I thought the salient point in the colloquy between the two gentlemen had to do with sending as many as 10 members to the ILO conference rather than four, as heretofore, and previous to that two. Why 10? That is what I do not understand. The House ends up paying the costs for these 10. When they sent two to Geneva the tab was picked up by the State Department, as I recall.

Mr. BOLLING. The situation, I will say to the gentleman from New York, has been described accurately by the gentleman, and I said the same thing when I was discussing the resolution, that this is a larger number. There are members on the Committee on Education and Labor who feel strongly that it should be 10 members, and that it is justified. I am not one who can be a judge of that.

The point I was making with regard to the House sending them is that, as I understand, if they are sent by the State Department and paid for by the State Department they will receive a lesser amount than if they are sent under a resolution such as this by the House.

I would hope, in either case, that the money that is expended would be from counterpart funds. We have tried very hard to make it very explicit in this resolution, as many of the Members know, that we believe that congressional expenditures should be made in counterpart funds wherever possible. I frankly do not know whether or not the State Department does that, or not, but I do know that we have tried to arrange it in that fashion.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is exactly correct in that this resolution certainly increases the number, and I stated that in the beginning of the discussion.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield for a further statement?

Mr. BOLLING. I will be delighted to yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr Speaker, I have never understood that Swiss francs would be considered counterpart funds. I have always thought the Swiss franc was one of the best currencies in the world.

Mr. BOLLING. That is absolutely correct. But as I understand it, and I cannot say that I am an expert on the matter, that it is possible to do some trading in various money markets where you have substantial sums. I know that when I have traveled I traveled on counterpart funds, and I was told that some of the currencies that were being used had to be shifted through the use of other counterpart funds. As I say, I am not an expert, as the gentleman from New York is, on any of this.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. BOLLING. Certainly I will yield.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is it not the fact that these 10 members would have no status there in Geneva at the ILO conference other than that they would be spectators, or observers?

Mr. BOLLING. I am not clear on that. I do not know what arrangements would be made with the State Department. I am sure that they could be designated by the Executive as observers, or they could be designated, some of them, at least, as delegates, but I suspect that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK), who I think, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, has more experience with this than I, and could answer it better than I can.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there were two points raised. First of all, that the delegation would be composed of 10 members, and I would say, speaking for the minority side, that we would prefer having two members. It was our intention to support the resolution for two members on each side.

I will say to the gentleman from New York that the Committee on Education and Labor on the majority side looking at their situation preferred to have five members go. If the House wants to tell them to have less than five that, of course, would be within the prerogative of the House.

The minority still intends to send two. We do not think it was either our prerogative and in the second place we did not have the evidence to tell them that the United States should have only two. If in the wisdom of the House, we want to tell the majority side to have two or three or four—that is perfectly their prerogative. We would agree to go along with that decision.

We do not intend to send five. We are going to have two delegates as we have had in the past.

But, we have no objections to the chairman of the committee and the Democratic members looking at their situation and saying that they think it would be in their best interest to have two or three or more. That, of course, would be a reply to that point.

As to what purpose we have there—it has been my experience, although we have been categorized as observers, that there are certain deferences given to the Members of Congress. We have been a part of the policymaking decisions. It has been my experience that every morning at the Ambassador's residence there have been staff meetings and we have been brought in as a matter of policy. We help them on some of the policy decisions there. I think not only has the experience that has been gained been of some benefit to the House, but as a practical observation, I think that to the extent that policy matters come up, the Members of Congress although they are not in an official delegate capacity have in many ways helped to influence some policy decisions.

I can think of some specific examples if the gentleman is interested. But they have brought us into the policymaking matter which I think is of help in these situations, and I would hate to see this good relationship terminated.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield so that I might answer the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. BOLLING. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Is not this the organization or conference that George Meany told a House subcommittee on appropriations was nothing more nor less than an anti-American sounding board and a propaganda stage for Soviet communism? Has the distinguished gentleman ever read the hearings?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I read the hearings—yes; I will say to the gentleman—I have read the hearings.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. What have our observers been doing over all the years at these meetings, when they permit this to happen in this international organization?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say to the gentleman that the observation of Mr. Meany is valid as to some points. I, myself, take a different view.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, we not only had the testimony of Mr. Meany, but of Mr. Ed Neilan, former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and we had Under Secretary of Labor Hillenbrand, and it is admitted by the State Department.

This had never been brought to the attention of the committee before and that is the reason we have shut off their water.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that, first of all, the ILO does not set out to be a sounding board for the Communists. It is 53 years old and it was not set up for the purpose of providing a place for Congressmen to go in June. It was set up and it has been there a long time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. So far as the weather conditions are concerned, I am acquainted with the weather in Geneva in June and do not have to inquire about it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would have to say first to the gentleman that the only basic complaints levied about Members of Congress that joined the delegation in the past has been the tendency of the United States to sit on the sidelines and to let it be used as a forum, as he pointed out, and not respond, as it has been obvious to us. If anything, we have encouraged our delegation to become more involved.

I think the difference between Mr. Meany and myself, and I think the answer lies in becoming more involved, rather than from withdrawing, concerning the situation as you have pointed out—if he wants to withdraw.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim the floor, I will be delighted to yield to either gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

You know, it occurs to me that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is in a very peculiar position. I am amazed in view of his background and what he is reputed to stand for that he should be taking the side of the U.S.S.R. delegates who have been permitted to attack us continually in the ILO.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman. I am sure the gentleman did not understand it correctly. Perhaps I did not bring forth my response clearly. My idea, I said, is different from that of Mr. Meaney, who says, "Confronted with this situation, withdraw, and let them have the whole forum." My answer as a longtime critic of communism is that, confronted with this situation, do not withdraw, as has been suggested, but, rather, dig in deeper and take every effective way of answering their untimely attacks on us. Quite frankly, my answer is not to withdraw. That is the easy way out. But, rather, to become more involved. As I pointed out, in the past, congressional observers have urged our obligation to be more timely in our response to Soviet attacks. The ILO, I am sure, is used as every international organization is used by the Communist countries. But confronted with that, I do not think we should withdraw. I think we should get in deeper rather than withdraw. I think, to that extent, no, I am not inconsistent.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has explained the resolution in detail, and I shall not repeat, I hope, anything he has said. I believe the colloquy that has gone on on the floor has pretty well explained what the resolution is. May I simply add a couple of comments; in addition to the committees that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri mentioned, I believe the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Science and Astronautics also have general authority to travel all over.

Prior to the Easter recess, we had an overall resolution brought to us by the Committee on Education and Labor requesting these trips and a number of others. It was quite extensive. At that session I suggested the Easter trip was of importance, and that we should take that out of the resolution, approve it, pass it, and then consider future trips after they have a chance to write them out specifically.

That is what took place. Then this resolution was brought before the Rules Committee and, as originally introduced, there were four trips of 15 members, which would be 60; four trips with five staff members, totaling 20; that is 80 people; and then 10 to the ILO, a total of 90 people. On an amendment which I offered to the committee, which was accepted, it was reduced somewhat: Four trips, 11 members, 44; four trips with three staff, 12; a total of 56. The ILO was left as is, at 10. So that is a total of 66 individuals, a reduction from 90 down to 66.

When we had the resolution originally before the Easter recess, as I recall, nobody from the minority side came and appeared either for or against the resolution. We heard this resolution Tuesday, and we found ourselves without a quorum around noon, so we put it over to Wednesday.

My further recollection is that nobody from the minority side appeared either for or against the particular resolution.

The distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), an important member of the Rules Committee, who has been on the ILO trip, stated that two members from each side were sufficient. They are observers. That would be all that would be necessary. He offered an amendment as to the ILO to reduce the number of members, which did not pass.

Subsequently, when I came to the floor, a couple of members told me they did not think they needed this many, 10 members, to the ILO. But no information was submitted to me either prior to the previous hearing before the Easter recess or before the hearing on Tuesday and Wednesday.

So I had nothing, no information on which to try cut, excepting what the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska brought to my attention. If there are differences between the members of the committee, I think the Rules Committee should have the information before it. We do not want to nursemaid everybody on these trips. We try to do the best we can. We hope that this is a reasonable resolution. If you do not want to vote for it, vote against it. I feel we have done the best we can with the possible exception of the ILO, which I did support, because of no information being brought to us prior to the hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I have some requests for time. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which we have before us today provides for sending a total of 54 members of the Committee on Education and Labor—which I believe has a total of 35 members—to various parts of the world in the coming months; 11 from each one of four subcommittees plus 10 to the ILO convention in Geneva.

One subcommittee—in fact, one of the same subcommittees as included in this resolution—was previously authorized to make a foreign trip during the Easter recess.

I should like to address myself, however, Mr. Speaker, to the provisions concerning the ILO trip. As was stated by the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) a moment ago, I attended this meeting in 1966 as an observer.

Let me explain the background of the ILO. Each nation is allowed four voting delegates. Delegates from the United States consist of one from the State Department, one from the Department of Labor, one appointed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and one appointed by the AFL–CIO. Those are the four official delegates and the only representatives of the United States who have a vote and a voice in the sessions of this organization.

In addition, as pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK), other Departments of Government do send advisers over there, and we have a total staff from downtown offices, I believe, contemplated for this year of 36.

The State Department recommends and has recommended for many years that two go from the House and two go from the other body. I have checked with the Department of State within the past few days, and the other body, at least during the last 8 or 10 years, has never sent more than two from that body to the ILO.

The House resolution in previous years has never provided for more than four. In fact, in 2 years within the last six the House did not pass any resolution at all concerning authorization for foreign travel by this committee to the ILO. Those who did go from the Committee on Education and Labor in those years went at the expense of the Department of State.

I should like to reiterate that Members who go from the House and who go from the other body are simply observers. They have no vote. They have no voice in the proceedings. They have little or no influence as to what goes on.

Mr. Meany, the AFL–CIO delegate, walked out of the last ILO Convention in Geneva and refused to attend any further sessions. And, as the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) mentioned a few moments ago, Mr. Meany recommended at that time that the United States withdraw from the ILO organization.

The House last year, Mr. Speaker, in passing the appropriation bill which came from the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), omitted funds for the assessment of the United States for this organization.

I am further advised by another gentleman on the Appropriations Committee that it is not the intention of the Appropriations Committee to appropriate any funds for our assessment for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MARTIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to correct that statement. The State-Justice appropriation bill has not been marked up. No decision has been made. However, it is the intention of the gentleman now speaking to vote against funds until the situation is cleaned up in the ILO.

That should not be taken as an official

statement of our subcommittee, which has not marked up the bill yet. We have had hearings. We have gone into it. This is my own position.

In the last bill we did deny the funds to the ILO. As far as this Member is concerned, I will continue in that position until there has been changes in the ILO so that it ceases to be a propaganda machine for the Soviet Union and until the people there work with us in some of the items which we have. However, it has failed in its position.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Nebraska 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. It was a good organization, but I believe until the situation is corrected to the point where Americans have a real voice in the ILO, those funds should be denied.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not correct that the Committee on Appropriations last year did not include any funds for the ILO.

Mr. BOW. That is correct. We did not include funds last year. We had full testimony mainly from the former president of the Chamber of Commerce and members of the State Department and others, and on the basis of their testimony we withheld those funds.

Again I would say to the gentleman that my own position would be to continue in this position until there has been a correction in the attitude.

It seems to me, if we send 10 Members of this body over there after we have denied the funds, it is rather a ridiculous situation.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to correct a previous statement of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

I believe in giving credit where credit is due. It was the other body's Subcommittee on Appropriations and the full Senate Committee on Appropriations which denied funds for membership in ILO. Unfortunately, we on the House side did not know if the hijinks and the amazing things that happened in permitting the Soviet Communists to use the organization as a stage for their anti-American propaganda at the time the bill was before the House of Representatives. The result was that the bill passed by this body included the funds for a full year for membership in the ILO. It was while it was pending in the committee in the other body that Mr. Meany of the AFL–CIO, Mr. Nielan of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Under Secretary of Labor came before the House subcommittee and disclosed the anti-American attacks that had been going on for the many years. The Senate committee and the Senate then denied the funds.

I am going to agree with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), when it comes to the 1972 funds for ILO, and I think we can prove a satisfactory case here on the floor of the House.

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this resolution still contains 10 Members to be sent from the House of Representatives to the ILO, I must oppose this resolution when it comes up for a vote.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what are you going to do if 66 members of one committee take flight along with all of the rest of the junketing that has been authorized for other committees? How are you going to run the House of Representatives? Who is going to tend the shop if any substantial number of world travelers take off at the same time?

Let me remind the House that there is a deficit in the international balance of payments of about $10 billion. Members of Congress, of all people, ought to be interested in this staggering deficit in the balance of payments and the onslaught on the dollar that is now being waged abroad as a result of $35 billion worth of dollars floating around the world, to which tourists and Congressmen have made a contribution. Yet, instead of making contribution toward trying to straighten out the deficit in the balance of payments, what are we doing here today? We are asked to authorize junkets for 66 members of one committee to Russia, Geneva, Switzerland, and you name it.

I doubt that anyone could figure out all the way points the junketeers will hit.

Yes, my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Ashbrook), is certainly drinking out of a strange pitcher here this afternoon in supporting this resolution.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I think the gentleman from Iowa knows that I find myself in usual accord with the gentleman from Iowa, except when he gets real liberal and votes on farm bills and some others. I do not think the gentleman can categorize all of these trips as junkets.

How does the gentleman define "junket"?

Mr. GROSS. I define a "junket" as kind of a trip where Members go to Geneva to consort with the Communists who run the International Labor Organization. I wonder when the Communists saw fit to take to their bosoms the delegates, the walking delegates from the Congress of the United States? When did all this happen? Only a year ago we wanted no part of the ILO, because the U.S. delegates were virtually excluded. That is a Communist-dominated organization. They want our big annual contribution for support of the organization, but they do not want the United States to have a voice.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well, my question——

Mr. GROSS. I would call that a junket.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I, myself, would look upon a junket as something a little different. I think if a Member of Congress loses in his bid for reelection and goes on an around-the-world trip, that might be termed a junket after he loses. I would call that a junket.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can have his definition for it. The gentleman is experienced enough in the ways of foreign travel and the House of Representatives to know that a lot of these trips overseas are totally unjustified. All are at the expense of the taxpayers, and all contribute to the deficit in the balance of payments.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Could I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Does the gentleman from Iowa consider every trip by every Member of Congress outside the Continental United States as a junket?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman consider every trip a junket?

Mr. GROSS. Beginning with the granddaddy of all junketing organizations, the Interparliamentary Union, I would have to search the record backward and forward to find any contribution that has been made. All we have done in this country is go downhill with all of the junkets that have been taken by all Members of Congress. I can think of very few that have made any contribution, except to provide Members with nice, enjoyable trips, and there is usually "space available" for some of their relatives. You take it from there and tell me what has been contributed.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that I certainly cannot agree with him that every trip taken by every Member of Congress outside the Continental United States is a junket.

Mr. GROSS. You are entitled to your own ideas about it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am as critical of foreign aid as is the gentleman from Iowa. However, I think any time when his Committee on Foreign Affairs takes a trip it usually brings back good information, and whenever the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Passman), a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid takes a trip he is not on a junket, because I think we have had a great deal of good to come out of his trips.

So, I guess I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What is your committee going to get out of Russia on this trip? Does the gentleman have any idea? And you are not going to spend counterpart funds in Russia because there are none in that country, and I doubt that there are any counterpart funds in Geneva.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield to me at that point?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Never in my wildest dreams could I imagine that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) would arise here and defend a junket.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa and to the gentleman from New York it is not a question of defending junkets. I think you can easily imagine the gentleman from Ohio never being in the position of not going to a Communist-oriented organization just because they happen to be at odds with our particular philosophy at some particular place.

I would say to the gentleman from New York is it not a strange position, in view of the very distinguished background of the gentleman from New York as it relates to communism for us to not participate and let them completely control and dominate the International Labor Organization?

Mr. GROSS. Before my time runs out, I would like to urge the Members of the House, when they get to a vote on this proposition, to send it back to the Rules Committee or wherever it originated. Let them come back with something that is within reason.

Sixty-six members of one committee, getting set to tour the world and 10 of them going over to Geneva, Switzerland, for 23 days. This is ludicrous. This ought to be defeated, and let them come back with a resolution that is reasonable and palatable.

Better still, Congress ought to cut out about 90 percent of foreign travel until we can get our financial house in order here at home, and certainly we should put the brakes on travel and spending abroad until the huge deficit in the international balance of payments is wiped out.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I merely take this time to correct one statement that my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), made. I think if the gentleman will check the record of the past years he will find that he was incorrect on one point. That is he indicated that 10 Members wanted to go to Geneva for 23 days. It has been my experience that no Member of Congress has spent more than 6 or 10 days to 2 weeks during that period of time. I do not know of any Member of Congress who intends to go for the full 23 days. Quite frankly, there has been some problem of getting Members to have their schedules worked out to go more than 2 weeks. I have not been there for more than 2 weeks. So I do not think that any Member is planning to go there for the full 23 days.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 156, nays 172, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—156

Abourezk	Green, Oreg.	Perkins
Abzug	Griffiths	Pirnie
Adams	Gude	Poage
Addabbo	Halpern	Podell
Ashbrook	Hanley	Preyer, N.C.
Ashley	Hechler, W. Va.	Price, Ill.
Aspin	Helstoski	Pucinski
Aspinall	Hicks, Mass.	Purcell
Begich	Hicks, Wash.	Quie
Bell	Hogan	Rees
Bergland	Horton	Reid, N.Y.
Bingham	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Blanton	Jonas	Rodino
Blatnik	Jones, Ala.	Roncalio
Boggs	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Boland	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Bolling	Kazen	Roush
Brademas	Keith	Roy
Burke, Mass.	Koch	Ryan
Burleson, Tex.	Kyros	St Germain
Burlison, Mo.	Landrum	Sarbanes
Byrne, Pa.	Leggett	Scheuer
Carey, N.Y.	Long, Md.	Seiberling
Carney	McClory	Shipley
Casey, Tex.	McClure	Sikes
Celler	McCormack	Slack
Chisholm	McFall	Smith, Calif.
Clark	McKay	Smith, Iowa
Conyers	Macdonald, Mass.	Stanton, James V.
Corman	Matsunaga	Steed
Culver	Mayne	Steele
Daniels, N.J.	Mazzoli	Steiger, Wis.
Danielson	Meeds	Stokes
de la Garza	Melcher	Stratton
Dellenback	Mikva	Stubblefield
Derwinski	Mills	Sullivan
Dingell	Minish	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Mitchell	Tiernan
Eckhardt	Mollohan	Udall
Edmondson	Monagan	Ullman
Esch	Moorhead	Van Deerlin
Fascell	Morse	Vanik
Findley	Mosher	Waldie
Flood	Moss	Watts
Foley	Murphy, N.Y.	Whalen
Ford, William D.	Natcher	White
Fraser	Nedzi	Whitten
Gallagher	Obey	Wilson, Bob
Garmatz	O'Hara	Wolff
Giaimo	O'Neill	Yates
Gibbons	Patman	Young, Tex.
Gonzalez	Patten	Zablocki

NAYS—172

Abbitt	Belcher	Brown, Mich.
Abernethy	Bennett	Brown, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Betts	Broyhill, N.C.
Andrews, Ala.	Bevill	Buchanan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Biester	Burke, Fla.
Archer	Blackburn	Byrnes, Wis.
Arends	Bow	Byron
Baker	Bray	Cabell
	Broomfield	Caffery
	Brotzman	Camp
	Cederberg	Heckler, Mass.
	Chamberlain	Hosmer
	Chappell	Hull
	Clawson, Del	Hungate
	Collier	Hunt
	Collins, Tex.	Hutchinson
	Colmer	Ichord
	Conable	Jarman
	Conte	Johnson, Pa.
	Coughlin	Jones, N.C.
	Crane	Jones, Tenn.
	Daniel, Va.	Keating
	Davis, Wis.	Kemp
	Denholm	King
	Dennis	Kuykendall
	Devine	Kyl
	Dickinson	Latta
	Downing	Lent
	Duncan	Lloyd
	Dwyer	Lujan
	Edwards, Ala.	McCollister
	Eshleman	McDade
	Evans, Colo.	McKevitt
	Fish	McKinney
	Fisher	Mahon
	Flowers	Mailliard
	Ford, Gerald R.	Martin
	Forsythe	Mathias, Calif.
	Fountain	Mathis, Ga.
	Frelinghuysen	Michel
	Frenzel	Miller, Ohio
	Frey	Minshall
	Fulton, Pa.	Mizell
	Fuqua	Montgomery
	Galifianakis	Myers
	Gettys	Nelsen
	Goodling	Nichols
	Griffin	O'Konski
	Gross	Passman
	Hagan	Pelly
	Haley	Pettis
	Hall	Pike
	Hamilton	Poff
	Hammer-schmidt	Powell
	Harsha	Price, Tex.
	Harvey	Pryor, Ark.
	Hastings	Railsback
	Hébert	Randall
		Rarick
		Reid, Ill.
		Rhodes
		Riegle
		Roberts
		Robinson, Va.
		Robison, N.Y.
		Rogers
		Rooney, N.Y.
		Rousselot
		Ruppe
		Sandman
		Satterfield
		Scherle
		Schmitz
		Schneebeli
		Schwengel
		Scott
		Sebelius
		Shoup
		Shriver
		Skubitz
		Smith, N.Y.
		Spence
		Springer
		Stafford
		Stanton, J. William
		Steiger, Ariz.
		Stuckey
		Talcott
		Taylor
		Teague, Calif.
		Terry
		Thompson, Ga.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Thone
		Vander Jagt
		Veysey
		Vigorito
		Waggonner
		Wampler
		Whalley
		Whitehurst
		Williams
		Wydler
		Wylie
		Wyman
		Zwach

NOT VOTING—104

Alexander	Eilberg	Madden
Anderson, Ill.	Erlenborn	Mann
Anderson, Tenn.	Evins, Tenn.	Metcalfe
Annunzio	Flynt	Miller, Calif.
Badillo	Fulton, Tenn.	Mink
Baring	Gaydos	Morgan
Barrett	Goldwater	Murphy, Ill.
Biaggi	Grasso	Nix
Brasco	Gray	Pepper
Brinkley	Green, Pa.	Peyser
Brooks	Grover	Pickle
Broyhill, Va.	Gubser	Quillen
Burton	Hanna	Rangel
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Roe
Clancy	Hansen, Wash.	Rostenkowski
Clausen, Don H.	Harrington	Roybal
Clay	Hathaway	Runnels
Cleveland	Hawkins	Ruth
Collins, Ill.	Hays	Saylor
Cotter	Henderson	Sisk
Davis, Ga.	Hillis	Snyder
Davis, S.C.	Holifield	Staggers
Delaney	Howard	Stephens
Dellums	Jacobs	Symington
Dent	Kee	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Kluczynski	Ware
Donohue	Landgrebe	Widnall
Dorn	Lennon	Wiggins
Dow	Link	Wilson, Charles H.
Dowdy	Long, La.	Winn
Drinan	McCloskey	Wright
du Pont	McCulloch	Wyatt
Edwards, Calif.	McDonald, Mich.	Yatron
Edwards, La.	McEwen	Young, Fla.
	McMillan	Zion

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Carter.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. Link with Mr. Ware.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Young of Florida.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Brinkley with Mr. du Pont.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Eilberg.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Dellums.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Metcalfe.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Staggers.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Drinan.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Mann.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Howard with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Kee.

Messrs. ABBITT, DOWNING, PASSMAN, BLACKBURN, and FULTON of Pennsylvania changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the remainder of this week, if there is any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the minority leader, it is my intention to ask to go over until Monday there being no further program for this week.

Monday is District day and there are five bills scheduled:

H.R. 2596, Metropolitan Police Band expansion;

H.R. 6638, school fare subsidy;

H.R. 5638, penalty for assaulting firemen;

H.R. 2594, minor's share in decedent's estate; and

H.R. 7931, administration of estates.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, the schedule is:

Second supplemental appropriation bill, 1971.

H.R. 3613, Emergency Employment Act of 1971. This is subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

We hope to conclude the legislative work Wednesday because of the large number of Members who are going to New York City on Thursday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask the distinguished majority leader this question. I understand a rule is being sought on the emergency employment act of 1971 on Monday.

If a rule is granted by the Committee on Rules on Monday, will that bill be the first order of business?

Mr. BOGGS. No; it is our plan to schedule the second supplemental appropriation bill prior to that and we would hope to conclude the consideration of the second supplemental appropriation bill on Tuesday and to consider the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 on Wednesday, provided of course that a rule is granted on Tuesday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What is the title of the bill that the gentleman inquired about?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The title of the bill, as listed on the prospective whip notice, is H.R. 3613, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

Mr. GROSS. The Emergency Appointment Act?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. No; the Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. GROSS. Employment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Could the majority leader tell us how the bills on the District of Columbia came out of the District Committee—whether they were unanimous or whether there was any dispute?

Mr. BOGGS. I am sorry I am unable to provide that information at this time. I presume they came out by a substantial majority and we have no indication that it was otherwise.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MAY 10

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

NONE BUT AMERICANS ON GUARD

(Mr. FLOWERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, in April, 1777 a British deserter's attempt to poison General George Washington prompted him to direct his regimental commanders to "put none but Americans on guard tonight." No soldiers of fortune from other countries, no deserters who had come over from the other side—he would have none of these. It was a time of great crisis, and "none but Americans" were sufficient to the task.

This is likewise a critical time in our history as a Nation.

The orderly process of Government seems to come under attack daily. More often than not, those who protest and those who disrupt offer no rational alternatives; their actions become the desired ends in themselves. They protest for the sake of protest. They would substitute anarchy and chaos for democratic government. There is, of course, a right to disagree with and oppose any Government policy. I know that I have done this on occasion myself. But those who turn this right into a license to disrupt, to burn, to rob, are not cloaked with immunity under the Constitution.

I was greatly encouraged by the words of our President last week. Referring to recent actions by some antiwar protest groups, he said:

> Let me make one thing clear. The Congress is not intimidated; the President is not intimidated. This Government is going forward. It does not mean that we are not going to listen to those who come peacefully, but those who come and break the law will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

It is my hope that these words will be translated into action at any time the need arises during the current demonstrations or at any other time.

It is incredible to me that some can cry out so loudly in protection and defense of the disrupters of the last few days, yet have nothing at all to say in condemnation of the actions that they are attempting to perpetrate on our Nation's Capital and law-abiding citizens who only wish to get to work. Apparently some feel that the comfort, convenience, and advantage should be with those who come to defy.

There is nothing in the world more incompatible than the concept of freedom in a climate of anarchy. Freedom can only exist in a society which is protected

by well ordered liberty. As the great jurist Oliver Wendell Holmes said:

Your rights stop at the end of my nose.

In other words, one's own personal freedom does not give him a right to punch someone else in the nose. Some idealists seem to believe that man can exist in society without any system of rules to govern human conduct. Others, much in the news recently, are simply straightforward in their desire to create anarchy. We have only to look to experiments in anarchy to see the result. The French Revolution, began in freedom, devolved into carnage and mass destruction and resulted in further tyranny. Universities and cities in our own day who have submitted to mob rule have seen the resulting chaos. It is surely not too much to say that unordered freedom—real anarchy—destroys the very goal that its purveyors claim to be working toward.

There are also those who tell us that all individual rights take precedence over community needs. They would have us believe that all speech, no matter how calculated it is to inspire violence; all forms of pornography, no matter how calculated to twist young minds; all expressions, no matter how dangerous the mob—come under the protection of the Bill of Rights. But this is not what our Founding Fathers intended. There is a time—and a place—where the pressing needs of a community must come first. Mr. Justice Holmes also said that freedom of speech did not go so far as to permit someone to shout "fire" in a crowded theater. Now, just as appropriately, we can say simply that freedom of speech does not include the right to tear this country apart.

We are living in trouble times—in a Nation and in a world where it often seems none but Americans are on guard. Fortunately, though, there are loyal and responsible citizens in Government, in law enforcement, in the military and in private life across this great lands of ours. And I have got a lot of confidence in my fellow Americans.

In my judgment, we all owe a very special debt of gratitude to the law enforcement agencies who have so tirelessly and unselfishly helped maintain law and order this week. Particularly for myself and those that I represent in Alabama who love this great city and what it has stood for in a troubled world, I want to say a deep and sincere thank you to the officers and men of the Washington Police and the District of Columbia National Guard.

FARM TRUCK REGULATIONS

(Mr. ABOUREZK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that 57 of my colleagues from 35 States have joined me today in introducing legislation that would amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act. The purpose of the bill which I am introducing today is to insure that the ill-considered farm truck regulations proposed by the Transportation Department will not be allowed to hamper farm operations in South Dakota or anywhere else in the Nation.

As you may know, there has been a historic exemption for farm vehicle operators in the Motor Carrier Safety Regulations. However, the proposed new regulations that were to go into effect would change this. Originally, these regulations were published in the Federal Register on June 7, 1969, and were to go into effect on January 1 of this year. However, despite this notice, it was only shortly before that deadline that farm groups became aware of the danger in which they found themselves. Since that time, they have been making their feelings known throughout the country. It was after this outcry that the DOT agreed to postpone the effective date until July 1, 1971.

It is rumored, and I am hopeful that the Transportation Department will make my legislation unnecessary by withdrawing or substantially modifying its proposals. But, if it does not, I intend to lead a battle in Congress to insure that these silly regulations will never go into effect. I would welcome a spirit of compromise within DOT and am anxiously awaiting their long-promised news release indicating what new proposals they will have for us. However, I feel that my legislation gives farmers and ranchers the protection from harassment that they have traditionally enjoyed and which they need if they are to survive the cruel economic struggle which is now the watchword of rural America.

If these initial proposed regulations were to go into effect, it would mean that all operators of farm vehicles who engage in interstate commerce must be at least 21 years of age, carry a medical certificate not more than 24 months old and pass Federal written and road tests. All this would be in addition to State regulations. Further, if the driver were an employee of the farmer, he would have to provide the farmer with evidence of compliance with these requirements.

This would mean that farm youths, even if they have had years of experience operating farm vehicles, could no longer do so legally. It would mean that the farmer would have to hire outsiders to operate his trucks even if he had sons perefectly capable of doing so. It would mean that the woefully inadequate numbers of medical personnel available in rural areas would have an additional burden placed on their time by administering all those medical exams. It would mean that at the peak harvesting season when farmers are the busiest, they would have to track down all the records of those they hire.

All this harassment exhibits an acute lack of understanding of the nature of farm truck operations. There are 2.8 million farmers and ranchers who use nearly 3.7 million trucks of all sizes and kinds in their operations. However, this mostly involves short trips, for local hauling on an intermitted basis. A regulation which would be effective and desirable for large-scale transportation would destroy the family farm.

I am sure that many of my colleagues who may not be familiar with the facts in this case will suspect that the legislation I offer today is just another piece of special interest legislation which would protect the farmer at the expense of the safety of thousands of motorists. If there were any evidence to this effect then they would be justified in their suspicions. But there is not.

The fact is that the Transportation Department cannot come up with any evidence whatsoever to support the claim that their new farm truck regulations would increase highway safety. On the contrary, the record shows that drivers of farm trucks have a safety record three times as good as that of other commercial haulers.

While the record cannot show that the regulations my legislation would prevent will increase highway safety, it does show beyond the slightest doubt that these regulations would seriously hamper the small family farmer.

Given these facts, I just cannot see any need for turning aside the historic exemption of farm truck operators from the motor carrier safety regulations. To do so will merely add an additional hardship to our overburdened farm community. It is the intent of my bill to provide permanent protection for that community from these unfair regulations. I think that I can safely say that with the kind of broad support that my bill enjoys from farm groups and from our colleagues in Congress, the Transportation Department is going to have to think twice before it puts its crippling new regulations of farm truck drivers into effect. A list of cosponsors by State follows:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

ALABAMA

Walter Flowers, Dem.

ALASKA

Nick Begich, Dem.

ARIZONA

Morris Udall, Dem.

ARKANSAS

Bill Alexander, Dem.

CALIFORNIA

Chet Holifield, Dem.
Robert Leggett, Dem.

FLORIDA

Sam Gibbons, Dem.
Claude Pepper, Dem.

GEORGIA

Jack Brinkley, Dem.
W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr., Dem.

ILLINOIS

Kenneth Gray, Dem.
Tom Railsback, Rep.

IOWA

John Culver, Dem.

KANSAS

Dr. William Roy, Dem.

MAINE

William Hathaway, Dem.
Peter Kyros, Dem.

MARYLAND

Lawrence Hogan, Rep.

MASSACHUSETTS

Rev. Robert Drinan, Dem.
Michael Harrington, Dem.

MICHIGAN

Elford Cederberg, Rep.
John Conyers, Jr., Dem.
Marvin Esch, Rep.

MINNESOTA
Bob Bergland, Dem.
John Zwach, Rep.

MISSISSIPPI
G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Dem.

MISSOURI
William Hungate, Dem.
William Randall, Dem.

MONTANA
John Melcher, Dem.
Richard Shoup, Rep.

NEBRASKA
John McCollister, Rep.

NEW HAMPSHIRE
James Cleveland, Rep.

NEW JERSEY
Edwin Forsythe, Rep.

NEW YORK
Bella Abzug, Dem.
Herman Badillo, Dem.
Hamilton Fish. Jr., Rep.
Charles Rangel, Dem.

NORTH CAROLINA
L. H. Fountain, Dem.
David Henderson, Dem.
Walter Jones, Dem.

NORTH DAKOTA
Mark Andrews, Rep.
Arthur Link, Dem.

OHIO
John Seiberling, Dem.

OKLAHOMA
Ed Edmondson, Dem.

OREGON
Al Ullman, Dem.

SOUTH DAKOTA
James Abourezk, Dem.

TENNESSEE
Ray Blanton, Dem.
John Duncan, Rep.
Ed Jones, Dem.
Dan Kuykendall, Rep.

TEXAS
Omar Burleson, Dem.
Ray Roberts, Dem.

UTAH
Sherman Lloyd, Rep.

VIRGINIA
W. C. (Dan) Daniel, Dem.

WASHINGTON
Mike McCormack, Dem.

WEST VIRGINIA
John Slack, Dem.
Harley Staggers, Dem.

WISCONSIN
Les Aspin, Dem.
Alvin O'Konski, Rep.

HUD BUILDING MATERIALS APPROVAL POLICY SHORTCHANGES CONSUMER

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital and least understood areas within our society is that of industrial standards and building codes.

It is a field with which I have been long concerned. My Small Business Subcommittee has held numerous hearings concerning standards and codes over the period of the last 5 years. The development, drafting, promulgation, and enforcement of standards have tremendous potential to affect the lives of each of us. Standards, covering as they do virtually any commodity you can name, can be used to protect the consumer, to insure competition, and to provide the uniformity necessary for an industrialized society. Conversely, their misuse can result in anticompetitive conspiracies and an anticonsumer impact in terms of diminished quality and increased price. The same is true in a more specialized sense of building codes. Codes can be used as a means of protectionism—to keep out new products resulting from new technology, as a means of securing increased market shares for existing products, or as a method of insuring that the home buyer gets a fair shake.

In its concern to protect the consumer, Congress cannot afford to overlook the biggest consumer protection issue of all: home buying and home repair. The single biggest expenditure the average American makes as a consumer is the purchase of his home. For those who rent their homes, rent may likewise represent a sizable item of consumer expenditure. This is especially true in the case of persons of low and moderate income, for whom monthly rent payments or monthly mortgage payments constitute a sizeable chunk of the family income. Consumer interest in the construction and repair of residential and other buildings has been badly overlooked by Congress and by the Nation.

Recently, the National Bureau of Standards has sought an increased budget to develop performance-oriented building codes. This would be done through a cooperative program between the National Conference of States on Building Codes and Standards and the individual States. Spokesmen from the Department of Commerce have indicated that they hope it will produce significant results within 2 years. During fiscal 1972, the conference is expected to establish a procedure for measuring performance of innovative building systems and components.

This is most heartening. All standards and codes should be based on performance. What is important to the consumer is what a wall will do—its strength, its durability, its heating and noise insulation quality, and so forth, not what material is used.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to have to report to you and my colleagues that, despite the admirable objectives of this proposed National Bureau of Standards' program, the lack of internal liaison and coordination within the present administration is destroying whatever gains might have been achieved through this innovative approach.

Despite recent pronouncements by HUD Secretary George Romney that more emphasis will be placed on performance criteria for building materials by the Federal Housing Administration, the record to date simply does not corroborate this. Indeed, it points in the opposite direction toward blind obeisance to the old ways—the acceptance of individual materials by name, size, composition, and so forth, rather than on the basis of their performance.

Amazingly, during a period when much progress is being made on increased consumer protection, HUD is seemingly fleeing into the miasmic mists of the past. As an example, in a recent letter to a Member of this body, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, RAY MADDEN, Patricia Hampton, Acting Chief of the Workable Program Branch of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has stated:

> To set the record straight, we should like to reiterate that HUD does not require the use of any particular material, does not attempt to judge the merits of such material, *does not attempt to judge the credibility of the industry standards under which a particular material is produced,* and makes no claim regarding any product or system of construction. (Emphasis supplied).

This quotation may be paraphrased rather briefly—let the buyer beware—and if he ends up with his largest single investment represented by a house which is not durable and does not function well, that after all is scarcely the problem of HUD.

This is shocking. If the public interest is not the point of HUD's existence, then how do we justify the many billions of dollars expended by that vast bureaucracy. Further, at the very time when the National Bureau of Standards is struggling to obtain adequate funds to protect consumers by converting codes to the vastly more desirable performance basis, HUD representatives are insisting that local codes must allow builders to use any material approved by HUD. It should be noted, however, that HUD does not assume any responsibility to assure that individual building materials meet any performance criterion as to safety or durability.

Thus, HUD is now in the process of breaking down consumer protection feaures built into State, county, and municipal building codes—which term includes also regulations pertaining to plumbing, mechanical, and electrical systems, but not housing codes. These codes, while crude and imperfect measures of consumer protection, do embody a very important principle, that is, production is for the sake of consumption and not vice versa; no producer of a building material is entitled to market his commodity simply for the reason that he somehow managed to produce it. To the extent that a code regulates or restricts use of any construction material or method, based upon reliable performance criteria, it constitutes a qualification on the wide open homebuilder practice of "buyer beware."

Granted that a given restriction may be unwise, unnecessary, or unsupported by scientific or technological data. This is a question of fact, a question of applying the general principle to particular sets of circumstances. The general principle remains eminently necessary for the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare. The "home buyer beware" approach is unworthy of a Federal Goverment which spends billions of dollars annually in an effort to help those of moderate means acquire their own homes. The aim of public policy at all levels of Government should be to reform building code restrictions, not eliminate them entirely.

HUD has embarked upon a policy of forcing or requiring any county or municipality seeking recertification of its

"Workable Program for Community Improvement" to throw out all code restrictions even though originally enacted to protect the consumer. The HUD code philosophy has been spelled out for the record in a letter from Secretary Romney to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama; said letter can be found in published hearings before a subcommittee of the House Select Committee on Small Business, held in Chicago, Ill., September 18, 1970, at pages 249–250. I am reliably informed that the same policy has been reaffirmed recently and continues in effect.

The policy is precisely stated as follows:

> Our policy regarding local codes is based on the premise that all materials, irrespective of nature or origin, which have been produced under nationally recognized and accepted industry standards and which have been certified as having met the requirements of such standards should have a place in the building codes of each community, without limitation or restriction, unless there is a local geologic, climatic or soil condition which would warrant a limitation on its use.

In the same letter, Secretary Romney also states that HUD does not conduct programs of research and testing on new building materials, but accepts the findings of other agencies both public and private:

> HUD does not . . . have the facilities or budget appropriations necessary to conduct the type of research and testing that has been suggested . . . We, of necessity, accept the published findings of the National Bureau of Standards, Underwriters Laboratories, the American Society for Testing and Materials and the National Sanitation Foundation, among others. These organizations are equipped and staffed to judge the adequacy of materials and methods and are nationally recognized as experts in their respective fields."

HUD makes extensive use of model building and related codes published by some half-dozen organizations which it refers to as "Nationally recognized model code organizations." Examples are: Building Officials and Code Administrators International, Southern Building Code Congress, and International Conference of Building Officials. Secretary Romney in the letter cited above quite correctly points out that these code organizations are, like HUD, dependent upon the findings of the testing organizations and also upon the standards produced by such organizations.

One of the problems encountered in attempting to understand standards and codes is their complexity and the fact that they cover many, many thousands of individual commodities. One of the individual commodities that has become somewhat familiar to me through testimony before my Small Business Subcommittee is plastic pipe. Recently, a violent controversy has occurred within the plastics industry concerning a new standard for smaller, thinner-walled polyvinyl chloride—PVC—plastic pipe for drain, waste, and vent usage. The standard has just recently been approved by the American Society for Testing and Materials, one of the organizations relied upon by both HUD and the model code publishers for testing as well as production of standards. The recent case of this ASTM standard, known as D–2949, deserves to be carefully studied by the Congress in both respects. It received its final approval on April 7 of this year, to become effective May 7.

During the recent fight to prevent 2 by 4 lumber from which homes are, in the main, framed and built from being made skinnier by virtue of a new standard, one of the arguments advanced against the new standard was that existing pipes will not fit inside a wall built around the new skinnier 2 by 4. Proponents of the new lumber standard solemnly assured us that this was not a valid argument. It is highly disturbing to discover now, retrospectively, that the plastic industry in its advertising notes that the new skinnier pipes will fit inside the walls and that this is one of their great virtues. Is it not a shame that equal confirmation of this position could not have been received from the industry before the new standard allowing the skinnier 2 by 4's had been adopted?

Now that this product, namely, 3-inch thin wall PVC plastic pipe and fittings for drain, waste, and vent application, has been blessed with an ASTM standard specification, it must be accepted as approved in the plumbing code of any community desiring to maintain the certification of its workable program with HUD. The penalty for noncompliance is ineligibility to receive Federal loans and grants sometimes amounting to millions of dollars in a particular community.

We are told that ASTM has tested it; ASTM has approved it and granted it a standard; therefore it is ready to be tested in the marketplace, and further restrictions by State or local officials in the interest of consumer protection or environmental protection must be pitched out the window.

Of what sort then is this ASTM testing and ASTM standards approval process?

In this particular case, there has been some revealing documentation in the public record, including the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and we are fortunate to have access to certain documentation circulated within ASTM itself.

Within ASTM, we are concerned with six bodies within which a proposed standard is considered and voted upon. From the bottom up, they are: task force, section, subcommittee, committee, society membership, and committee on standards. A standard is typically developed within a technical committee and its subordinate bodies. Following committee approval, it is submitted to the membership of the society by letter ballot. The results, even if unanimous, then go to the committee on standards for final action.

D–20 is the committee on plastics.

D–20.17 is the subcommitee on plastic pipe and fittings.

D–20.17.01 is the PVC, polyvinyl chloride section.

Finally, there was in this case a task group on 3'' thin wall PVC–DWV pipe and fittings.

The proposed standard D2949 therefore moved out of the task group through the PVC section to the D–20.17 subcommittee. At this point there was a minority report opposing the standard signed by 19 members of the subcommittee. At the committee level the vote was for approval over several dissents, and so the measure went to membership letter ballot, where there was only one dissenting vote cast by a rival industry group. Prior to the final consideration by the committee on standards, the negative vote was sent back to the task group, subcommittee D–20.17 and full committee D–20 for review. This time, the vote at these three levels reaffirming the previous action was unanimous in all cases. Following a rebuttal made by the dissenter, the committee on standards voted to approve the proposed standard.

Mr. Speaker, I include a sample of this ballot in the RECORD at this point. By way of explanation, D–2949 was identified on the ballot as D–2955 and the number was subsequently changed.

The ballot follows:

BALLOT REQUEST FORM, SOCIETY BALLOT NO. 1–71

(Use the following code: R=Request copy, A=Affirmative, N=Negative, and Ab=Abstain.

NEW STANDARD

Thermal and Cryogenic Insulating Materials (Committee C–16): C 677, Use of a Standard Reference Sheet for the Measurement of the Time-Averaged Vapor Pressure in a Controlled Humidity Space Recommended Practice for.—

Plastics (Committee D–20)

D 2951, Thermal Stress Crack Resistance of Types III and IV Polyethylene Plastics. Method of Test for.—

D 2952, Ethylene Plastics Specifications for.—

D 2953, Polymeric Materials for Service in Ionizing Radiation. Classification System for.—

D 2954, Determining Absorbed Gamma and Electron Radiation Dose with the Ferrous Sulfate-Cupric, Sulfate Dosimeter, Procedure for.—

D 2955, Three Inch Thin Wall PVC Plastic Drain, Waste and Vent Pipe Fittings, Specifications for.—

Electrical Insulating Liquids and Gases (Committee D–27) D 2945, Gas Content of Insulating Oils. Method or Test for.—

Peats, Mosses, Humus, and Their Composites (Committee D–29) D 2944 Peat Materials, Methods for Sampling.

Space Simulation (Committee E–21), E 422. Measuring Heat Flux Using a Water Cooled Calorimeter, Method for.—

E 423, Normal Spectral Emittance at Elevated Temperatures of Non-Conducting Specimens. Methods of Test for.—

REVISION OF STANDARDS

Cement (Committee C–1)

C 185–70, Air Content of Hydraulic Cement Mortar, Test for

C–219–66, Hydraulic Cement, Definitions of Terms Relating to C 430–70 Fineness of Hydraulic Cement by the No. 325 Sieve, Test for.—

C 505–68, Blended Hydraulic Cements, Specifications for.—

Building Joint Sealants (Committee C–24), C 542–69, Elastomeric Structural Glazing and Panel Gaskets. Specifications for.—

Electrical Insulating Materials Liquids and Gases (submitted Jointly by Committees D–9 and D–27).

D 2413–69, Preparing and Electrical Testing of Insulating Paper Impregnated with a Liquid Dielectric, Methods for.—

Electrical Insulating Materials (Committee D-9), D 351–62, Natural Muscovite Mica Based on Visual Quality, Specification for.—

D 748–59, Natural Block Mica and Mica Films Suitable for Use in Fixed Mica-Dielectric Capacitors, Specifications for.—

D 876–65, Nonrigid Vinyl Chloride Polymer Tubing, Method of Testing.—

D 1080–70, Absorbent Laminating Paper for Electrical Insulation, Specifiation for.—

D 1677–62, Untreated Mica Paper Used for Electrical Insulation, Methods for Sampling and Testing.—

D 2131–68, Natural Muscovite Mica Splittings, Specification for.—

D 2413–70, Preparing and Electrical Testing of Insulating Paper Impregnated with a Liquid Dielectric, D 2865–70, Calibration of Standards and Equipment, Recommended Practices for.—

Plastics (Committee D–20), D 1527–69, Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene (ABS) Plastic Pipe, Schedules 40 and 80, Specification for.—

D 2282–69a, Acrylonite-Butadiene-Styrene (ABS) Plastic Pipe (SDR-PR), Specification for.—

D 2471–68, Gel Time and Peak Exothermic Temperature of Reacting Thermosetting Plastic Compositions, Method of Test for—

D 2581–69, Polybutylene Plastics, Specification for.—

Electrical Insulating Liquids and Gases (Committee D-27), D 2283–70a, Chlorinated Aromatic Hydrocarbons (Askarels), Specification for.—

D 2472–69, Sulfur Hexafluoride, Specification for.—

ADOPTION OF TENTATIVE AS STANDARD WITH REVISION

Electrical Insulating Liquids and Gases (Committee D-27), D 2300–68T, Gassing of Insulating Oils Under Electrical Stress and Ionization (Modified Pirelli Method), Method of Test for.—

Statistical Methods (Committee E–11), E 177–61T, Use of the Terms Precision and Accuracy as Applied to Measurement of a Property of a Material. Recommended Practice for.—

ADOPTION OF TENTATIVES AS STANDARDS WITHOUT REVISION

Plastics (Committee D-20), D 1501–65T, Exposure of Plastics to Fluorescent Sunlamps, Recommended Practice for.—

D 2673–67T, Oriented Polypropylene Film, Specification for.—

Materials for Electron Devices and Microelectronics (Committee F-1), F 83–67T Thermionic Constants of Electron Emitters, Definition and Determination of.—

REAPPROVAL OF STANDARD

Electrical Insulating Materials (Committee D-9), D 352–63, Pasted Mica Used in Electrical Insulating Materials for Testing

D 618–67, Conditioning Plastics and Electrical Insulating Materials for Testing, Method of.—

D 1039–65, Glass-Bonded Mica Used as Electrical Insulation Method of Testing.—

D 1082–54, Power Factor and Dielectric Constant of Natural Mica, Test for.—

D 1829–66, Electrical Resistance of Ceramic Materials at Elevated Temperatures, Test for.—

Plastics (Committee D–20), D 569–59 (1961), Measuring the Flow Properties of Thermoplastic Molding Materials, Method of.—

D 756–56 (1966), Resistance of Plastics to Accelerated Service Conditions, Methods of Test for.—

D 757–65. Flammability of Plastics, Self-Extinguishing Type, Method of Test for.—

D 864–52 (1961), Coefficient of Cubical Thermal Expansion of Plastics, Method of Test for.—

D 1181–56 (1966), Warpage of Sheet Plastics, Method of Test for.—

D 1042–51 (1966), Measuring Changes in Linear Dimensions of Plastics, Method for.—

D 1204–54 (1966), Measuring Changes in Linear Dimensions of Nonrigid Thermoplastic Sheeting or Film, Method for.—

D 1239–55 (1966), Resistance of Plastic Films to Extraction by Chemicals, Method of Test for.—

D 1299–55 (1966), Shrinkage of Molded and Laminated Thermosetting Plastics at Elevated Temperatures, Method of Test for.—

D 1433–58 (1966), Flammability of Flexible Thin Plastic Sheeting, Method of Test for.—

D 1499–64, Operating Light- and Water-Exposure Apparatus (Carbon-Arc Type) for Exposure of Plastics, Recommended Practice for.—

D 1672–66, Exposure of Polymeric Materials to High Energy Radiation, Recommended Practice for.—

D 1703–62, Presentation of Capillary Flow Data on Molten Thermoplastics, Recommended Practice for.—

D 1712–65, Resistance of Plastics to Sulfide Staining, Method of Test for.—

D 2117–64, Melting Point of Semicrystalline Polymers, Method of Test for.—

Electrical Insulating Liquids and Gases (Committee D–27), D 878–65, Inorganic Chlorides and Sulfates in Insulating Oils, Method of Test for.—

Materials for Electron Devices and Microelectronics (Committee F–1).

F 23–64, Temperature Measurement of Thermionic Emitters. Method for.—

F 113–65, Stiffness Testing of Wire for Electron Devices and Lamps. Method of.—

F 155–65, Temper of Strip and Sheet Metal for Electron Devices, Method of.—

F 300–64, Interface Impedance Characteristics of Electron Tube Cathodes, Method of.—

WITHDRAWAL OF STANDARD

Electrical Insulating Materials (Committee D–9), D 273–40, Conducting Paths in Electrical Slate, Tests for.—

D 886–49, Impregnation and Penetration of Glass Yarn with Insulating Varnish, Method for.—

D 1472–62, Set Time for Thermosetting Phenol-Formaldehyde Varnishes, Method of Test for.—

Materials for Electron Devices and Microelectronics (Committee F–1).—

F 8–64, Electron Tube Materials Using Reference Triodes, Method of Testing.—

F 11–68, Electron Tube Parts by Means of a Reference Planar Diode, Method of Testing.—

Mr. Speaker, now obviously no single individual can know all about—as an example—muscovite mica, splittings, absorbent laminating paper, the temperature measurement of thermetic emitters or phenolformaldehyde varnishes, and so forth, to select but a few.

In a speech on the floor of this House on December 17, 1970, my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS) alluded to a report on the performance of plastic drainage systems in Europe authored by a certain Rom Rhome, an employee of Uniroyal and former president of the ABS Institute, Inc., a national trade association for the ABS plastic industry. That report was incorporated in Representative NICHOLS' remarks as published in the RECORD. It alluded specifically to the proposed ASTM thickness of 3-inch PVC DWV pipe from its present schedule 40 outside diameter 3.50 to 3.25 inches.

The summary of findings resulting from Mr. Rhome's investigation follows:

INVESTIGATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF PLASTIC DRAINAGE SYSTEMS IN EUROPE

(By Rom Rhome)

I. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. In Europe PVC *pressure* systems were designed with heavy walls and conservatively rated for a life expectancy of fifty years. The most common dimensional schedule for PVC corresponds to a pressure rating of 10 atmospheres or 147 psi. The wall thicknesses are very close to Schedule 40 PVC drainage pipe in the United States conforming to ASTM D 2665.

2. In determining the design stress for PVC at ambient temperatures of 20° C. (68° F.) proper recognition was given to elevated temperature. On the Continent, both pipe and fittings for pressure service were subjected to 1000 hours of hydrostatic test at a continous temperature of 60° C. (140° F.) before the ambient temperature rating was set.

3. As a result of the proper determination of working stress and allowance for high temperature exposure, PVC *pressure* systems have steadily displaced conventional materials with a conspicuously successful record of service.

4. Exactly the reverse, however, has been true of PVC *drainage* piping, which was grossly underdesigned with thin walls to meet the difficult competitive situation prevailing at the time with cast iron, steel, and even asbestos cement (within buildings).

5. With the introduction of automatic dishwashers and washing machines with self-contained water heaters, widespread failures of PVC drainage systems have occurred. These heat deformation failures occurred in both 3" and 4" soil stacks as well as waste lines 2" and smaller.

6. As a result, PVC has been eliminated entirely from standards in some countries for waste lines as well as 3" soil stacks, with the higher heat resistant plastics, particularly ABS, being used instead.

7. In some countries thinner than Schedule 40 PVC DWV has been retained, but with the restriction that the product be used to handle domestic effluent only. Such service restrictions prolong the use of traditional materials, particularly cast iron, which are thereby required for all commercial installations which could be handled with adequately designed PVC pipe.

8. In the Netherlands, for example, the use of thin wall PVC is continuing, but with the restriction that effluent temperatures not exceed 158° F. This virtually rules out PVC in all modern structures containing automatic appliances.

9. Uniform outside diameter is the most important single achievement in the standardization of plastic pipe. Recommendations of the International Standards Organization have established a single schedule of outside diameters for both pressure and drainage service now in use on four continents. This uniform metric standard for outside diameters parallels the similar standardization in the United States on Iron Pipe Size Outside Diameters. Any effort to introduce nonstandard dimensions, such as the 3.250" O.D. proposed for thin wall PVC DWV in the United States, is a serious departure from dimensional standardization.

Thus, we have a prominent member of the plastics industry stating that the skinnier walled smaller pipe proposed by the new standard has had a highly unfortunate experience in Europe. This in turn set off additional controversy within the plastics industry. As an example, Mr. R. F. Williams, president of Genova Products of Davison, Mich., one of the largest manufacturers of PVC pipe, in a letter to the editor, published in this year's April issue of Contractor magazine, contradicted Mr. Rhome and then went on to say that while PVC was a reliable product, ABS plastic pipe was not. Europeans refused to use it, he said, since it was a fire hazard. Quoting Mr. R. Edmondson, chairman of the Board

of the Hunter Group of Companies, large British plastic DWV manufacturer, Williams says:

As you can see, he states in no uncertain terms that the statement "widespread failures" as used in Mr. Rhome's report is totally untrue. He further states that ABS stacks are not used or specified because of fire transmission hazards. This fact is as well known in this country as in Europe.

I am sure that we will follow Europe's lead in banning this most flammable plumbing material from all stack uses as soon as more people become aware of the hidden danger already built into many otherwise 'fire safe' buildings.

The minority report of the 19 dissenting members of subcommittee D–20.17 which considered the standard illustrates how violently the issue was fought by the competing forces within the same branch of the plastic pipe industry. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the minority report with the names of those who supported it. The minority report makes the point that the wall thickness of so-called thin wall under the new standard will be only 58 percent of that of schedule 40 pipe in the same numerical 3-inch size.

The full report follows:

MINORITY REPORT ON ASTM D–20 BALLOT OPPOSING 3 INCH THIN-WALL PVC DRAINAGE PIPE AND FITTINGS

1. This standard revives a pipe dimension which a concensus of the industry agreed to abandon eight years ago. Dimensions were detailed in CS 219–59. The O.D. of nominal 3 inch SWP (solvent welded pipe) in CS 219–59 was the same as in the proposed specification i.e. 3.25'' O.D. Reasons for abandoning this dimension are as valid now as then.

a. The multiplicity of sizes were confusing to the user and expensive to stock for the manufacturer and distributor.

b. The Schedule 40 pipe which was based upon the established standards of the steel industry was well known and understood by the piping industry.

c. The SWP pipe offered nothing to the consumer that could not be done better by Schedule 40 pipe.

d. Even though SWP pipe with its thinner wall than Schedule 40 sold for less than Schedule 40 it was still abandoned in the interests of quality.

2. We object to the fact that this proposed standard equates a product with only 58% of the wall thickness of the Schedule 40 pipe in the same nominal 3'' size. Given the two types of PVC DWV each having ASTM specifications, the lower cost product is bound to displace the presently accepted Schedule 40. The financial hardship resulting from the proposed ASTM specification would involve obsolescence of millions of dollars of investment in tooling and inventories of both fittings and pipe.

Since the only competitive advantage of this proposed Thin Wall Pipe is lower cost it will force a revival of a corresponding thin walled ABS pipe as was discussed in Part 1. The flaw of the "product description" concept under which the proposed specification is being advanced can only lead to an indefinite proliferation of dimensional standards with continual thinning of the wall. This must result in product misapplication, eventual failures and a reflection upon the plastics industry as a whole.

Too often an ASTM standard is sought for a product that sells at a lower price not in the interests of standardization but as a sales gimmick to be used before less knowledgeable code authorities with the implication the ASTM specification indicates a product that has the blessings of the pipe industry.

TO MEMBERS OF ASTM COMMITTEE D–20

The members of ASTM D 20.17 listed below support the position expressed in the attached minority report opposing 3 inch Thin Wall PVC Drainage Pipe & Fittings.

Their signatures subscribing to this report have been sent to the secretary of D20.17.

Bryce Batzer, Thomas Doyle, Roy Eastman, Paul Finn, William Gallagher, Clifford German, William Hess, John Madden, Robert McAtee, D. L. Moody Jr.

Thomas Pillichody, Rom Rhome, Joseph Richerson, Joseph Rourk, Ben Schiewe, John Shay, Eli Schwartz, Robert Webb, Jeryl Zirkelbach.

Mr. Speaker, other correspondence relating to this matter was published in various issues of Contractor magazine, published semimonthly by Buttenheim Publishing Corp. at Berkshire Common, Pittsfield, Mass. These letters are: first letter from G. R. Munger, executive director, Plastics Pipe Institute of New York, which appeared in the March 15 issue; and second letter of Rom Rhome, identified above, which appeared in the May 1 issue:

RIGID TESTS FOR THIN-WALL PVC

DEAR SIR: We are writing concerning the information on PVC Thin-Wall DWV attributed to Mr. Rom Rhome which appeared in the Feb. 1 issue of CONTRACTOR.

PVC Thin-Wall DWV is a relatively new product which has recently been assigned an ASTM standard number, ASTM D2949–71. The granting of such a standard indicates that this product has undergone the same rigid testing procedures and evaluation by producer, consumer and general interest groups which all thermoplastics piping with an ASTM standard must have endured.

Also, it has a satisfactory history of usage in DWV applications throughout the country. At present, there are five manufacturing firms producing PVC Thin-Wall DWV and all are reporting satisfactory performance in the field.

It is based on the above facts that the Plastics Pipe Institute endorses PVC Thin-Wall DWV, as it does all thermoplastics piping products with ASTM standards, as an adequate material when installed in accordance, with manufacturers' recommendations and accepted good practice.

The failures reported by Mr. Rhome in Europe involved a product which is different from its American counterpart in dimension and basic raw material formulation.

It is therefore misleading to imply that, because there have been alleged problems with one, problems are sure to occur with the other.

G. R. MUNGER,
Executive Director,
Plastics Pipe Institute,
NEW YORK, N.Y.

MORE ON PLASTIC PIPE REPORT

DEAR SIR: Recent issues of Contractor have made reference to my report on the performance of plastic drainage systems in Europe.

One article stated that the text of the report was entered in the *Congressional Record* by Rep. Bill Nichols of Anniston, Ala.

The following statements may clarify the nature and purpose of the investigation.

1. The report was a *confidential, internal, technical* document compiled solely for the guidance of an ASTM committee concerned with the development of standards for plastic pipe. I have been unable to determine how the report reached the hands of Representative Nichols, but any publication of the report was done without my knowledge or consent.

2. While I in no way retreat from the conclusions of the report, the problem is created by the fact that interests hostile to plastic pipe are disseminating the report and quoting it out of context to the detriment of our industry. The same maneuver was used some years ago with a report on plastic drainage systems compiled by the Building Research Advisory Board of the National Academy of Science.

3. The report is really concerned with the philosophy of selecting the proper standards for a product in the light of service experience. In its full text, it is hard to see how this report could benefit the metal pipe industry or in particular the cast iron foundries of Anniston, Ala. Note paragraph 7 of the conclusions:

"In some countries thinner than Schedule 40 PVC DWV has been retained, but with the restriction that the product be used to handle *domestic effluent only.* Such service restrictions *prolong* the use of traditional materials, *particularly cast iron,* which are thereby required for all commercial installations *which could be handled with adequately designed PVC pipe.*"

4. In other words, our industry's aim is the displacement of metal pipe in drainage service, and the more conservative segment of the PVC pipe industry adheres to the concept that a product with no service restrictions and with consistently successful performance will achieve this objective more rapidly than through the promotion of a limited service product.

5. A competing trade association has made improper use of a confidential document to imply disunity within the plastic pipe industry. Compare this situation to the plight of the metal pipe association which claims that plastic pipe is unserviceable, yet finds eight of its members prominent producers of plastic pipe!

6. The guerrilla warfare tactics of our opposition cannot materially delay the eventual day when virtually all new mains under the street, services to the building, and interior drainage plumbing will be PVC, ABS, or other appropriate plastic.

ROM RHOME,
Products Manager, Uniroyal Chemical.
NAUGATUCK, CONN.

I am appalled first of all at the statement by Mr. Rhome to the effect that his report—inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—was a confidential, internal, technical document, compiled solely for the guidance of an ASTM committee concerned with the development of standards for plastic pipe.

Because of the HUD policy mentioned above, an ASTM committee performs a de facto public function, and it is shocking that Mr. Rhome, who benefits from that policy with respect to other products, should entertain the thought that his document is entitled to confidentiality by reason of its having been compiled solely for the guidance of an ASTM committee concerned with the development of standards for plastic pipe. Congressman NICHOLS has performed a magnificent public service by the publication of this confidential internal document right where it very properly should be published, on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Another troublesome aspect of the ASTM procedure arises from the fact that the 19 dissenters at the subcommittee level and the eight negative votes at the full committee D–20 on plastics level vanished into thin air at the time of the members' vote and even reversed them-

selves later. The sole negative vote on the membership ballot came from a competing industry. In the reconsideration following this negative vote, the decision to ignore it was unanimous at the task group, subcommittee, and committee levels.

Highly significant in this regard is the statement in the letter of Mr. Munger, set forth above:

That the Plastics Pipe Institute endorses PVC Thin-Wall DWV, as it does all thermoplastics piping products with ASTM standards.

One may, I trust, be pardoned a suspicion that the ASTM D–20 Committee on Plastics operates very much as a party caucus, allowing full scope for intracaucus debate with the proviso that it be confidential and internal, coupled with a clear understanding that industry members stand together like brothers when they have to face the rest of the world.

I am not criticizing the industry caucus technique as such, and as a Member of Congress I would be hard pressed to do so. It seems a highly effective technique from the standpoint of industry interest but what about the consumers' interest?

I am also disturbed by the fact that D–20.17 is actually a joint committee sponsored by ASTM and the Plastics Pipe Institute. Stationery printed for use of the subcommittee bears the insignia of both ASTM and PPI and the names of both organizations in the letterhead. Apparently such joint subcommittees are provided for in ASTM procedures. I am not questioning the legality of the operation, but am only pointing out further evidence of the intimate collaboration between ASTM and a trade association of the industry most likely to be affected by the approval or disapproval of a proposed standard.

An ASTM letter ballot goes out to the membership—I understand it is some 15,000 strong—with perhaps scores of propositions to be voted on. In each case, the ballot contains only an identifying number and subject. In each case members are voting to approve, withdraw or reaffirm a standard. In each case there are three possible votes: affirmative, negative, and abstain. If a member wishes to learn what he is supposed to be voting on, he may request a copy of the proposed standard and also argument pro and con distributed at the industry committee level.

It seems to me that pressure is extremely great for a party not directly involved to either abstain or mark a pro forma affirmative on most votes. Voting negative takes time and trouble. A negative vote must be explained in writing, whereas an affirmative vote or abstention need not be. Even those members who feel they will be seriously hurt economically by approval of a new standard must think twice before voting in the negative. The day will come when the nay-sayer will want an ASTM approval for his own standards and the possibility of retaliation lurks in the background. It certainly seems that this type of balloting exerts heavy psychological pressure on industry members of ASTM to convert the entire organization into a private industry caucus, in much the same way that committee D–20 appears to function as a plastics industry caucus.

In the case of D 2949, material distributed to those few members requesting information so they would know what they were voting on included the proposed standard, letters from the task group chairman and the subcommittee chairman urging full D–20 committee approval, test data, and the minority report set forth above.

The test data apparently originated entirely with the B. F. Goodrich Chemical Co., an organization obviously having a great economic interest in an affirmative result. There was no record of any testing whatsoever conducted in any Federal or other public facility, or in ASTM or other private facility. The test data were submitted over the signature of R. C. Wilging who was also chairman of the 3-Inch Thin Wall Task Group.

This is an extremely interesting triple play. Mr. Wilging is, I am sure, an entirely honest and reputable individual. However, conducting tests for his employer, B. F. Goodrich, acting as the chairman of the Thin Wall Task Group, and further, apparently, as a member of both the subcommittee and committee, simply places him in a totally untenable conflict-of-interest position. It is, of course, disquieting to learn that the entire testing which garnered ASTM approval and thereby FHA and HUD approval with the further consequence that all municipalities must accept the product or be subject to losing much sought after Federal funds was performed by a manufacturer of the commodity affected by the standard.

Mr. Wilging, being responsible as an employee, the proponent of the standard as chairman of the task group, and an objective member of the committee acting as both judge and jury is neither credible nor tenable. Where is the testing carried on by ASTM referred to by Secretary Romney? Where is the quasi-public institutional guarantee of objectivity so widely proclaimed?

Is testing by a manufacturer what Mr. Munger refers to in the letter cited above when he says:

The granting of such a standard [ASTM D 2949] indicates that this product has undergone the same rigid testing procedure and evaluation by producer, consumer and general interest groups which all thermoplastics piping with an ASTM standard must have endured.

There is not any presently available evidence of any testing or evaluation, rigid, or otherwise, by any consumer or general interest group.

I am also disturbed by the statement in Mr. Munger's letter that PVC thin wall DWV had been assigned an ASTM standard number. While the date of his letter does not appear, it is published in a magazine issue dated March 15, 1971, at a time when the issue of final approval was pending before the ASTM committee on standards. The letter must have been written well in advance of the decision of that committee which was made on April 8, and certainly well in advance of the effective date which was 30 days later.

I am also reliably informed that some industry members have advertised the granting of an ASTM standard for thin wall PVC before the final approval action became effective. Such an example was an advertisement by Genova Products in the March 1971 issue of the Iowa Plumbing, Heating, Cooling Contractor, official publication of the Iowa Association of Plumbing, Heating, Cooling Contractors, Inc., Boone, Iowa.

The premature usage of the ASTM approval was at the least a most serious impropriety. Certainly, if there were any doubt about final approval, members of the ASTM Committee on Standards might think twice about the consequences of a negative decision which would cause embarrassment and perhaps legal expense and trouble for prestigious members of a constituent industry.

The minority report cited above makes much of what may be called Gresham's law of building materials, that is to say, bad materials tend to drive out good materials. I would hope that present HUD policy will not have this effect—I very much fear that it will until some effective method of consumer representation and home buyer representation is provided for within the deliberative councils of ASTM and similar bodies that crank out the standards specifications which in turn become the basis of HUD building code policy. The Congress should, especially in the wake of the recent scandals concerning Federal low- and moderate-income housing—section 235, Housing Act of 1968—give serious consideration to halting the policy which is leading to a proliferation of standards too often accompanied by a resultant and continual downgrading of quality.

Vastly preferable would be the development of impartial and objective performance standards applicable to all new materials without exception. Only when judgments can be made in the total public interest based upon such objective standards will we bring about public respect for Federal codes and standards policy and Federal building materials approval policy. Only then will we bring an end to recriminations between members of competing industries and even within the same industry. Only then will we achieve true protection for the Nation's consumers.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which is designed to correct what is considered to be a very serious deficiency in the federal employees health benefits program. My bill will extend coverage under the program to unmarried children of employees or annuitants regardless of age who are dependent, full-time students.

Under the existing provisions of law, a child of an employee or annuitant is covered provided he is unmarried and under 22 years of age. There is no require-

ment for dependency or for a student relationship.

My bill would not change this provision but would extend coverage to unmarried children 22 years of age or over—actually regardless of age—provided they are full-time students and receive more than half their support from the employee or annuitant.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, it is not unusual today for a child beyond the age of 21 years to be still living at home or attending college and completely dependent upon the parents. Yet, under existing law, the moment that the child becomes age 22, he ceases to be included under the federal employees health benefits program, despite the fact that the parent is still under heavy financial strain not only in supporting the child but in also paying for educational expenses.

It certainly seems incongruous that an unmarried child under age 22 who might not be dependent can be included under the parents health benefits program, while a child 22 years or older who is completely dependent and for whom the parent is under some considerable financial strain in sending to school, is not included. My bill will correct this inequity.

I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is not anticipated that the enactment of my bill would have any significant impact upon premium charges. This is true because children at this age are considered to be premium risks with a relatively low incidence of illness or hospitalization. They are excellent insurance risks.

I am very hopeful that my bill will receive prompt and favorable action by the committee as it considers amendments to the Federal Employees Health Benefits program this year.

THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE, FLEXIBLE, AND RESPONSIVE MANPOWER PROGRAM

(Mr. ESCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, virtually all authorities in the field of manpower training will stipulate that the Nation's manpower programs urgently need overhauling, and while there is less unanimity upon details there is wide agreement on basic principles: the existing programs must be combined to create a flexible system responsive to local conditions and capable of delivering a package of services tailored to the individual needs of unemployed and underemployed persons.

In a paper prepared for the National Conference on State and Local Manpower Policy Planning, on April 30, 1971, two recognized authorities in this field, Sar A. Levitan and Robert Taggart III, of the Center for Manpower Policy Studies of the George Washington University skillfully summarized problems with the existing programs in a section entitled "The Need for Action." They said, in part:

> The need to overhaul and reform our manpower efforts is generally recognized. . . . there is widespread agreement that the manpower effort falls far short of accomplishing what it could and should. . . . Because services are fragmented and frequently uncoordinated, clients are often unable to find the assistance they need. Some of these difficulties are the inevitable result of designing and implementing experimental social programs, but many problems result from the underlying philosophy of the manpower efforts—the centralization of authority at the Federal level . . . Funding comes with many strings attached, and the operating agencies have little flexibility. Centralized administration has too often resulted in the Procrustian solution of forcing all local efforts into rigid programmatic forms.

I believe that the manpower special revenue sharing proposal embodied in H.R. 8141, which I have introduced today would bring the reform of our manpower delivery system which is so urgently needed. It may be argued that the proposal has not had formal hearings before our committee and therefore is not sufficiently well understood to serve as a substitute for the committee-reported bill. This is a shallow argument that will not stand up. During the hearings on H.R. 3613 there was a full and complete review of the major issues involved in manpower special revenue sharing, including a full presentation by Secretary Hodgson and his associates.

From the very first hearing of the Select Subcommittee on Labor in which the witnesses were Governor Rampton of Utah and Governor Love of Colorado, the principles of special revenue sharing were discussed.

The desirability of program flexibility was underscored in the following exchange with Governors Love and Rampton and myself:

> Mr. ESCH. Let's go on to another area. We have talked from the standpoint of allowing flexibility within your state. Maybe both the gentlemen could respond to this.
>
> Do you see that one of the real desirable features of any program would be allowed as much flexibility so that the administrator, in this case the Governors, could be allowed an opportunity to make decisions on where the programs were most needed within their state? Would you want to concur with that, or what do you think about the flexibility of the system?
>
> Governor LOVE. If I may, I am strongly in favor of it. I think that one of the areas in which the proliferation of programs has been most apparent to the present Federal system of categorical grants has been in manpower training programs. Obviously we deal with this problem from perhaps different viewpoints, different angles, but small differences, whether we are talking about the programs that are run through our welfare, through our vocational schools, through the Manpower Development Training Act, through all the others.
>
> It is, of course, obvious that the situation in Denver is different from that, say, in Seattle. It seems obvious to me that those of us there at the local level are in a much better position to determine what kind of jobs, what kind of training, what kind of program will meet the particular problems that exist there. So I would strongly urge, to the extent possible, that as much flexibility and local control be built into any program that is developed here.
>
> Mr. ESCH. Would you want to respond to that, Governor Rampton?
>
> Governor RAMPTON. John and I don't always disagree. I think we are in agreement with that. Generally we see problems eye to eye.
>
> Mr. ESCH. So if we could develop a system which would allow maximum flexibility in the states, you would agree with this?
>
> Governor RAMPTON. Yes.

Governor Rampton expressed some reservations about too little Federal direction and then was asked by Congressman STEIGER, of Wisconsin:

> If you had a choice between a single purpose categorical grant program, the public service employment on top of everything else, or a comprehensive manpower bill decategorized and decentralized that included a public service component, which one would you choose?
>
> Governor RAMPTON. I think I would choose the latter.
>
> Mr. STEIGER. Governor Love?
>
> Governor LOVE. I don't have the reservations that Governor Rampton does. I think that the categorical grants, particularly I think manpower training has been one of the examples that has been used more often of the overlapping, duplicating, proliferation of programs in this area. I think that the categorical grants make it almost impossible to meet a reasonable series of priorities at the state and local level where I think they should be met.

Similarly, many of the issues in manpower special revenue sharing were raised at another hearing with a panel of mayors, and of course there was a very complete exposition of the specific details of H.R. 6181 in the course of Secretary Hodgson's testimony.

There is an even more pertinent reason for congressional familiarity with these issues: they are are the same points which were extensively discussed over the past 18 months in connection with the President's earlier proposal for comprehensive manpower legislation and the subsequent passage by the House of H.R. 19519 which involved major elements of the President's proposal as well as a transitional public service employment program. Unfortunately, that legislation was so altered by the other body and in the Committee of Conference that the President was constrained to veto the bill—which was sustained in the other body.

The legislation I am proposing as a substitute for the committee bill would fundamentally reform our manpower programs to meet the needs of the individual jobseeker across the Nation, while at the same time permitting a far more generous and far more flexible public service employment component at the discretion of State and local governments.

It would consolidate a dozen narrowly categorical training programs into a single, flexible authorization; it would decentralized the administration of these programs to States and major urban units of local government—with the result that instead of 10,000 separate contracts made by the Department of Labor with all sorts of public and private agencies, there would be about 350 sponsors running closely coordinated programs responsive to local needs. Rather than the burdensome procedure at the Federal level of detailed supervision and approval by the Secretary of Labor, there would be full public disclosure of every aspect of the operation of these 350 State and local governmental sponsors—with adequate Federal fiscal audit. This would free a host of experts in the Department of Labor to be available for technical as-

sistance at the request of program sponsors. In my view it is absolutely essential that we find ways to blend Federal expertise with State and local decisionmaking and free Federal officers so they can exercise more creativity.

Title II of the Esch substitute gives emphasis to those areas where Federal leaderdship is urgently needed, such as conducting basic research and demonstration projects in the manpower field, the development of a comprehensive system of labor market information on a national, State, local, or other appropriate basis, and the establishment and operation of a national computerized job bank program. Such long overdue Federal initiatives are another strong argument in favor of my substitute to the very narrow committee-reported bill.

Oddly, perhaps, considering the expressed concern of the majority of the committee for public service employment to the exclusion of all else, the Esch substitute would provide a larger initial authorization, and a more useful continuing authorization available for public service employment.

Upon enactment, it would authorize the appropriation for this fiscal year of an amount up to $500 million—any part or all of which could be used for public service employment in areas of high unemployment. This additional amount would be triggered in any fiscal year in which the national rate of unemployment equals or exceeds 4.5 percent for 3 consecutive months. But unlike the committee bill, my proposal does not rest mainly upon a national trigger device, which is a major fallacy of the committee-reported bill. While unemployment is a national concern, by its very nature, it is a local problem—with local pockets of high unemployment even in the healthiest of national economies. Accordingly, programs for meeting these needs must be localized, which is precisely what this proposal does. Beginning January 1, 1972—in addition to the immediate authorization of $500 million described above—my bill would authorize annual appropriations of whatever sums are needed to carry out effective manpower programs—for which the President is prepared to request $2 billion for the first full year. Eighty-five percent of these funds would be allotted to States and localities on a formula having State and local unemployment rates as a key element, so that areas experiencing high unemployment automatically would receive a larger share of funds. No trigger of any kind—national or local—would be necessary to initiate these funds, that could be used for a flexible mix of programs—specifically including public service employment—designed by State and local governments to meet the particular manpower needs in their respective areas.

The committee-reported bill, in sharp contrast, would authorize only $200 million for this fiscal year. Moreover, while the committee bill would authorize $750 million for fiscal 1972 and $1 billion for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years for public service employment, the authorization depends upon a national trigger mechanism of 3 consecutive months of unemployment at or above the 4.5 percent level, and the funds might never be triggered on, or having been triggered on, might be triggered off again by 3 consecutive months in which the unemployment rate did not reach 4.5 percent.

Recognizing the defectiveness and uncertainty of this device, the majority of the committee added an additional $250 million Treasury fund, not dependent upon any trigger device, for use in areas where the unemployment rate equals or exceeds 6 percent. Therefore, it may well be that all that would be authorized for appropriation for public service employment in the years following fiscal 1971 would be that $250 million fund under section 6 of the bill. I cannot overemphasize the fact that the Esch substitute provides a far more certain method of meeting needs in pockets of high unemployment as well as a more generous level of support than does the committee bill.

A fair reading of the hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Labor will support the conclusion that this proposal is precisely the program which the governors and mayors of both parties—to say nothing of the unemployed—both want and need—and this Congress now has the opportunity to make this valuable device available to them with all possible speed and the assurance of ultimate approval.

The obvious advantage of this proposal is that it would permit different States and localities—faced with widely different job markets and training requirements—to tailormake a comprehensive manpower program to those local needs and to revise it as the needs change. In effect, if public service employment proved to be the best or only way a particular State or locality felt it could meet its unemployment problem it could utilize all of its funds for that purpose.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ISSUE

It is my firm conviction that public service employment should be one of many options available to serve unemployed and underemployed individuals. But I feel quite strongly that public service employment should be of limited duration, just as assistance to individuals in regular training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act has been for a limited period. Otherwise we are not dealing with manpower training and programs related to training objectives, but with a Federal subsidization of a particular category of permanent employment in units of State and local government. That is a completely different proposition which is not addressed to the problems of those who find themselves temporarily unemployed and need help—or to those who are underemployed because of inadequate skills—but rather to the needs of persons who are essentially unemployable for other reasons. These kinds of problems could more appropriately be dealt with through a reformed welfare system—or through legislation not related to manpower training.

I would like to note that the Committee on Ways and Means, in connection with its consideration of the administration's proposal for a Family Assistance Plan, has tentatively agreed to fund 200,000 public service jobs, at an estimated annual cost of $800 million, for welfare recipients. This may shortly be before the full House.

Accordingly, this proposal would keep the public service employment component directly related to the goals of manpower training. It would authorize transitional public service employment which will encourage persons so employed to be moved into regular jobs provided by either public or private employers; payments to any individual under any type of program authorized under the act would be limited to 104 weeks. However, the Secretary of Labor would be authorized—at the request of a program sponsor—to waive the requirement where it would create undue hardship.

Clearly, the Esch substitute recognizes that periods of relatively high unemployment require a reassessment of manpower training policies which were geared to tight labor markets, and that we do need tools such as public service employment in order to permit a flexible response to changing conditions. However, it also recognizes that high unemployment is a spotty condition which will tend to become more so as we successfully move away from the war economy of the sixties to the peace economy of the 1970's. Even then there will be spots of high unemployment, sometimes within a State enjoying virtually full employment; just as today there are tight labor market areas. It is for these very obvious reasons that I have stressed the need to respond to local conditions which cannot be fully predicted using national indexes. The approach taken by the committee bill is not only inadequate in terms of overall manpower policy, but it is also wooden and unimaginative as a response to local needs.

I believe that the majority on the committee, however well intentioned, have misdirected their efforts with this bill. As an instrument to help relieve temporary unemployment it would affect at most about 150,000 of the Nation's 4.8 million unemployed. Manpower revenue sharing would have a much greater impact—and with changes I am proposing, just as immediate an impact—while at the same time reforming our total manpower training program so as to make it far more effective in serving the unemployed.

The only other argument for the committee reported bill advanced by the majority is that there are thousands of jobs which could be filled by persons doing useful work at the State and local level but which are not filled for lack of funds. Yet presumably this condition exists completely independently of rates of unemployment which at either national or local levels would trigger assistance under this bill. Indeed, the triggering on and off of funds under the committee bill would very likely prevent—or at any rate seriously impede—the use of these funds by any State or locality to meet continuing public needs. By contrast, under the program I propose there could be assured a continuity to the public service segment which would permit its utilization in a constructive way.

Actually, if the committee bill were enacted and fully funded it would result

in an increase of only 0.3 percent in Federal, State and local funds which flow into public services. H.R. 3613 simply does not measure up as an effective instrument for dealing with either the problems of unemployment or the need for expanded public services. Undoubtedly there are better ways than through manpower programs to meet these needs. One which has been suggested by President Nixon is general revenue sharing. I fervently hope it will be given serious attention by the Congress.

OTHER DEFECTS IN THE COMMITTEE BILL

There are numerous problems, in my judgment, with the committee bill and we attempted to correct several major ones in the committee. I favored a more effective trigger mechanism, for example, which would have made $600 million available for public service employment without regard to national unemployment rates, to be utilized in areas having high unemployment. I still feel that the "trigger" retained in the committee bill is a cumbersome, uncertain device not calculated to be responsive to local needs.

Another major difficulty is the attempt throughout the bill to equate persons hired on programs under this bill in every way with regular State and local public employees, most of whom are under a competitive civil service system. Indeed, this bill strikes directly at such systems. I am sensitive to the fact that unjustified or unreasonable civil service requirements may be a bar to the employment particularly of persons sought to be helped in this legislation, but I doubt the wisdom of approaching that problem through this legislation, particularly at a time when there already are serious jurisdictional problems with regard to the representation of public employees. While I certainly would not argue that persons hired under this authority should have working conditions less favorable than regular public employees, in my view the committee bill goes too far. In fact, considering that the program might be triggered out of existence at any time I am dubious that assurances of equal treatment between these employees and regular employees could be carried out. In any event, these provisions raise serious questions which received far less than adequate attention in the committee.

Additionally, the failure to adopt an amendment limiting individual benefits under this bill to 2 years was, in my opinion, a serious error, particularly in view of the fact that our amendment would have empowered the Secretary of Labor to waive the requirement in circumstances where it would create a particular hardship. What the committee bill tends to do is to assure that only a very small fraction of the unemployed would be given public service jobs, and then to permit that small fraction to monopolize the available places. The possible use of this to reward political supporters while excluding other unemployed persons from an opportunity for public service employment is so obvious it scarcely requires comment.

MEETING THE REAL NEEDS

The President's manpower special revenue-sharing proposal is addressed to long range and continuing manpower needs. While the reform of our delivery system for manpower services is in itself badly needed in order to more effectively serve those in need of such services, I recognize the special requirements created by relatively high rates of unemployment. As stated, I have amended the President's proposal as embodied in H.R. 6181 to trigger immediately an amount up to $500 million in any fiscal year in which the national rate of unemployment equals or exceeds 4.5 percent for 3 consecutive months. These additional funds would be utilized in areas of high unemployment to supplement the full range of programs and services, including public service employment. Beginning January 1, 1972, the entire reform of the manpower program would go into effect and State and local governments could determine their programs as dictated by their needs. In my judgment, it is a complete mistake to view public service employment as the only answer to special needs in areas of high unemployment. It is one of several needed tools, all of which should be available.

One of the critical problems today is the high rate of unemployment amongst veterans returning from Southeast Asia. An amendment I offered to the committee bill which the majority accepted was one to give preference to veterans who served in the Armed Forces in Southeast Asia after August 4, 1964. However, in the committee bill this applies only to public service employment. I propose to amend the manpower revenue-sharing bill in the same way, except that the preference for placement will extend to the full range of training and retraining—which is the only way to meet the real needs of returning veterans.

Another change I would make in the President's proposal as originally introduced is to charge the State in each instance with the responsibility of working out a system to insure coordination between the States and local governmental programs and to facilitate the integration into the programs of a wide variety of State services. This will further strengthen the legislation.

Finally, I have provided for retaining the Job Corps as a national program, pending a more thorough study of alternatives by our committee. I do not feel that the administration's proposal to repeal the Job Corps authority and fold it into State and local programs has had sufficient study to merit its retention in the substitute bill.

For the reasons I have cited, I feel the proposed substitute for the committee-reported bill is at least as well as and probably better understood. Further, it would be a far more effective and responsive instrument that would bring about the urgently needed and fundamental reform of our total manpower training and development effort. I urge my colleagues to support it—for it is a proposal that meets the challenge we have before us.

FOREIGN DEBT AND THE DOLLAR CRISIS IN EUROPE

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. dollar is under attack in Europe by the rush of speculators to buy foreign currencies, especially the German mark. The fact is there are just too many dollars floating around Europe, and central banks are being forced to buy too many of them to keep the value of their own local currencies stable.

This international monetary crisis could have an effect of devaluing the dollar if proper action is not taken. Imported goods will cost more in the United States adding to our already serious inflation. At the same time, U.S. export prices and earnings will decline. It has been suggested that the United States could help to ease the crisis by absorbing excessive European holdings of dollars.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we should and can absorb them. I would urge those European nations that owe us money to pay some of the debts they owe us, especially those that are delinquent. These debts run into billions of dollars. Members of the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee—of which I have the honor to be chairman—have repeatedly asked the State Department and U.S. Treasury to step up their collection efforts. If there ever was a time to do this, it is right now. I hope every Member of Congress will join us in this demand.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a tabulation pertinent to this subject:

U.S. GOVERNMENT LONG-TERM LOANS AND CREDITS TO EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, AMOUNTS OUTSTANDING

[In dollars or dollar equivalents]

	Active foreign credits, principal outstanding, June 30, 1970	World War I debts, principal and interest outstanding, Dec. 31, 1970
Austria	35,423,452	26,024,540
Belgium	59,391,851	715,637,078
Denmark	26,998,584	
Finland	58,540,470	3,897,000
France	313,339,446	7,312,866,931
Germany	19,559,450	1,615,757,560
Greece	200,064,085	33,152,180
Iceland	29,129,021	
Ireland	119,054,184	
Italy	261,390,862	2,336,173,159
Luxembourg	1,766,200	
Netherlands		
Norway	19,076,880	
Portugal	78,554,085	
Spain	557,396,760	
Sweden	12,459,537	
Switzerland		
United Kingdom	4,279,173,338	10,289,109,302
Yugoslavia	611,419,582	94,463,281
Czechoslovakia	4,869,868	292,053,224
Estonia		39,663,746
Hungary	2,810,374	4,433,377
Latvia		16,215,038
Lithuania		14,561,108
Poland	92,936,424	489,221,134
Rumania	10,919,875	121,182,768
Soviet Union	162,342,304	693,645,892

TEXTILE IMPORTS PROBLEM

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a press release which has just been issued by the Department of Commerce on the subject of textile imports. Figures contained in that release are shocking and emphasize more clearly than any arguments that could be made the magnitude of this problem and the cost to our country of the failure last year by the other body to accept the legislation so carefully put together by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House.

Mr. Speaker, imports of manmade fiber textiles in the month of March alone, 1 month—March alone of this year—amounted to a record level of 386 million yards, and during the first quarter of this year reached 1 billion square yards equivalent. I would point out that during the same period of 1970 these imports amounted to only 550 million yards. This is an increase of 100 percent in just 1 year.

As you would expect, Mr. Speaker, Japan is the major contributor to this flood of imports. During the first quarter of 1971 we imported almost 300 million yards from Japan as compared with last year when imports in the first quarter from Japan amounted to 164 million yards. Mr. Speaker, imports from Japan for the 12 months ending March 31, 1971, in manmade fiber textiles amounted to 900 million yards with imports from all countries amounting to 3.2 billion yards.

But we must not lose sight of other principal suppliers of these products. Imports of textiles from Nationalist China amounted to 417 million yards for the 12 months ending March of 1971, to 300 million yards from Korea, and to 200 million yards from Hong Kong. It is well known that these countries have concentrated very heavily on exports of the most labor intensive items and that this continuous and shocking growth of imports is having a major effect on the job opportunities for our own textile and apparel workers.

The President has said that he strongly supports the textile quota provisions passed by the House in the last session. The wisdom of his position is made clear by the figures released today by the Department of Commerce. No one can challenge the existence of an unrestrained flood of textile and apparel imports into this country, and only a blind man can fail to see the impact these have on our industry and workers. Mr. Speaker, action is required promptly to stem this relentless tide before it completely engulfs the domestic textile industry. Unless curbed, this ever-increasing flood of imports will either drive our textile industry out of business or abroad—and the ones who will suffer most are the millions of workers who derive a livelihood from the textile and apparel industries of this country. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to report out quota legislation so we can save the domestic textile industry before it is too late.

I include the text of the Department of Commerce release as a part of these remarks and commend its contents to my colleagues for their very serious consideration:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NEWS RELEASE, DATED MAY 6, 1971

The Department of Commerce today released data on imports of man-made fiber, cotton and wool textile manufactures during the month of March 1971.

Man-made fiber, cotton and wool textile imports in March reached an all-time high, totaling 523 million equivalent square yards. These imports were 21% higher than in the previous month; 43% above the level for March a year ago; and 15% above the previous record set in January 1971. The cumulative total of these imports for the first quarter of this year was 1,407 million square yards, 38% higher than in the same period of 1970.

In the first quarter of 1971, the value of imports of all three fibers totalled $542 million compared with exports valued at $171 million. The trade deficit of $371 million compares with $246 million in the same period of 1970 when imports were valued $419 million and exports at $173 million.

Imports of yarn in the three-month period of 1971 were 110% higher than the same period last year. Apparel imports were 29% higher; fabric imports were 15% higher; and imports of made-up and miscellaneous goods increased 3%.

Imports of these textiles from Japan, Hong Kong, and the Republics of China and Korea were 37% higher than in the first quarter of 1970 and represented 57% of total imports.

March 1971 imports of *man-made fiber textiles* reached a new record level of 386 equivalent square yards, 89% higher than in the same month of 1970, 30% above the February 1971 level, and 23% above the former record level of January 1971.

The value of man-made fiber textile imports for the first three months of 1971 was $341 million and exports were valued at $99 million. The net trade deficit of $242 million compares with $110 million for the same period of 1970 when imports were valued at $206 million and exports at $95 million.

Imports of *cotton textiles* in March 1971 totalled 126 million square yards. This total is 1% higher than in the previous month but 15% under the level of March 1970. Total cotton textile imports in the first quarter of 1971 were 383 million square yards, 11% less than in the same period of 1970. Imports of yarns, fabrics, and made-up and miscellaneous goods declined while apparel imports increased.

The value of cotton textile imports for the first quarter of 1971 was $146 million compared with $143 million in the first quarter of 1970. The value of exports declined to $70 million from $75 million of the same period of 1970. The trade deficit of $76 million compares with $68 million for the same period of 1970.

Wool textile imports in March were 10 million equivalent square yards, 29% above the level of February 1971 but 22% below the level of March 1970. In the first quarter of 1971, these imports totalled 27 million square yards, 25% less than in the same period of 1970.

Wool textile imports during the first three months of 1971 were valued at $56 million compared with $71 million in the same period of 1970. Exports declined from $3 million in 1970 to slightly less than that figure this year and the net trade deficit declined from $68 million in January–March 1970 to $53 million in the same period this year.

Tables of detailed statistics on imports, exports and trade balances of man-made fiber, cotton and wool textiles are attached.

U.S. GENERAL IMPORTS OF COTTON, WOOL, AND MANMADE FIBER MANUFACTURES

[Million equivalent square yards]

	Net quantity						
	March		January–March		Calendar year		
	1970	1971	1970	1971	1970	1969	1964
THREE FIBERS							
Total trade	366.5	522.6	1,020.8	1,407.3	4,455.0	3,625.9	1,523.5
Yarns	82.4	176.7	202.8	426.3	1,126.0	533.6	159.9
Fabrics	105.4	123.1	310.5	356.2	1,179.8	1,140.8	592.4
Apparel	138.3	182.0	398.1	512.3	1,684.1	1,520.0	560.7
Made-up and miscellaneous	40.5	40.9	109.5	112.4	465.1	431.5	210.6
LEADING COUNTRIES							
Japan	103.2	140.4	281.4	388.5	1,152.4	1,042.7	531.0
Hong Kong	53.4	48.2	148.0	146.3	591.6	590.8	286.3
Republic of China	26.5	59.7	91.3	160.5	418.5	301.7	61.3
Republic of Korea	24.6	38.1	65.7	109.4	300.1	252.7	36.4
MANMADE FIBER							
Total trade	204.8	386.3	554.2	998.0	2,751.5	1,782.6	328.4
Yarns	69.7	166.6	167.0	400.3	1,007.8	385.7	65.0
Fabrics	38.6	75.1	109.2	204.9	506.5	392.1	122.7
Apparel	87.9	131.9	253.7	362.2	1,131.7	914.8	92.1
Made-up and miscellaneous	8.6	12.8	24.4	30.6	105.5	90.0	48.6

	Net quantity						
	March		January–March		Calendar year		
	1970	1971	1970	1971	1970	1969	1964
COTTON							
Total trade	148.7	126.2	431.1	382.8	1,535.3	1,651.9	1,057.5
Yarns	10.7	8.3	29.5	21.5	95.9	124.3	73.5
Fabrics	60.1	44.2	185.6	142.0	624.2	685.2	422.0
Apparel	47.5	47.5	135.5	142.3	476.3	524.5	414.6
Made-up and miscellaneous	30.4	26.2	80.6	76.9	338.9	317.9	146.9
WOOL							
Total trade	13.0	10.1	35.5	26.5	168.2	191.4	137.7
Yarns	2.0	1.8	6.2	4.5	22.3	23.6	20.9
Fabrics	6.7	3.8	15.8	9.3	49.0	63.5	47.6
Apparel	2.9	2.6	8.9	7.8	76.1	80.8	53.9
Made-up and miscellaneous	1.5	1.9	4.5	4.9	20.8	23.6	15.2

TEXTILE MANUFACTURES: U.S. GENERAL IMPORTS, EXPORTS, AND BALANCE OF TRADE, JANUARY–MARCH 1970 AND 1971

[In millions of dollars]

	Imports		Exports		Trade balance	
	1971	1970	1971	1970	1971	1970
Man-made fiber	340.9	205.5	98.8	95.3	−242.1	−110.2
Cotton	145.9	142.9	69.7	74.8	−76.2	−68.1
Wool	55.5	70.8	2.7	3.0	−52.8	−67.8
Total, above	542.3	419.2	171.2	173.1	−371.1	−246.1
Other textiles	83.9	102.4	19.0	17.1	−64.9	−85.3
Total, all textiles [1]	626.2	512.6	190.2	190.2	−436.0	−331.4

[1] Excludes man-made fiber filaments, linoleum, rubber and leather apparel, and clothing donated for charity.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NEWS RELEASE, DATED MAY 6, 1971

The Department of Commerce today released data on imports of man-made fiber, cotton and wool textile manufactures during the month of March 1971.

Man-made fiber, cotton and wool textile imports in March reached an all-time high, totaling 523 million equivalent square yards. These imports were 21% higher than in the previous month; 43% above the level for March a year ago; and 15% above the previous record set in January 1971. The cumulative total of these imports for the first quarter of this year was 1,407 million square yards, 38% higher than in the same period of 1970.

In the first quarter of 1971, the value of imports of all three fibers totaled $542 million compared with exports valued at $171 million. The trade deficit of $371 million compares with $246 million in the same period of 1970 when imports were valued $419 million and exports at $173 million.

Imports of yarn in the three-month period of 1971 were 110% higher than the same period last year. Apparel imports were 29% higher; fabric imports were 15% higher; and imports of made-up and miscellaneous goods increased 3%.

Imports of these textiles from Japan, Hong Kong, and the Republics of China and Korea were 37% higher than in the first quarter of 1970 and represented 57% of total imports.

March 1971 imports of man-made fiber textiles reached a new record level of 386 equivalent square yards, 89% higher than in the same month of 1970, 30% above the February 1971 level, and 23% above the former record level of January 1971.

The value of man-made fiber textile imports for the first three months of 1971 was $341 million and exports were valued at $99 million. The net trade deficit of $242 million compares with $110 million for the same period of 1970 when imports were valued at $206 million and exports at $95 million.

Imports of cotton textiles in March 1971 totalled 126 million square yards. This total is 1% higher than in the previous month but 15% under the level of March 1970. Total cotton textile imports in the first quarter of 1971 were 383 million square yards, 11% less than in the same period of 1970. Imports of yarns, fabrics, and made-up and miscellaneous goods declined while apparel imports increased.

The value of cotton textile imports for the first quarter of 1971 was $146 million compared with $143 million in the first quarter of 1970. The value of exports declined to $70 million from $75 million of the same period of 1970. The trade deficit of $76 million compares with $68 million for the same period of 1970.

Wool textile imports in March were 10 million equivalent square yards, 29% above the level of February 1971 but 22% below the level of March 1970. In the first quarter of 1971, these imports totalled 27 million square yards, 25% less than in the same period in 1970.

Wool textile imports during the first three months of 1971 were valued at $56 million compared with $71 million in the same period of 1970. Exports declined from $3 million in 1970 to slightly less than that figure this year and the net trade deficit declined from $68 million in January-March 1970 to $53 million in the same period this year.

Tables of detailed statistics on imports, exports and trade balances of man-made fiber, cotton and wool textiles are attached.

U.S. GENERAL IMPORTS OF COTTON, WOOL, AND MAN-MADE FIBER MANUFACTURES

[Million equivalent square yards]

	Net quantity						
	March		January–March		Calendar year		
	1970	1971	1970	1971	1970	1969	1964
3 FIBERS							
Total trade	366.5	522.6	1,020.8	1,407.3	4,455.0	3,625.9	1,523.5
Yarns	82.4	176.7	202.8	426.3	1,126.0	533.6	159.9
Fabrics	105.4	123.1	310.5	356.2	1,179.8	1,140.8	592.4
Apparel	138.3	182.0	398.1	512.3	1,684.1	1,520.0	560.7
Made-up and miscellaneous	40.5	40.9	109.5	112.4	465.1	431.5	210.6
LEADING COUNTRIES							
Japan	103.2	140.4	281.4	388.5	1,152.4	1,042.7	531.0
Hong Kong	53.4	48.2	148.0	146.3	591.6	590.8	286.3
Republic of China	26.5	59.7	91.3	160.5	418.5	301.7	61.3
Republic of Korea	24.6	38.1	65.7	109.4	300.1	252.7	36.4
MAN-MADE FIBER							
Total trade	204.8	386.3	554.2	998.0	2,751.5	1,782.6	328.4
Yarns	69.7	166.6	167.0	400.3	1,007.8	385.7	65.0
Fabrics	38.6	75.1	109.2	204.9	506.5	392.1	122.7
Apparel	87.9	131.9	253.7	362.2	1,131.7	914.8	92.1
Made-up and miscellaneous	8.6	12.8	24.4	30.6	105.5	90.0	48.6
COTTON							
Total trade	148.7	126.2	431.1	382.8	1,535.3	1,651.9	1,057.5
Yarns	10.7	8.3	29.5	21.5	95.9	124.3	73.5
Fabrics	60.1	44.2	185.6	142.0	624.2	685.2	422.0
Apparel	47.5	47.5	135.5	142.3	476.3	524.5	414.6
Made-up and miscellaneous	30.4	26.2	80.6	76.9	338.9	317.9	146.9
WOOL							
Total trade	13.0	10.1	35.5	26.5	168.2	191.4	137.7
Yarns	2.0	1.8	6.2	4.5	22.3	23.6	20.9
Fabrics	6.7	3.8	15.8	9.3	49.0	63.5	47.6
Apparel	2.9	2.6	8.9	7.8	76.1	80.8	53.9
Made-up and miscellaneous	1.5	1.9	4.5	4.9	20.8	23.6	15.2

TEXTILE MANUFACTURES: U.S. GENERAL IMPORTS, EXPORTS, AND BALANCE OF TRADE, JANUARY–MARCH 1970 AND 1971

[In millions of dollars]

	Imports		Exports		Trade balance	
	1971	1970	1971	1970	1971	1970
Man-made fiber	340.9	205.5	98.8	95.3	−242.1	−110.2
Cotton	145.9	142.9	69.7	74.8	−76.2	−68.1
Wool	55.5	70.8	2.7	3.0	−52.8	−67.8
Total, above	542.3	419.2	171.2	173.1	−371.1	−246.1
Other textiles	83.9	102.4	19.0	17.1	−64.9	−85.3
Total, all textiles [1]	626.2	521.6	190.2	190.2	−436.0	−331.4

[1] Excludes man-made fiber filaments, linoleum, rubber and leather apparel, and clothing donated for charity.

LET THE BLIPS FALL WHERE THEY MAY

(Mr. MIZELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, in the March 6, 1971, edition of the Washington Post, there appeared on page 1 a story I believe will be of interest to my colleagues.

As a part of the Post's American Diary series, reporter Haynes Johnson wrote a story featuring residents of Tobaccoville, N.C., and their views of the ban on cigarette commercials on radio and television.

I strongly opposed the imposition of that ban, as did several of my distinguished colleagues in this House, but our efforts to prevent that imposition were, unfortunately, unsuccessful.

But we, like the people mentioned in Mr. Johnson's article, have resigned ourselves to abide by this prohibition, despite the injury it is certain to inflict on both the tobacco and broadcasting industries.

But the problem seems now to have gone beyond a basic question of whether an entire industry's rights have been violated. The question is whether arbitrary bureaucratic power has forced the fair name of Winston-Salem, N.C., to be forever banished from the Nation's airwaves.

On February 20 of this year, the American Broadcasting Co. televised final-round action of the Winston-Salem Bowling Classic, a segment of the professional bowlers tour.

During the course of that broadcast, a conscious effort was made by the sports commentators to avoid mentioning the name of the city in which the tournament was being held, for fear of giving an inadvertent "plug" to two well-known cigarette brands, and thus offending the FCC.

Great verbal dexterity was applied to that task, as viewers were exposed to every synonym for the city ever spoken or written. Announcer Chris Schenkel extolled the charm of "the Moravian settlement" in the heart of "the rolling hills of North Carolina."

Mr. Speaker, the city of Winston-Salem existed long before the birth of R. J. Reynolds, who founded a tobacco company there. The city of Winston-Salem was thriving long before the first Winston cigarette tasted good, like a cigarette should, long before the American people were forced to decide whether they wanted good grammar or good taste.

And the city had stood even longer when Salem cigarettes were introduced, when nationwide distribution took Salem out of the country but failed to take the country out of Salem.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, things have gotten out of hand. Can bowlers on televised events never again score a "lucky strike"? Can Willie Mays never hit another "home run" on TV without being called on the carpet by the FCC? If that is the case, I wish I was still pitching against him.

Can David Susskind or William F. Buckley never again say "that's true" without being accused of a double entendre? Will the thousands of honest American citizens named Phillip Morris and Herbert Tareyton be prohibited from appearing on television or addressed on radio?

Will we never again hear of Pall Mall, Tenn., the home of one of America's greatest heroes, Sgt. Alvin C. York of World War I fame?

If this is the plan of the FCC's new "blip doctrine," let it be applied evenly throughout the land. Let the blips fall where they may.

If Winston-Salem is to be excluded from future broadcasts, at least 37 other cities in America must also go unmentioned, since they have names like Kent, Salem, Marlboro, Newport, Belair, and Pall Mall.

Written requests for clarification of this whole situation have been sent to the FCC by the editor-publisher of the Pulitzer Prize-winning Winston-Salem Journal and Sentinel, and by the president of WSJS-TV in Winston-Salem.

The FCC has replied that "the Federal Government will apply the law reasonably," that it will observe the spirit as well as the letter of the law, and that it will instruct broadcasters to do the same.

This action, they say, will guarantee that Winston-Salem, N.C., is not "blipped into oblivion." I view this action with some relief, but some apprehension will remain until the fruits of this directive are borne on subsequent telecasts.

An excellent test of the blip doctrine will come on August 6, with the running of the Winston-Salem 250 auto race, a televised segment of the grand national auto circuit.

Whatever their response, I can only counsel the FCC, as Polonius advised Hamlet:

To thine own self be "blip."

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the Mizell Dictionary of Banned Lingo In Public Performances (BLIPP) as a guide for my colleagues on future broadcasts. I would like permission to enter the text of Mr. Johnson's article in the Post, and a related news article and editorial from the Winson-Salem Journal.

The material follows:

MIZELL'S DICTIONARY OF BANNED LINGO IN PUBLIC PERFORMANCES (BLIPP)

(A compendium of cigarette brand names, and their various usages, with certain appropriate substitutions to placate the Federal Communications Commission.)

Alpine—The unmentionable name of cities in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Idaho, New Jersey, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas and Utah; try Alpigene or Montiform.

Belair—The unacceptable name of cities in Florida, Maryland, Ohio and Texas, with varied spelling. If it must be used, spell it out on the air.

Benson & Hedges—If there is a law firm like this in your district, refer to it as Hedges and Benson. But don't count on Benson to vote for you anymore.

Camel—Lawrence of Arabia will never make it to the small screen. If you must refer to the animal in conversation, say Dromedary or Bactrian, depending on the number of humps.

Half & Half—Use instead "six of one, half a dozen of the other."

Home Run—Try four-bagger, circuit clout, or ask Hank Aaron. Better yet, ask Howard Cosell.

Kent—The soon-to-be-forgotten name of cities in New York, Ohio and Washington, with variants in Louisiana, Maine, Indiana and Maryland.

L&M—If you're scheduled to appear on Sesame Street and recite the alphabet, skip the middle part.

Lucky Strike—Avoid interviews with Don Carter, or, if forced into it, take along Howard Cosell.

Marlboro—The verboten name of cities in Massachusetts, New York, New Hampshire and Maryland.

Newport—The nixed name of cities in Arkansas, Kentucky, Rhode Island, with variations in Virginia and Vermont.

Old Gold—If used in slang for a family of established wealth, use instead *vieux riche*.

Pall Mall—The non-referrable name of the Tennessee home of America's greatest World War I hero, the late Sgt. Alvin C. York.

Parliament—Be specific: House of Lords or House of Commons.

Raleigh—Use instead "the Capitol of North Carolina" or "the very good friend of Elizabeth I."

Salem—The unairable name of cities in Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Virginia and West Virginia; with variations in North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

Spring—Try something like "Soon after the vernal equinox," a young man's fancy turns, etc.

Virginia Slims—Try Minnesota Fats.

Vogue—Use instead "fashion," or subscribe to Harper's Bazaar.

Winston—The "it-goes-without-saying" first half of the name of a beautiful North Carolina city, incomparable British Prime Minister, and a distinguished Vermont Senator.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1971]

TOBACCOVILLE, N.C.: "WE GOT A BUNCH OF QUACKS UP IN WASHINGTON"

(By Haynes Johnson)

TOBACCOVILLE, N.C.—Like many of us, Roger Helsabeck watches television every day and likes what he sees less and less. It isn't the programs, mind you, it's those commercials—or, more specifically the lack of them.

"I don't like it," he says. "They got to runnin' a whole lot of short ads on there. Seems like they picked up more and more of them. They're all the time cuttin' in on the programs."

Then, drawing another deep puff on his cigarette, Helsabeck launched into what really bothers him.

"Biggest damn fool thing I ever heard of cuttin' them tobacco ads off," he says. "Why that's just plumb stupid. If they want to cut something off, cut the liquor ads off. That's where they ought to start. That's where all the trouble is. It ain't in cigarettes."

(Hard liquor is not advertised on TV or radio.)

Helsabeck, a weather-beaten man of 50 with a lined face and a perpetual stoop to his shoulders, has more than casual interest in the question. He's been farming tobacco all his working life back in the pine hills of the Piedmont, north of Winston-Salem, and like others here he's angry. The government has hit him where it hurts most. He's afraid that the government ban on cigarette commercials may put him out of business.

And don't try to tell him cigarettes may be harmful to health. He doesn't believe it.

"I enjoy them," he says, taking another deep puff. "Smoked them all my life. They ain't hurt me. They can't convince me they do you any harm. Liquor and beer cause

more people to die than cigarettes, in my opinion."

"I farmed all my life right here in this neighborhood," said B. M. Kiger, a wiry, sandy-haired man, "but the small farmer, he's getting squeezed out today. Killed two hogs the other day and they wasn't as big as a jackrabbit when we got 'em dressed down, and you take 'em off to the market and get 12 cents a pound for 'em. Now this cigarette thing. My father he smoked 40 years and it didn't kill him—I don't think. Now of course he had a heart condition and he had a stroke, and maybe the doctors know more than I do."

Earl Atkins had another thought. "Those cigarette health studies, they're just a waste of money, if they'd take the money they put out trying to kill the cigarette industry as a whole—well, if they'd put it to beneficial use like helping the poor it would have been worthwhile. But this ain't worth a damn.

"Just like shootin' that man to the moon. Three hundred billion dollars shot up there and it ain't worth a hill of beans. All the scientists want is to shoot them up and keep their jobs.

"And this damn welfare business. Some of these people that loaf around and live off the taxpayer's money, I say if they're able to work, put 'em to work."

Clearly, they think they know where to place the blame for their problems. The federal government.

"I think we got a bunch of quacks up there on the seat in Washington," Atkins said.

They all laughed uproariously. Today, you can hear that kind of bitter remark throughout the rolling Piedmont farmland. "I feel we got some of the biggest crooks in the country in Washington," said N. H. Tuttle, standing in the doorway of his home off a dirt road not far from the few stores that make up the heart of Tobaccoville. "I think they're giving us a dirty deal, that's what I think. I just don't believe they're giving the tobacco men a fair break."

And he said, "Oh man, I reckon there is a strong feeling around here. People around the store and everywhere, you hear lots about it."

They are small farmers and tobacco has been their way of life. Indeed, many of them are second and third generation tobacco farmers ("My grandfather, he raised it, just half a mile from here on the creek," Helsabeck says). Their area is well suited for tobacco raising, and the big market is easily accessible.

They truck the tobacco to Winston-Salem where it goes directly into the cigarettes manufactured by the R. J. Reynolds Co. making Winstons and Salems among them. So far they haven't noticed any drop in their market since cigarette commercials were ordered off the nation's airwaves beginning January 1. But they fear the worst.

Tobacco industry spokesmen say the cigarette commercial ban probably won't affect consumption "greatly". Last year, despite the increasing tempo of the national anti-smoking campaigns, the number of cigarettes produced in the United States rose by 17.4 billion to 575 billion. The amount of cigarettes being exported also increased.

But there are other figures that indicate the long effort to educate the public to the potential dangers of smoking are finally paying off. Five years ago, for instance 51.9 per cent of American men 21 or older smoked cigarettes. Last year, the government estimates, that figure had dropped to 42.2 per cent. For women the comparable figures were 33.7 per cent in 1966 (the year the first health warning on cigarette packages appeared) down to 30.5 per cent last year. The percentages of those smoking both cigars and pipes also had declined in that time.

Those figures offer small comfort to the farmers here. "They done took the freedom away from the people in this town," N. H. Tuttle remarked, spitting in disgust in the dirt.

As for Roger Helsabeck, he isn't about to give up his business or his habit, health or government withstanding. "I enjoy them," he said again, lighting up another cigarette.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Feb. 23, 1971]

NO-NAME, N.C.

All kinds of calamities have befallen the tobacco country in recent years, but who ever thought we would have to get used to living in a town that will now become known as "Blip-Blip"?

As we are beginning to realize, this will be the inevitable result of a law passed by Congress under pressure from Sen. Frank E. Moss of Utah, the leader of the Black Shank conspiracy in Washington.

By that law Congress banned the promotion of cigarettes on television and radio. It so happens that two of the most popular cigarettes are named after our town (although you'd be amazed at the number of outsiders who think it was the other way around). Consequently, any mention of our town on television is likely to result in a double blip, the sound that is made to blot out naughty words.

The dire effects of this dastardly law were brought home to us last week when a national television network broadcast the finals of the Blip-Blip (bowling) Classic. No one mentioned our town, by name, we understand, until sign-off time. The people who thus consigned us to "cities anonymous" were so anxious to avoid any direct reference to the names Blip and Blip that they ordered a reporter to remove a press badge inscribed with the full name of this newspaper.

Moreover, when it came time to present the trophies, the president of the tobacco company sponsoring the event was introduced on television as "William S. Smith Jr.". Everybody in our town knew, of course, that his real name was Prince Albert. But the company was so anxious to stay within the law that it let him assume a most improbable pseudonym for the occasion, and asked him please to refrain from wearing his customary frock coat. He obliged even in that.

Our town, of course, may not be the only victim of the Black Shank conspirators. What of all the other "Winstons" and "Salems" (pardon our failure to blip) scattered around the country? (The Rand McNally atlas lists 25 of the latter.) Isn't it possible that the residents of those towns will feel the sting as much as we? Suppose, for example, that a tornado should level the town of Winston, Missouri. Presumably, the newscaster would have to describe the scene of the disaster as being "somewhere in the Midwest." To his bewildered television audience he might add: "We are not at liberty to publicize the name of this devastated town, but, believe us, it was devastated . . ."

Residents of Marlboro, Conn., Morristown, Ind., or Chesterfield County, S.C., may find themselves victimized in the same way. Mention the town of Upper Marlboro, Md., on television and somebody would assume no doubt that you were talking about a super-super-king-sized cigarette.

Consider, also, the fate of Blip Churchill, the late British statesman and Nobel prize winner. It is not inconceivable that a network might one day do a documentary depicting the life of this great man. Does he get blipped throughout? Or, for that matter, can there be any reference to his equally famous ancestor, the Duke of Marlborough (give that one three blips, please)? Well, we should think not!

What would Sen. Moss say?

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Feb. 24, 1971]

THE BLIP-BLIP CLASSIC REVISITED: WE DO NOT ASK EQUAL TIME—JUST TIME

The Journal and Sentinel urged the Federal Communications Commission last night to keep Winston-Salem from being "blipped into oblivion" on the airwaves.

A telegram from the newspapers to Dean Burch, the commission chairman, pointed out that the ABC network all but omitted the city's name when it broadcast the finals of the Winston-Salem Classic, a bowling tournament, last Saturday.

The tongue-in-cheek telegram, signed by Wallace Carroll, editor and publisher, recognized that Congress last year prohibited the advertising of cigarettes on radio and television. But, it said, "Congress did not intend to abolish or prohibit the use of that beautiful name, Winston-Salem," even though the city has given its name to two popular brands.

Carroll therefore urged Burch to assure the networks that they will not be punished if they say Winston-Salem "loud and clear."

He also asked Burch to tell the networks that they could even mention the name of certain British statesman (Sir Winston Churchill) and his great ancestor (the Duke of Marlborough).

Carroll's telegram follows:

"Will you please do what you can to keep our town from being blipped into oblivion?

"As you know, Public Law 91–222 passed by Congress last year prohibits the advertising of cigarettes on radio and television.

"It happens that two popular brands of cigarettes are named for our town. I know there is a widespread opinion that the contrary is true, but really our town was not named for the cigarettes. Consequently, Congress in passing Public Law 91–222 did not intend to abolish or prohibit the use of that beautiful name, Winston-Salem.

"Nevertheless when the Winston-Salem Classic, a bowling tournament sponsored by our local tobacco company, was telecast last week, the ABC network made a mystery of its location. Announcers referred to the rolling hills of North Carolina, the red clay of the Piedmont and the quaintness of our old Moravian settlement. But did they ever come right out and say where it was happening? No, they did not.

"If this practice persists and spreads, the name Winston-Salem will be obliterated from the airwaves. When the name occurs in a news story, listeners will hear only a blip or double blip. We like the name Winston-Salem, we think it is a good name and we don't want our town to become known throughout the country as 'Blip-Blip.'

"Will you therefore assure the network people that they will not be sent to Leavenworth if they come right out and say 'Winston-Salem'? Tell them to inhale deeply and speak it loud and clear.

"And while you are about it, please assure them too that they are free to mention a certain British statesman whose first name is identical with our first name. And his great ancestor too. Although the latter has no connection with our town, we think it would be a shame to have him become known to television listeners as the Duke of Blip."

THE UNITED STATES IN SPACE—APPLICATIONS AND EXPLORATION

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, this is the third in a series of expositions in which

I hope to inform my fellow colleagues about the national space program.

Today, I want to talk about our unmanned satellite program, with some discussion of accomplishments over the past years, its present status, and the prospects for the future, I will cover the applications, planetary and deep space exploration satellites of our NASA program.

I think it proper at this point to introduce some historical perspective drawn from the legislative experience of the House and from the Committee on Science and Astronautics. In 1958, at about the time the Committee was created, the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration was deeply engaged in the formation of the basic law now known as the Space Act. Testimony from a broad spectrum of witnesses—scientists, industrialists, educators—strongly endorsed a program that would produce a wide variety of spacecraft to investigate the phenomena of planets, stars and the space separating them. There were many allusions to weather satellites, communication satellites, navigation satellites and the profound benefits they would bring to millions of people. These statements produced a reaction that frankly bordered on the incredulous with no little amusement in many quarters.

The past 12 years contain all of the achievements that were promised back in 1958. We have put to work our Tiros and Nimbus weather satellites in an operating system that is producing 24-hour coverage on a routine basis of not only the weather, but the entire earth's climatic cycles. The information we receive from these satellites is available to any nation on earth that desires it.

These satellites have saved thousands of lives and billions of dollars of property, savings that can be fully documented. Worth the investment? One minor incident of catastrophic potential to only a few humble farmers in Mexico comes to mind. These people lived in the shadow of a dam which stored irrigation water vital to a rather extensive farm area. Heavy rains had filled the reservoir almost to the breaking point, and Mexican officials seriously considered releasing the water to save the village from destruction, but wiping out all the crops in the valley. However, a query of the Nimbus satellite revealed no more rain in the offing, and the situation quickly returned to normal. Here was a real return to the benefit of many small people of low economic level. There are many, many other incidents such as this one that could be cited. Remember Hurricane Camille? It was discovered aborning by Nimbus which tracked it down to its final dissipation after it had wreaked tremendous destruction. But, experienced that 20,000 to 50,000 American lives were saved, as a result.

Various studies into the cost-savings we can expect from meteorological satellite work have produced incredibly impressive results. The IBM Corp., a few years ago, conducted a comprehensive analysis of the benefits of more accurate weather forecasting and concluded that if weather could be accurately predicted even 3 days in advance, man could save $60 billion a year. Sixty billion, not million. Even if this estimate is highly optimistic, we must not forget that whatever the cost-savings is, the space program has never cost more than $6 billion per year. And this estimated $60 billion is an annual return on work in merely one field. Furthermore, NASA's work today in this field is aimed at accurate weather forecasting not merely 3 days in advance, but 2 full weeks. We cannot begin to calculate the savings in a system with that capability.

I would also like to highlight the amazing results of NASA's work in another major field, satellite communications. To the credit of NASA's achievements, today we can have a profitmaking international communication satellite network tying together over 40 countries of the world located on six continents. Since the advent of the commercial communication satellite in 1963, we have seen an annual growth in international telephone traffic of more than 20 times, the introduction of international real-time television transmissions, and a decline in the cost of international communication by a factor of more than 25 times.

Examining this impact of the communication satellite in more detail, without the satellite international television would never have been possible. The relatively low channel carrying capacity of today's undersea cables make carrying a television signal impossible. In terms of the cost impact, the investment cost per channel per year for an international telephone link has fallen from $16,000 to approximately $600 with the availability of the latest generation of communication satellites, the Intelsat 4.

The impact of the communication satellite on domestic communications is forecast to be even greater. In 1960, Americans made 18 billion telephone calls; 10 years later Americans made 200 billion telephone calls. This country's domestic telecommunications network, consisting of 700 million miles of wire, cable, and microwave relays, unquestionably represents the finest and most sophisticated communication system in the world today. But with the advent of television and data communications, the present system has been pushed to its virtual limits in terms of being expanded by conventional means. Clearly, the communication satellite offers this country the hope by which we can meet the communication demands of tomorrow.

Further outgrowth of this work is the promise for educating the masses of the many developing countries throughout the world. One of the most exciting programs involves the use of a NASA satellite, ATS–F, to provide instructional and educational television to the country of India. India has received permission from NASA to use the satellite in 1974 to provide direct broadcast programing to over 5,000 villages. Indian Government officials see this as only the first step in a satellite broadcasting program eventually encompassing over 500,000 separate villages. Likewise, Brazil has also asked for permission to use the ATS–F satellite. The country is currently planning to implement a program built around instruction satellite broadcasting to more than 150,000 schools.

The communication satellite offers the only means by which the masses of the developing countries of the world can be reached and taught on an accelerated basis. The satellite will offer to compress the process of world education by decades.

Another spacecraft of outstanding utility has been the navigational satellite, a series of which has been in continuous use since 1960. The satellites were first put into use by the Navy, but, increasingly, they are being employed by virtually all major commercial deep-water operators.

An example of such use is a private company specializing in drilling in very deep water, perhaps up to 20,000 feet. It is absolutely essential that the drillers know exactly what their position is before beginning to drill. Land based Loran stations do provide very accurate position data, but not as good as does the navigation satellite.

Navigation on the ocean and in the air is still a matter of a series of heading adjustments which, over a course of time can amount to considerable loss of productive money. In fact, 1 percent savings in fuel and manpower costs due to navigational improvement would save the shipping industry $150 million per year. The transit system has already shown that it can make a significant contribution in meeting this goal of reducing operating costs.

This, then, is a general summation of what has been accomplished in applications satellites that are returning real benefits to people on earth. What about the future plans?

There are some very exciting programs already underway that will be of highly pragmatic value to people here at home and abroad. One is the earth resources technology program. This is a satellite system that is aimed eventually at a comprehensive as well as specific survey of the earth's resources. The principal value and application, which is becoming of dire importance today, is the opportunity to develop the means by which man can intelligently and effectively manage those resources, especially the ones upon which his survival literally depends.

From space we will be able to survey and evaluate the most important of man's needs today, the availability and location of water. Satellites will measure and determine the water content of snow and ice fields, streams and rivers. We have already at hand the ability to detect natural underground reservoirs, and to pinpoint large seepages of fresh water from continental shelves far out from the shores of oceans and seas. Of recent discovery are those located off the California coast and in the Persian Gulf. Many others have been found in other areas of the world, some which are desperate for water or are actually arid wasteland.

The Department of the Interior has organized and has in operation today a vigorous, hard-working planning group that is eager to help in creating this satellite system. Think what it would mean to our ever-expanding population,

to our marginal agricultural areas and to industry. Think of the heavy financial burden that cities and States are carrying at this moment to provide fresh water to their communities. This burden, under present technologies, is not expected to be diminished. But it will be greatly relieved by the information and data gained from satellite surveys. Think also of the importance of the systems to floods, the accuracy of their prediction, their extent and their control.

Earth resources satellites will also play a principal role in giving each nation an insight and knowledge of the extent of its own natural resources that could not otherwise be obtained. Such geological surveys will be able to identify the location of minerals and oil, saving untold numbers of dollars and long periods of exploration time. The prospector of tomorrow will be a data specialist in an analysis center, not the lonely man and his jeep in a wasteland.

Still another advance will be a great boon to agriculture. Satellites will be able to distinguish between different types of crops, between diseased and healthy plants and trees, various ground conditions. They will be able to assess timber lands and farmlands, and aid in the planning and use of land for roads, parks, and waterways.

A further outgrowth of this work will be in mapping and charting—gathering information which will in turn be folded back into almost an unlimited number of fields including ecology, meteorology, navigation, geology, geography, agriculture, forestry, transportation, and urban affairs. One of the keys to this broad contribution by satellite technology is simply the satellite's vantage point. As an example, to accurately and comprehensively scan the United States by airplane and produce a photographic composite would require a full decade. Obviously, this would be prohibitively expensive. But future photographic satellites will yield such a composite in less than 3 weeks. The satellite, therefore, provides the only means for undertaking this type of venture.

The second area of satellite activity I will discuss briefly is the area of the planetary and exploratory programs. Much has already been accomplished in this field. In fact, we have at present in orbit an unmanned astronomical observatory that has already revolutionized the concepts of the universe, its dimensions, its energies, and its nature. The information revealed has been so surprising to astronomers that it will take considerable time before they will be able to fully understand the impact of this data on present theories in astronomy and concepts of cosmology. The satellite's eleven telescopes are measuring and sending back data on the magnetic spectrum of space, especially in the ultra-violet, that scientists would never be able to obtain from the earth because of the intervening atmosphere. As one measure of this satellite's contribution, I have been told that the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory, in terms of man's ability to investigate the stars and the planets, is equivalent in importance to the invention of the telescope.

Further activity in this field of exploratory work involves NASA plans to send two Mariner spacecraft to Mars. The satellites will be placed in an orbit about the planet. From these spacecraft we will receive thousands of pictures which will permit us to map the entire surface. Based upon this early exploratory work of the Mariners, we will direct our activities to sending a later vehicle to Mars which will be equipped with instruments to analyze the surface composition. This information will permit further comparisons of the earth with still another body in our solar system, thus enhancing our knowledge of the earth.

A final very exciting effort will be to send two spacecraft to the very edge of our solar system. By taking advantage of an extremely rare lineup of the solar system's outer planets, a satellite will be able to use the power of the gravitational field of Jupiter to swing the spacecraft on to a course toward four other major planets. This rare lineup occurs only once in every 179 years and will permit NASA to investigate Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto. This program, the grand tour mission, offers NASA the opportunity to explore the furthermost reaches of our solar system and compress the total mission time by a factor of 4.

In summary, I have tried to give you some insight into what the future holds for mankind in the endeavor to explore space and to use space technology for our own benefit. More than 10 years ago, when the Committee on Science and Astronautics was still in its infancy, expert scientists and engineers described for the committee the achievements in space they expected to accomplish. Those achievements and more have already been realized by this country.

The national effort we began in 1958 we will continue far into the future, as far into the future as it is possible to project—if, and I want to emphasize that "if" we continue to have the will, the purpose and the desire to do so. We have the skill, the resources, and the vision to use space research and technology to elevate the welfare and the spirit of mankind to a level never before believed possible. The most exciting rewards from space lie only just ahead. It is now time for us to reach out for them.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in an era that is repeatedly faced with serious environmental problems and challenges, the dimensions of dealing with the problem of solid waste disposal and management are staggering. The most recent Government figures available indicate that the solid wastes produced annually in the United States total approximately 4.3 billion tons. This figure includes residential, commercial, industrial, mineral, and agricultural wastes. Unfortunately, a very small percentage of this is salvaged, recycled, or composted. In fact, only three-fourths of it is ever collected.

Furthermore, imaginative thinking in disposal practices is not widespread. Land fills, incinerators, open dumps, and ocean dumping are the means almost universally utilized. Also, the burden of dealing with this enormous problem falls almost totally on the local units of government, those which can least afford to bear the cost.

Obviously, this is not a simple problem that can be solved merely by banning one-way bottles and cans. Therefore, today I am introducing legislation that seeks to establish a national framework for solving the problem of managing and disposing of solid waste. My bill would: First, establish a nationwide system of solid waste processing recycling centers; second, encourage the development of new technology to deal with the problems of solid waste disposal; third, encourage the manufacture of products that are easily disposed of or recycled; and fourth, relieve the heavy financial burden now carried by local governments for trash disposal.

A 5-member Solid Waste Management Commission would be created, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission would undertake studies and hearings to ascertain the scope of the solid waste disposal problem in America and then recommend to the Congress a disposal tax plan. Disposal taxes would then be levied by Congress on all nonconsumable products, at their point of manufacture or importation. The charge would reflect, based on the Commission's findings, the actual cost of disposing or recycling the materials in each product, minus their salvage value. The charge would not apply to food or drugs, but would apply to the packages they come in. The disposal charge is aimed, primarily, at discouraging the manufacture of products that present disposal problems. Also, it provides for the financing of new developments in solid waste disposal to meet this national problem.

The revenue from the disposal taxes would go into a Federal trust fund, similar to the present highway trust fund, to be administered by a Federal Solid Waste Disposal Corporation. The Corporation will carry out an ongoing program of research and development with respect to improved solid waste disposal techniques and equipment. Most importantly, in cooperation with the State and local governments, the Corporation would develop a nationwide system of regional solid waste processing and recycling centers. These centers would be financed by revenues generated by the disposal taxes.

Solid waste disposal in the United States is now handled by more than 10,000 individual cities, towns, and villages. A few hundred have incinerators, nearly all of which pollute the air. The rest use dumps, which pollute the land. Both methods waste basic natural resources. We already have the techniques to recycle most of our solid waste, but they are practical only if applied on a large scale. This means setting up regional waste management districts, each served by a regional processing center. The processing centers would ultimately replace all existing municipal dumps.

landfills, and incinerators. To minimize trucking, the wastes could be shredded at collection points in each city and shipped to the processing center by pipeline.

Until the processing centers are in full operation, part of the trust fund money could be used to upgrade conventional disposal facilities. Nearly all of the country's existing dumps and incinerators are substantial health hazards. However, until they can be phased out, part of the trust fund money could be used for grants to convert existing dumps to sanitary landfills and to purchase pollution control devices for incinerators. Trust fund money would also go to rehabilitate former dump sites to be used for parks and other purposes.

Furthermore, industries would be allowed to bid for the purchase of salvaged materials on long-term contracts. Successful bidders would be allowed to build their own plants at the regional centers, thereby encouraging industries to develop ways of refining and using recycled materials. It would also make each regional center the focus of a major industrial complex, creating thousands of jobs. These satellite plants, like the processing center itself, would operate under strict environmental standards.

In addition, the measure would require "disposal bonds," or refundable deposits, to insure the proper disposal of such items as automobiles. For example, the original purchaser of a car would put down a $100 bond, which would pass to each successive owner. The last owner would get the money back when and if he brought it to a proper disposal center. This would also have the effect of giving old cars, refrigerators, and so forth, a minimum trade-in value. Thus, car dealers might be willing to accept cars for disposal, using the disposal bond as credit against purchase of another new or used car.

Mr. Speaker, the day has passed when we can simply bury our wastes or burn them or dump them in our streams or lakes or oceans. Not only are the penalties paid by our environment far too high for this, but the fact of shrinking national resources coupled with a technological and population explosion will no longer allow us such extravagance if we are to survive. As we consider these problems, we must remember that however we pay, pay we must. The adoption of a comprehensive, national plan is necessary or we will continue to witness a gradual and steady decline in our living conditions. I believe the legislation I have introduced today provides a sound basis for both payment and for planning.

Mr. Speaker, I include the entire text of the Solid Waste Management Act of 1971 in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to establish a national system of solid waste management

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

SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the "Solid Waste Management Act of 1971."

(b) For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Solid Waste Management Commission established by section 2.

(2) The term "Corporation" means the Federal Solid Waste Management Corporation established by section 5.

(3) The term "Board" means the Board of Directors of the Corporation.

(4) The term "trust fund" means the Solid Waste Management Trust Fund established by section 4.

(5) The term "solid waste" shall have the same meaning as such term has under section 203(4) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is established within the executive branch of the Federal Government a commission to be known as the Solid Waste Management Commission.

(b) The Commission, in accordance with section 3 of this Act, shall recommend to the Congress disposal tax plans and disposal bond systems for products or materials.

(c) The Commission shall be composed of five members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members of the Commission shall be broadly representative of industry and of the technical and scientific disciplines involved in solid waste management. Members shall be appointed for terms of five years. Members of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate provided for level 1 of the Executive Schedule. The Chairman of the Commission shall be designated by the President.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

DISPOSAL TAXES AND DISPOSAL BONDS

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall conduct such studies and hold such hearings as may be necessary or appropriate to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to disposal taxes for purposes of chapter 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and disposal bond systems under subsection (d) of this section.

(b)(1)(A) The Commission shall recommend to the Congress which products or materials require disposal taxes, at what stage in the process of manufacturing or processing of the product or material the tax shall be levied, the unit on which the tax is based, and the amount of tax per unit. The Commission shall recommend a disposal tax plan which shall specify for purposes of chapter 43 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—

(i) the product or material to which it applies (the taxable article),

(ii) the taxable persons,

(iii) the taxable unit, and

(iv) the applicable rate of tax.

(B) Any determination under subparagraph (A) on which a disposal tax plan is based shall be made on the record after notice and opportunity for hearing. No disposal tax plan may take effect until after the plan has been approved by the Congress.

(2) Disposal taxes shall reflect as closely as possible the actual cost of disposal or processing each material or product, taking into account its physical and chemical properties, its salvage value, if any, and any special problems or hazards involved in its handling. A disposal tax on any material or product shall be uniform throughout the United States.

(c)(1) Subtitle D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to miscellaneous excise taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 43—DISPOSAL TAXES

"Sec. 4961. Imposition of tax.

"Sec. 4962. Definitions.

"SEC. 4961. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed on the sale by the taxable person of any taxable article a tax at the applicable rate per taxable unit determined under the disposal tax plan applicable to such article.

"(b) BY WHOM PAYABLE.—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the taxable person.

"SEC. 4962. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) DISPOSAL TAX PLAN.—The term 'disposal tax plan' means a disposal tax plan adopted under section 3(b)(1) of the Solid Waste Management Act.

"(2) TAXABLE ARTICLE.—The term 'taxable article' means a product or material to which a disposal tax plan applies.

"(3) TAXABLE PERSON.—The term 'taxable person' means a person who conducts an operation of manufacturing or processing an article which (under the disposal tax plan for such article) subjects him to tax upon the sale of the article.

"(4) TAXABLE UNIT.—The term 'taxable unit' means a unit of measure or quantity prescribed in a disposal tax plan with respect to a taxable article.

"(5) APPLICABLE RATE.—The term 'applicable rate' means the rate of tax per taxable unit specified in a disposal tax plan applicable to a taxable article."

(2) The table of chapters for such subtitle is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Chapter 43. Disposal taxes."

(d)(1) If the Commission makes a determination on the record, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that a disposal bond system for a product of a particular kind is necessary in order to insure the proper disposal of such product after use, it may by regulation require the manufacturers, processors, and suppliers of all products of such kind to establish a system under which (A) a deposit is required to be made by any person who purchases the product (other than for purposes of resale) and (B) such deposit is refunded to such purchaser (or any subsequent purchaser) upon delivery of the product to a manufacturer, processor, distributor, or disposal center, as may be specified in such regulation. Any disposal bond system so prescribed shall provide adequate protection of the financial interest of consumers in any deposits made by them. No regulation prescribed under this paragraph shall take effect until ninety days after it is published in the Federal Register.

(2)(A) No product of a kind to which a regulation in effect under paragraph (1) applies may be transported or sold in commerce unless the transportation or sale is in accordance with such regulation. For purposes of this subparagraph, transportation or sale is in commerce if such transportation or sale affects commerce between a State and a place outside such State, or affects commerce within the District of Columbia, or a Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(B) Whoever violates subparagraph (A) shall be fined not more than twice the value of the product so transported or sold.

(e) The Commission shall require that the amount of any disposal tax or disposal bond shall be separately stated at the time the product or material to which it applies is sold to the consumer.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND

SEC. 4. (a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the Solid Waste Management Trust Fund, consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the trust fund as provided in this section.

(b) There are hereby appropriated to the trust fund—

(1) amounts equivalent to the taxes received in the Treasury under section 4961 (relating to disposal taxes) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

(2) amounts received in the course of the Solid Waste Management Corporation's operations under section 6 of this Act.

The amounts appropriated by paragraph (1) shall be transferred at least quarterly from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts referred to in paragraph (1) received in the Treasury. Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(c) (1) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold the trust fund, and to report to the Congress each year on the financial condition and the results of the operations of the trust fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected condition and operations during the next five fiscal years. Such report shall be printed as a House document of the session of the Congress to which the report is made.

(2) (A) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the trust fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. For such purpose, such obligations may be acquired (i) on original issue at the issue price, or (ii) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price. The purposes for which obligations of the United States may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the issuance at par of special obligations exclusively to the trust fund. Such special obligations shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest, computed as to the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of such issue, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt; except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such special obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum next lower than such average rate. Such special obligations shall be issued only if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the purchase of other interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or of obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States on original issue or at the market price, is not in the public interest.

(B) Any obligation acquired by the trust fund (except special obligations issued exclusively to the trust fund) may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price, and such special obligations may be redeemed at par plus accrued interest.

(C) The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the trust fund shall be credited to and form a part of the trust fund.

(d) One-third of the receipts of the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, for making expenditures after June 30, 1970, to the Corporation to carry out the program authorized by section 6. Two-thirds of such receipts shall be available as provided in appropriation Acts for making expenditures after such date, to carry out sections 206 and 207 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby created within the executive branch of the Federal Government a body corporate to be known as the Federal Solid Waste Disposal Corporation.

(b) (1) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors which shall be composed of three Directors appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, Directors shall be appointed for terms of six years. Of the members first appointed—

(A) one shall be appointed for a term of two years,

(B) one shall be appointed for a term of four years, and

(C) one shall be appointed for a term of six years, as designated by the President at the time of appointments. Any Director appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A Director may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office. Two Directors shall constitute a quorum.

(2) The Chairman of the Board shall be designated by the President, and shall be an ex officio member of the Environmental Quality Council.

(3) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate provided for level 1 of the Executive Schedule. The other Directors shall be compensated at the rate provided for level 2 of the Executive Schedule.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this Act the Corporation—

(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

(5) may make and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary or advisable in the conduct of its business;

(6) shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident of the District of Columbia within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to venue of civil suits;

(7) may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of its business, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as the Board may determine, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on such bonds;

(8) may acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or donation such real and personal property and any interest therein, and may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such real and personal property, as the Board deems necessary for the conduct of its business; and

(9) shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

(d) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting after the words "Tennessee Valley Authority;" the following: "Federal Solid Waste Management Corporation;".

(e) The Corporation shall submit to the President for transmission to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session an annual report of its operations under this Act.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 6. (a) The Corporation shall carry out a program of research and development with respect to improved waste disposal techniques and equipment, and a program of construction and operation of facilities utilizing such techniques and equipment.

(b) The Corporation is authorized to enter into contracts with State, interstate, regional, or municipal governmental bodies, or with private industry, for the construction or operation of facilities financed by the Corporation.

(c) The Corporation is further authorized to buy, sell, lease, or exchange land and other property, including existing waste disposal facilities; and to enter into contracts with private persons or corporations for the sale of salvaged materials or other products generated at its facilities.

(d) (1) The Corporation shall develop, in cooperation with the State and local governments, a coordinated, nationwide system of solid waste processing centers. Such centers shall be located on large sites, separated from populated areas and otherwise appropriate for the location of a heavy industrial complex. The location of each such center shall be selected with due regard for the impact of solid waste processing operations on natural resources and ecological systems.

(2) Such centers shall be designed to replace all local sanitary landfills, dumps, incinerators, and similar operations now carried on by municipalities or private disposal concerns. Each center shall be equipped to receive all solid waste generated in the region it serves and to process that waste to—

(A) reclaim all potentially reusable materials,

(B) reduce the nonreclaimable waste to minimum bulk by incineration or compacting, and

(C) provide for the ultimate disposal of the reduced residue either by shipping it to remote disposal areas or, if possible, by forming it into blocks or granular materials that can be used in construction and paving.

(3) The Corporation shall undertake a program of research and development with respect to equipment designed to reclaim salvageable material generated by regional solid waste processing centers. The Corporation shall, if practicable, carry on research and development with respect to the salvage process for each commodity only to the point where it would become economically attractive to private enterprise to conduct salvage operations. Private industries shall be given the opportunity to contract to utilize the salvaged material under a long-term contract, to construct processing or fabricating plants within the regional processing center, and to utilize all the material of a given type generated by the center's operations.

(4) The facilities of a regional solid waste processing center shall be available to a State or local government in the region if—

(A) such State or local government continues to be responsible for the collection of waste at the local level, either directly or through the proper supervision of private collection services, and

(B) each State or local government is responsible for the cost of transporting its waste to the regional processing center up to a distance of twenty-five miles. The transportation costs beyond twenty-five miles would be paid by the Corporation.

(5) Subject to paragraph (4), the Corporation may construct and operate (or provide by grant or contract for the construction or operation of) facilities for transporting solid waste to regional solid waste processing centers.

(e) On or before July 1, 1976, the Corporation shall report to Congress on the state of solid waste management technology as of that time, on the effectiveness of facilities so far constructed, and on its plans for the development and construction of additional facilities.

INTERFERENCE WITH RIGHTS

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Capitol steps were the scene of an outrageous interference with the rights of the Members of Congress and other Americans who had assembled peacefully

to petition their Representatives for a redress of grievances.

More than a thousand citizens gathered on and in front of the steps at the invitation of myself, and Congressmen DELLUMS, MITCHELL, and RANGEL. They came to present the "People's Peace Treaty" for peace in Indochina, which agrees, in essence, to a swift withdrawal of all American forces in return for a cease-fire and release of prisoners of war.

The Capitol steps are a traditional meeting place for Americans and this is only fitting because the Congress is and must be the guardian of the Constitution and of the Bill of Rights. But even as we Members of Congress, duly elected and with very strong mandates, were addressing this assembly, even as I was congratulating the demonstrators and the police for the peaceful nature of this particular meeting—and it was a peaceful and proper assembly and it was an exercise of the first amendment and the right to petition for redress of grievances—the Capitol Police moved in and began making wholesale arrests. Almost 1,200 individuals were carted off to makeshift jails without being charged with any specific wrongdoing.

I asked the police for an opportunity to address the crowd and to inform them that the police were asking them to leave and that those who remained behind would be subject to arrest. This was denied me and the police continued to arrest people who had gathered at the invitation of Members of Congress and who were completely unaware that the police had ordered them to leave. In the process, Congressman DELLUMS and others were subjected to personal indignities by policemen.

What happened on the steps of the Capitol yesterday was all the more shocking because it was reminiscent of the total disregard for civil liberties and due process of law that we have witnessed here in the District all week. I was appalled to hear of the conditions in some precinct houses from lawyers who had been refused access to their clients who were kept in groups of as many as 15 in a 5 by 8 cell for as long as 18 hours without adequate food, water, or sanitation facilities. Even as I speak there are citizens who have been detained for than 40 hours without the benefit of counsel or knowledge of the charges against them while awaiting arraignment. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the civil rights of many thousands of individuals have been violated this week in repeated incidents we are all well aware of and as a result our system of justice has suffered.

I believe that the leaders of Congress who collaborated with the police in this unlawful action owe the Members an apology and should act speedily to obtain the release of the thousands of Americans who have been arrested without cause.

Undoubtedly, many demonstrators who came to Washington planned to commit acts of civil disobedience and were prepared to face the consequences of arrest in the tradition of Thoreau and Martin Luther King. But there were thousands more who committed no unlawful acts and large numbers who merely happened to be caught unwittingly in the midst of the demonstrations, and they too were arrested.

The responsibility for these violations of constitutional rights rest with President Nixon, and Attorney General Mitchell. Apparently they feel that it is consistent to use illegal tactics to maintain an illegal war, but leaders of Congress should not be parties to such unconstitutional procedures. And I suggest to the administration and the Congress that if they let the war and the killings in Indochina drag on for another year or longer, there will not be jails or football stadiums big enough to hold all the protestors.

At this time I include in the RECORD articles from this morning's Washington Post and New York Times which illustrate a number of the comments I have made:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 6, 1971]

CONTROVERSY MOUNTS OVER ARRESTS HERE

(By Sanford J. Ungar)

Controversy mounted in Washington's legal community yesterday over procedures used by police and other local and federal officials in arresting, detaining and processing persons during the militant antiwar demonstrations of this week.

A bitter feud developed between the city's courts and the police about who was responsible for setting policy in resolving thousands of arrest cases.

Joined by the American Civil Liberties Union, a former federal prosecutor called for empaneling of a special jury to consider whether the constitutional rights of those arrested had been violated.

Chief Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals, acting as chairman of the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia, named a former White House aide to head a study of whether a three-year-old program for mass arrests during civil disturbances had been followed.

After permitting hundreds arrested Monday to post $10 collateral that night, under a court order police again stopped accepting collateral Tuesday morning and said all arrested persons would be taken to court.

At 7 last night, more than 1,000 people arrested Tuesday still were being held awaiting court action.

The last 250 prisoners arrested Monday were removed from the Washington Coliseum at 3 p.m. yesterday and were sent to court.

Some had spent as much as 55 hours in custody. New prisoners were sent to the coliseum on Tuesday and yesterday.

Complaints about court congestion and delays, as well as sanitary and health conditions in emergency detention facilities, continued to pour in.

Meantime, a three-judge panel of the D.C. Court of Appeals ruled that fingerprints and other identifying information concerning everyone arrested here this week—including those held without field arrest forms—must be submitted to the FBI.

Lawyers protesting that decision bounced back and forth between the city's local and federal courts, and U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard A. Gesell announced a hearing for this afternoon on whether the FBI should be banned from disseminating such information to employers.

At 10:30 p.m., Superior Court Judge Alfred Burka took three separate habeas corpus petitions under advisement. One was filed by the D.C. Public Health Association, charging that an epidemic threatened the prisoners.

Burka rejected a fourth petition, filed by the ACLU and supported by two congressmen, on technical grounds.

In the Nixon administration's first formal response to criticism of the mass arrest procedure, an assistant attorney general told a North Carolina audience that "the circumstances were extraordinary" Monday, justifying suspension of normal law enforcement standards.

William H. Rehnquist, of the Department's office of legal counsel, said that the procedures developed out of a balance between "the needed authority of society to protect itself against crime and prevent violence" and "the right of the individual . . . to a speedy hearing in which he will be advised of the charges against him."

White House Press Secretary Ron Zeigler said at an afternoon briefing that President Nixon feels "the D.C. police force dealt with a very difficult situation in a very competent and appropriate way."

Pressed by reporters, Ziegler added that "the President feels strongly that the Constitution should be followed" in controlling civil disturbances.

In letters to Bazelon, Chief Judge Harold H. Greene of D.C. Superior Court, and Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.), Washington attorney Robert L. Ackerly contended that the orderly functioning of government without disruption "was accomplished by a suspension of constitutional guarantees and civil rights by the chief of police."

A former Assistant U.S. Attorney here, Ackerly said he was "shocked and sorely distressed that the police can, with impunity, sweep the streets and then receive the support of the courts, which not only set high bonds but practically eliminated the effectiveness of habeas corpus."

He compared the money bond set for persons arrested this week to the courts' willingness to release on personal bond persons charged with "armed robbery, rape, robbery, incest and other serious crimes."

Ackerly suggested that a special grand jury be established, on the model of one in Chicago that investigated the deaths of two Black Panthers during a police raid in late 1969. He suggested that it be led by a specially named prosecutor.

Ralph Temple, of the ACLU Fund, concurred in Ackerly's proposal.

"There were clearly widespread violations of constitutional rights on an unprecedented scale," Temple said. "We think that a grand jury should be convened to investigate whether in fact what happened was the result of violations of criminal laws by government officials."

But Thomas A. Flannery, U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, said that "I see no basis for such an investigation."

Bazelon had no comment on Ackerly's letter, but it was learned that on Tuesday he had named Stephen J. Pollak, formerly President Johnson's adviser on D.C. affairs, to head a Judicial Conference Committee on "justice under emergency conditions."

The Judicial Conference had authorized such a committee during its meeting last month at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., to study whether the report of a similar committee after the civil disorders here three years ago had been properly implemented.

Other members have not yet been named to the committee, but it was understood that Washington attorney Lloyd N. Cutler, chairman of the original group, would serve with Pollak.

The Cutler committee originally recommended the field arrest procedure for civil disturbances, which was abandoned by the metropolitan police during the unprecedented arrests of Monday. It since has been reinstituted.

Police and courts exchanged charges yesterday over who should be held responsible for the extreme delays in processing arrested persons.

In a sharply worded opinion, Judge Greene criticized the police for vacillating earlier in the week on whether to permit collateral to be posted by those arrested.

No sooner had Superior Court judges begun setting $250 bond in demonstration cases (as requested by police), Greene said, then the police switched and reinstituted collateral instead of bringing people to court.

"The court was placed in an untenable position," Greene said, "of either setting bonds that were meaningless—since no one would agree to court processing if he could be released at the precinct for a nominal amount—or of having constantly to adjust its bond policies to follow the ever-changing tactical line of the police department."

Police department general counsel Gerald M. Caplan, on the other hand, denied that police had taken cases to court slowly, blaming delays on defense lawyers for allegedly advising their clients not to cooperate.

Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson was critical of local judges for leniency in dealing with protesters previously. "I suspect some of the problems this week might have been averted," he said, "by some jail terms last week."

Assistant Attorney General Will Wilson, chief of the Justice Department's criminal division, appeared personally in Superior Court yesterday to argue against release of persons who had been held in the Washington Coliseum.

Sources at the Public Defender Service cited his presence as proof of Justice Department "complicity" in arrest policy.

Two judges dismissed all charges against that group.

Early yesterday, a three-judge panel of the D.C. Court of Appeals upheld Judge Greene's ruling at midnight Tuesday that persons held at the Washington Coliseum without specific details of their offenses must be released.

They struck Greene's provision, however, that fingerprints and other identifying information could not be sent to the FBI's files and should be destroyed unless charges were developed within 90 days.

Later in the day, the Appeals Court refused to grant a stay of its decision regarding the arrest records.

The Public Defender Service then brought its case before Judge Gesell, who has been sitting on similar matters related to the FBI's policy of distributing such material.

Denying a request for a temporary court order, Gesell said, "the court must take into account that this community is in a near state of siege, and I do not think it would be appropriate . . . to take steps to impede the chief of police."

He scheduled a further hearing for today, however on whether records should go to employers.

[From the New York Times, May 6, 1971]

THREE REPRESENTATIVES DECRY ARRESTS ON CAPITOL STEPS

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON.—"Don't you guys believe in the Constitution?" Representative Bella S. Abzug, her gaucho hat askew on her head, shouted at Representative Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat of Illinois, at the foot of the House steps.

On the steps, one by one, the chanting Mayday demonstrators, who said they had come to petition Congress for peace in Vietnam, were being arrested by the District of Columbia police and herded into buses.

"How are they violating any constitutional rights?" Mr. Pucinski asked.

"The police are violating constitutional rights and ours," Mrs. Abzug, a Manhattan Democrat, replied, sticking her face right up to Mr. Pucinski, "because they are interfering with the constitutional right of petition."

In gentler terms, the same point was made by Representative Ogden R. Reid to Speaker Carl Albert when the Speaker walked out onto the Capitol steps more than an hour after the arrests began. "Carl," the Westchester Republican whispered, "there is a problem of giving them a chance to leave peacefully."

DENY NOTICE IS GIVEN

For a few minutes the Speaker wavered, as reporters pressed around him asking who had given the orders to arrest the protesters and pointing out that Mrs. Abzug and Representative Ronald V. Dellums, Democrat of California, were contending that the police had given the protesters no notice to move before the arrests began.

"Where's the chief?" Mr. Albert called out.

"It's too late to make such an announcement," James Powell, chief of the Capitol police, told the Speaker. "It would be unfair to all the busloads that have gone."

The Speaker walked back alone into the Capitol as the arrests continued.

The protesters had been invited to the Capitol steps by Mrs. Abzug, Mr. Dellums, Representative Parren J. Mitchell, Democrat of Maryland, and Representative Charles B. Rangel, Democrat of Manhattan, to present their "people's peace treaty" for ending the war. The arrests began while Mr. Dellums was still speaking to the crowd from the top of the steps and continued as one of the protest leaders read the text of the "peace treaty."

PROTEST TO POLICE CHIEF

"We are here at the invitation of Congressmen, and the people have a right to petition their Congressmen," one protester called out.

Mrs. Abzug and Mr. Dellums stormed down the Capitol steps to Chief Powell to protest in vain against the arrests.

Mr. Powell, according to the two Congressmen, took the position that "they came here to be arrested, so they are going to be arrested."

Mrs. Abzug and Mr. Dellums, who were on the steps in the middle of the crowd when the arrests began, also protested that no notice had been given to the protesters to move on or face arrest.

Mr. Powell later told reporters that he had called out "Attention!" several times over his megaphone and had attempted to notify the protesters that they would be arrested. When reporters pointed out that neither Mrs. Abzug nor Mr. Dellums had heard any warning of arrest, the police chief said that his words must have been drowned out by the protestors' chants.

CHIEF VOICES DOUBT

Asked what right the police had to arrest the protesters when they were being addressed by members of Congress, Mr. Powell replied, "Members of Congress don't have the right to invite people here to violate the law."

The police chief also expressed doubt that, with "all the ranting and chanting and vulgarities being called out," the protesters "could have heard the people who were talking."

Just who gave the orders to arrest the protesters while the Congressmen were still talking was unclear.

The Capitol grounds come under the jurisdiction of the Speaker of the House and the Vice President, in his capacity as president of the Senate. Speaker Albert said, "I gave no instructions one way or the other that they be arrested."

On the Senate side, conservative Republicans charged that some politicians were encouraging the demonstrations.

Senator Clifford P. Hansen of Wyoming said, "I do not charge that every act of lawlessness and violence is a direct result of encouragement, either explicit or implied, by politicians seeking to exploit a growing weariness with the war in Southeast Asia. But I do charge that much of the brazenness, the callousness of those many, so much in evidence on Monday, was encouraged by politicians."

Senate Republicans praised the Nixon Administration's handling of the demonstrations, although liberals in the upper house complained that many people had been arrested without cause and that the police were carrying out illegal preventative detention.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 6, 1971]

1,200 PROTESTERS ARRESTED AT CAPITOL

(By William L. Claiborne and Bart Barnes)

Police arrested 1,161 singing, clapping and dancing antiwar demonstrators yesterday after the protesters forced the closing of the Capitol on the third day of their program of largescale disobedience.

The mass arrests on what was scheduled to be the last Washington action of the Mayday peace offensive brought to 10,500 the number of persons taken into custody during protests since Monday.

Most than 2,000 remained in custody last night.

Festive and exuberant in mood, they carried to the doorstep of Congress a demand to end the Vietnam war and a resolve by an earlier vote to accept arrest as an expression of their sentiment.

Protest leaders, their ranks diminished substantially since Monday, nevertheless called last night for a rally at 11:30 a.m. today in front of the South Vietnamese Embassy.

The rally is to be followed by a march through the streets of Washington, during which a copy of the people's peace treaty, a cease-fire agreement negotiated between Vietnamese and American students, is to be nailed to the doors of all government departments, protest leaders said. A march on the D.C. jail is to follow.

Meanwhile, 4,000 troops remained in the Washington area to provide security at bridges and key intersections.

A Pentagon official said they would remain here until they are no longer needed.

Protesters who crowded the east steps of the House of Representatives yesterday afternoon did not appear to be winding down their peace efforts.

With an audience of some tourists and many Capitol employees, the protesters whooped, chanted, cheered and sang as they sat on the House steps.

One youth waved a Vietcong flag, another bearded protester disrobed completely to a chorus of cheers, and four congressmen told the gathering it had succeeded in focusing attention on the Southeast Asia conflict.

A brief scuffle occurred when Sen. Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.) pushed a policeman aside, according to Metcalf's own account, when he was prohibited from crossing police lines.

Describing the policeman as a "pansy punk," Metcalf said, "This is outrageous. They're supposed to be protecting us, and they don't let senators and congressmen through . . ."

In another incident, Rep. Ronald V. Dellums (D-Calif.), said a policeman hit him in the ribs with a billy club when he tried to go through a police line.

"They didn't give a damn about the fact that I was a congressman; I'm a nigger, and that's exactly the way many of those people up there in that front line treated us . . ." Dellums told reporters.

Barely 20 minutes after the stairway had been filled with demonstrators, a motorcade of police buses pulled into the east Capitol plaza, and hundreds of members of the Civil disturbance unit began making arrests.

Even before 2:30 p.m. when the 1,500 protesters began their march to the Capitol from

the Mall at 3d Street, Capitol police began sealing the entrances to the building.

Tourists who were in the Capitol at the time were allowed to finish their touring, but all others without congressional credentials were refused admittance.

The halls were virtually empty of all but Capitol officials by 3:30 p.m., when the House adjourned. The Senate concluded its business at 2:15 p.m. Both closing times were about normal.

The genesis of the Capitol sit-down was a meeting on the Mall at which protesters voted on several different proposals of action.

A large number voted for civil disobedience and possible arrest on the Capitol steps, while others decided only to picket or visit individual congressional offices. However, the different groups became fused during the march to the Capitol and only a portion of those eventually arrested on the steps had voted for it.

Also, more than 500 government workers rallied against the war in Lafayette Square inside a cordon of Park police and metropolitan police, and then marched to the Capitol complex, where several persons were arrested near the Old Senate Office Building.

In a tangential development, Maryland State police used tear gas and dogs to force several thousand University of Maryland students to abandon a human blockade on U.S. Rte. 1 adjacent to the campus.

Later, Mandel proclaimed a 9 p.m. to 7 a.m. curfew on the campus and called in the National Guard to take charge of security operations.

The helmeted state police, called out by Gov. Marvin Mandel, were pelted by rocks and bottles after a rally at which the main speaker was Chicago Seven defendant Rennie Davis, who led some of the Mayday actions in Washington.

At American University, a group of about 20 students blocked traffic at Ward Circle three times during the evening rush hour while about 300 students watched from the edge of the campus. Police formed lines between the protesters and the streets and kept traffic flowing during all three attempts to snarl traffic.

One policeman, John Ford, 33, suffered a broken leg after being struck by a police motor scooter that went out of control when its rider was struck by a street barricade thrown by a demonstrator. Police said the demonstrator resisted arrest. He received injuries while being subdued that required nine stitches to be taken in his head, police said.

Nonviolent protests against the war spread to a number of Washington suburban public schools yesterday and at scattered colleges and high schools across the country. The demonstrations were part of a planned moratorium on "business as usual."

Montgomery County public school officials reported absenteeism about 5 per cent above normal, while officials in Prince George's County and Virginia jurisdictions said attendance appeared normal.

In Prince George's, about 200 students walked out of Parkdale Senior High School before noon. About 50 returned later, while the rest rallied in Greenbelt Park.

Other schools in the area held planned programs at which students discussed the Vietnam war.

Troops lined the Key, 14th Street and Memorial bridges for the third consecutive morning, and soldiers standing five feet apart ringed Dupont Circle. But protesters had not announced plans to block traffic and made no attempt to.

The first crowds began gathering around 11 a.m. on the Mall staging area for what was called a people's press conference.

At that hour the Capitol grounds were serene. Tourists drifted in and out, and visiting high school seniors posed for class pictures on the House and Senate steps.

At the press conference, which appeared to be more of a rally, speaker after speaker urged demonstrations upon their return home to continue disruptive tactics in protest of the Southeast Asia conflict.

About 1 p.m. the group, which by then had swelled to 1,500 or 2,000 persons, began a discussion of how the march on the Capitol would be conducted.

Directed by Carl P. Zietlow, coordinator of nonviolent training for the week's protest activities, the protesters voted to divide into groups.

One delegation was to march to the Senate office building, where protesters would sit in at senator's offices. They would demand that senators sign the people's peace treaty with the Vietcong.

Another group planned to picket the Senate Office buildings and the remainder, by far the largest delegation, decided to engage in civil disobedience and be arrested.

But by 2 p.m. at least 10 buses of helmeted and gas-masked equipped members of the police department's civil disturbance unit were on the Capitol grounds.

The Capitol and Senate and House office buildings were closed to the public, and members of the Capitol police force, wearing helmets, lined the hallways on the first floor inside the Senate wing of the Capitol.

Entrances to Senate office buildings were barred to protesters seeking to visit congressmen with demands that the people's treaty be signed.

About 2:30 p.m., the main body of protesters, marching three and four abreast, set out from the Mall for Independence Avenue, then headed east on Independence for the Capitol.

Police made no attempt to stop the marchers from entering the Capitol grounds at the east front, but policemen barred entry to the west down to 1st Street.

A wire barricade that had been erected on the west front steps for the April 24 antiwar march was still in place.

The marchers reached the east front steps on the House side and sat down, singing, clapping and cheering. Gradually, the steps filled with demonstrators almost down to the street level. Doors at the top were closed.

Almost immediately, Capitol Police Chief James M. Powell announced over a bullhorn that the demonstrators would be arrested in 10 minutes if they remained on the steps. His announcement was drowned out by the noise of the demonstrators.

As police slowly closed in on the demonstrators, four congressmen addressed the crowd and praised recent antiwar demonstrations.

The four were Reps. Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.), Dellums, Parren Mitchell (D-Md.), and Charles B. Range (D-N.Y.).

Arrests actually began about 3:30 p.m. and concluded some 2½ hours later. Demonstrators were escorted to police buses, searched and driven to various detention points.

The mass arrests on the Capitol steps came with the approval of House Speaker Carl B. Albert (D-Okla.)

Albert told reporters that he had been informed by Powell that the demonstrators should be removed from the steps, and he said he answered "OK."

In another incident, Rep. G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery (D-Miss.) charged up the Capitol steps to snatch what he thought to be a Vietcong flag from the hands of one of the protesters.

"I felt it was necessary to show that some members of Congress are opposed to tactics of anarchy and action bordering on oppression," Montgomery said later.

What Montgomery grabbed was not actually a Vietcong flag but a copy of the people's peace treaty on a banner.

On the Senate side, the session adjourned before the march on the Capitol began.

Some senators discussed the protests in floor speeches.

Minority leader Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) praised the "excellent work of the police, the courts and the mayor of this city."

Sen. Paul Fannin (R-Ariz.), who said his tires were slashed on Constitution Avenue Monday morning, said Monday's incidents resembled "the 1930s when brown-shirted youths intimidated Germany."

Dissent came from Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and Philip Hart (D-Mich.), who assailed arrest and detention procedures and said they "amounted to a suspension of civil liberties" for those arrested.

Reps. Dellums, Abzug, Mitchell and Rangel, meanwhile, all argued with police over the legality of the arrests on the House steps. Alongside them young men and women were being spread-eagled against buses and searched.

Arrests on the Capitol steps were completed at 5:15 p.m., with the last few demonstrators struggling briefly.

A 5:25 p.m. about 40 more demonstrators charged up the steps and urged others to join them. The crowd gradually grew to just over 100. They were ordered away by Chief Powell, refused to move, and were arrested.

All protesters were cleared from the Capitol grounds by 6 p.m., when the grounds were ordered closed.

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1971]

PROTESTS POINT UP CONFLICT OF RIGHTS

"It has long been a grave question whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of its citizens, can be strong enough to maintain its existence in great emergencies."—Abraham Lincoln)

(By Haynes Johnson)

That old American dilemma has never been more clearly in focus than this spring week in Washington. The demonstrators have made their protests, the government has survived, but citizens everywhere are wrestling with disturbing questions in the latest aftermath of massive acts of civil disobedience.

"At 8:30 the other morning I was radicalized and deradicalized and then confused about what I thought," said one Georgetown woman, recalling her reaction at witnessing clashes between police and protesters and then the destruction of her own property—first her trash cans and then her car.

The basic question involves probably the most delicate, complex and central theme of American life—rights. Citizen's right and society's rights. The right to assemble peacefully and petition the government for redress of grievances, and the right to move freely without impairment. The rights of a majority—and a minority. The right to due process of law, and the right to be free from excessive bail or be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment.

All of those came into direct conflict this week in the streets and prison compounds and courtrooms of Washington. They have left Washington a troubled city.

Over lunch and in offices, citizens can be heard discussing a number of aspects growing out of the demonstrations. Citizens at home are calling newspapers to report, often emotionally, one horror story after another—about a protester or a passerby or a prisoner. They have been telling about people manhandled, detained, their personal property taken and not returned.

The past few days have seen two distinct sides to those reactions.

Monday's shut-down-the-government demonstration brought a strong reaction from citizens whose rights to go to work or to a hospital or a bank or a store—and the right to have their property secure—were affected

It also brought an equally strong reaction from citizens and protesters alike who were caught in the massive-arrest tactics employed by police.

Citizens have been arrested on unspecified charges. For many, the government has been unable to produce specific evidence of criminal behavior. Many citizens against whom no formal charges have been lodged nevertheless have been photographed and fingerprinted, imprisoned for as long as 18 hours without being allowed to contact their families, and then freed after posting collateral. Their police records may follow them through life.

Those tactics have led the American Civil Liberties Union to charge that the police procedures adopted amount to "martial law characterized by the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus."

Other tactics—those employed by the demonstrators—have come under sharp criticism, and often from demonstrators themselves. It has been common this week to encounter groups of protesters debating quietly among themselves about the methods and strategy of their movement.

Often, the end result has led to only more confusion over the question of rights, both theirs and society's. Sometimes, they came down to a kind of us-against-them thinking. A college student demonstrating outside the Justice Department on Tuesday had said it was all right to take illegal actions because he felt it was, after all, "their law," not his.

Then he went on to ask a different kind of question. "Do you think," he asked, "that that American general in Vietnam was right when he said, 'To save the city we had to destroy it'?"

What has been clearly emerging amid all the anger and confusion is a sense of the continuing deep division among Americans. This week, some of the worst fears of both poles—those who fear lawlessness and those who fear police-state-type oppression—have come close to being realized. The events in the streets and the police precincts and detention centers appear to have driven the two farther apart.

"I think they ought to give it to them," said a Washington merchant. "There's no excuse for this kind of lawlessness. These are kids that, well, that don't know the seriousness of what they're doing. It all goes back to what a lot of psychologists told their parents: 'don't interfere with the children.' These kids need discipline. They need law and order."

A protester, trying to thumb a ride to New Jersey, gave another side. "I was clubbed twice, gassed, and thrown into that concentration camp," he said heatedly, "and I would like the country to know that I came here nonviolently and that we have a police state here in America."

Then there are those citizens in the center who say what happened to them has brought about a dramatic change in their own attitudes.

"I used to be a Republican until yesterday, and now I'm an anarchist," said the assistant personnel manager of a downtown department store as he was released from the makeshift detention center at the Washington Coliseum.

He said he had left his home near George Washington University about 8:30 a.m. Monday and was arrested 20 minutes later. He had gone inside the student union there to escape tear gas exploding around him, he said, and was swept up in the police dragnet outside as he stepped out the door.

"I was not told I was under arrest," he said, "and I have not been advised of my rights whatsoever. I haven't been able to sleep here. I didn't think this could happen to a D.C. citizen. I just can't let this go. They've deprived me of my personal liberty."

He added, by way of personal qualification, that he is a four-year veteran of the Marine Corps. He voted for Richard Nixon twice.

One citizen, interviewed Monday in Georgetown during the disturbances, expressed a less emotional opinion, but from a larger perspective.

"It's producing so much more frustration," he said. "I don't think it's going to produce anything positive for either side. This is not going to end the war and it's probably going to harden positions on both sides. You get increasingly extreme positions from both sides on something like this."

[From the New York Times, May 6, 1971]

PROTESTERS FAIL TO STOP CONGRESS; POLICE SEIZE 1,146

(By James M. Naughton)

WASHINGTON.—Antiwar protesters massed on the marble steps outside the House of Representatives today to demand that Congress ratify a "people's treaty" with North Vietnam to end the war in Southeast Asia.

But the 1,000 demonstrators, chanting, "Sign the treaty," as about 1,000 others cheered across a line of helmeted policemen, failed to achieve their stated goal of disrupting Congress.

By late this afternoon, the District of Columbia police had arrested 1,146 young people for "unlawful assembly" on the Capitol grounds, apparently ending the last major confrontation planned in a three week "peace offensive" this spring.

The actions in Washington today raised to more than 12,000 the number of arrests since the police began dealing firmly with protesters on Sunday. Many of the protesters deliberately sought arrest today for the second time.

RULING AGAINST POLICE

A three-judge panel of the court of appeals for the District of Columbia affirmed today a lower court ruling that the police had acted improperly on Monday, when they arrested many individuals in groups and carted them to impromptu prisons without making specific individual charges of wrongdoing.

The police reverted today to their customary procedures. As the protesters sat on the House steps on the east front of the Capitol, chanting, "The whole world is watching," patrolmen took the demonstrators away one at a time to be photographed and cited for unlawful assembly.

FOUR DEMOCRATS JOIN GROUP

Four House Democrats opposed to the war stood on the steps with the demonstrators, lamenting the fact that the ornate doors to the Capitol's interior were locked. One conservative from Missouri tore a copy of the "people's treaty," printed on a bedsheet, from the hands of one group of demonstrators.

The day's events appeared to have capped 17 days of protest. With many of the participants in jail and other disenchanted with detention after earlier arrests, the size of the protest group was dwindling. Many individuals said they were going home to try to initiate antiwar activities similar to those in the capital.

Earlier today, the opposition to the war was enunciated in Lafayette Park, across Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House, by participants in a rally sponsored by Federal Employees for Peace. More than 1,000 people, conservatively attired, many freely stating their names and the Government agencies for which they worked, protested against the war during their lunch break or took part of their annual leave to demonstrate.

The Capitol police initially refused to permit the demonstrators onto the grounds of the Capitol after the group had marched there, three abreast in clusters of 20 or 25, from an assembly point nearby on the Mall.

But they permitted them to gather on the steps after Representatives Bella S. Azbug, Democrat of Manhattan, and Ronald V. Dellums, Democrat of California, had said the protesters were their "guests."

Capitol Police Chief James Powell, his hand shaking as he spoke through a portable loudspeaker to the crowd, warned them that they were illegally gathered and gave them 10 minutes to leave.

About half the demonstrators assembled in a grassy section of the Capitol grounds, alongside spectators and curious members of Congress, rather than risk arrest.

But the rest remained on the Capitol steps, disregarding Mr. Powell and reading off their "people's treaty" demands: an immediate withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam, a $6,500 guaranteed annual income for families of four and the release of all "political prisoners" in jails in this country.

Representative Charles B. Rangel, Democrat of Harlem, told the crowd that he had come to join them, but that "they have locked the doors" behind him.

Policemen preparing to arrest the demonstrators were filling in sections of their arrest forms as Mr. Rangel, Mrs. Abzug, Mr. Dellums and Representative Parren J. Mitchell, Democrat of Maryland, exhorted both the police and the protesters to remain calm.

Representative G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Democrat of Mississippi, attired in a conservative gray suit, walked up to one group of protesters and snatched from them part of the printed text of the "treaty." He later told reporters that he had felt "it shouldn't be on the Capitol steps."

"I just lost my cool," he said. "It was just too much." He looked at the portion of the scroll bunched in his hand and said, "I'm sorry we didn't get it all."

Earlier, former Representative Laurie Battle of Alabama, now the chief clerk of the House Rules Committee, plunged into the marchers and grabbed a National Liberation Front flag from a young woman. Some bystanders said Mr. Battle had knocked her down, but he refused to deny or affirm it.

TAKEN IN BUSES TO CELLS

After their arrest, the demonstrators were taken in buses to cells in six police precinct houses or to the Washington Coliseum, one of the makeshift jails officials began using when their prison cells overflowed Monday.

The protesters were charged with unlawful assembly, which carries a possible fine of $500 and imprisonment for up to six months. Unlike charges of disorderly conduct lodged against demonstrators on Monday and yesterday, when they protested outside the Department of Justice, the unlawful assembly charge requires the assignment of bail before the protesters can be released.

There was confusion among the police today about the specific law that the protesters had violated. Initially, on arrest forms written out in advance, the police were charging the protesters with "unlawful entry" into the Capitol grounds. But midway through the arrests the charge was changed to "unlawful assembly" in violation of a 1967 law.

That law makes it unlawful to "utter loud, threatening or abusive language or to engage in disorderly or disruptive conduct" on the Capitol grounds "with intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb orderly conduct" of Congress or "to impede passage" through the Capitol.

Many of the demonstrators, perhaps 200, had indicated prior to seeking arrest at the Capitol that they wished to remain in jail without being released on bail as another form of protest.

A number of Senators and Representatives stood outside the Capitol to watch the protest and arrests while others, inside, made floor speeches to denounce, according to their inclinations, either the tactics of the demonstrators or the tactics of the police earlier this week.

Superior Court Judge Harold Greene ruled late yesterday that the police must release without bail all demonstrators who had been jailed on Monday without being linked specifically to an illegal act.

The three-judge Court of Appeals affirmed most of Judge Greene's ruling today, but said the demonstrators must submit to fingerprinting and photographing. The appeals judges also reversed Judge Green's ruling that the records of those not found guilty of an offense must be destroyed rather than given routinely to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

CHIEF ISSUES STATEMENT

The police issued a statement in which Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson assumed responsibility for the order Monday to suspend field arrest procedures and gather up all demonstrators for arrest. He said he felt the unusual steps had been "necessary to protect the safety of law-abiding citizens and to maintain order in the city."

A few protesters sought to regain access to the Capitol grounds after the arrests tonight, but the police quickly rounded them up, including a young man who had taken off all his clothes and tried to climb a lamp post and another who had climbed into the office of House Speaker Carl Albert through an open window.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 6, 1971]

MOST NOW FREE, OFFICIALS REPORT

Most of the 9,572 people that police report arresting in antiwar protests here Monday and Tuesday have been released from custody, according to reports from various agencies. As of midafternoon yesterday, not counting arrests at the Capitol yesterday, the situation looked like this:

The D.C. Superior Court had received formal charges on 2,123 people. Of these, only 105 were being held in jail awaiting friends and relatives to come up with bond money, according to a corrections department spokesman.

The Washington police department's prisoner control office said another estimated 1,400 to 1,500 people were still in various cellblocks around the city, waiting to go to Superior Court.

These figures would indicate that some 6,000 people have been released pending trial after paying collateral, including, police said, 2,200 to 2,500 of those who were held at the Washington Coliseum.

Officials said they did not have precise figures on those awaiting court action because police were trying to process cases, rather than conduct a head count.

These are the Monday and Tuesday figures:

Monday:	
Men	5,825
Women	899
Juveniles	168
Total	6,892
Tuesday:	
Men	2,210
Women	414
Juveniles	56
Total	2,680

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not be present when the vote was taken on House Resolution 412. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

NEED FOR EARLY TRADE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BETTS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, if we analyze the trends in our exports and imports over the past few years we can come to only one conclusion. It is that this country is losing out in world trade and in all products but a few. We can also see that even in this narrow sector we are being squeezed.

In the case of manufactured goods other than machinery and transport equipment, by which is meant automobiles and aircraft, we are in a weak competitive position. For example, in the past year, 1970, our imports of a wide variety of manufactured goods, other than machinery, and so forth, came to $13.280 billion while our exports of manufactured goods reached only $7.638 billion. Thus we had a deficit of $5.642 billion in this segment. Since 1965 our exports of these products grew by only $2.75 billion while our imports increased by $5.76 billion or over twice as much.

What were these manufactured goods? They included steel, textiles, electronic goods, insulators, footwear, typewriters, sewing machines, leather, plywood, apparel, glass and glassware, tiles, pottery, watches, clocks, musical instruments, athletic and sporting goods, toys, amusement equipment, and so forth, bicycles, motor scooters, record players, tools, nuts and bolts, recorders, optical goods, photographic equipment, and so forth.

It is true, we still export much more machinery than we import, but imports have been coming up rapidly and gaining on our exports. The gap is proportionately half as large as it was only a few years ago. Since 1965 imports of machinery, electrical and nonelectrical, increased 198 percent compared with a 65 percent increase in our exports.

At this rate our handsome lead in machinery exports will disappear in this decade, and possibly by 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how we can stand idly by when our trade is faced with such unmistakable trends. We are only now getting the backwash of years of tariff reduction and the building up of foreign manufacturing equipment with modern machinery. I say we went too far too fast. Unless we take steps now it may be too late. How we can expect to overcome our heavy unemployment under these circumstances surpasses my understanding.

We are working at cross purposes in our trade policy with our full employment goal. There is no foreseeable way by which we can put the unemployed back to work when so many of our industries are under severe pressure to reduce the number of man-hours required to produce a given output, as a means of competing with imports. We cannot respond to the need of displacing thoustands of workers in order to compete with imports and at the same time hire thousands of workers to meet the full employment goal. The two objectives are mutually exclusive.

The need for revised trade legislation is obvious. We need a better and surer remedy for injury from imports; but what we really need is a preventative. This is not to say that imports should be halted but rather that their penetration of our market should be controlled.

We do not owe to any country the sacrifice of any of our industries on the altar of free trade. We do not owe to any country the unimpeded admission of its goods if these goods have a competitive advantage based principally on the fact that they are produced at wages that are far below ours.

It is not fair to subject our producers, of whom we require minimum wages and obligatory collective bargaining, to competition from sources that are not subject to these minimum wages and other cost-raising requirements to which our producers must answer.

Foreign advantages of this variety do not reflect higher efficiency or better methods of production. By and large our producers still enjoy a productivity lead over their foreign competitors. This is to say that by and large the American output per man-hour or man-year continues to be at a higher level than in foreign manufacturing. However, the lead has been narrowing and in a few instances lost because of the great technological advancement of recent years in foreign countries.

It is not that we have stood still in this respect. The difference comes from the fact that after the war foreign countries began to adopt our methods of production. With our help they installed the most modern machinery and equipment, replacing much less productive instruments and methods of production. This gave their productivity a great boost not matched by our own.

At the same time, while in many instances their wages came up more rapidly proportionately or by a higher percentage than our wages, the gap in dollars and cents actually widened because they started from such a low base compared with ours, and because our wages at the time did not stand still. A 10-percent wage increase here could mean as much in dollars and cents or even more than a 50-percent increase in some of the countries that compete with us.

Mr. Speaker, the bright glitter of the free trade vision has already shown itself to be glitter rather than golden. The theory of free trade is not in tune with the realities in a world where economic control has been tightened over the years and continues to be tightened, or in a world in which social and welfare considerations are rapidly replacing purely business and commercial considerations. We are in the position as riders of our producers, of applying the lash harder and sharper to drive them to become more competitive while we load heavier burdens on them year after year. At the same time we expect them to hire more workers, while becoming more competitive means getting rid of workers through more productive machinery installations.

What is needed clearly is legislation that does something more than the present adjustment assistance accomplishes. We wait until imports have driven a business to the wall or nearly so and then extend some means of compensation to the workers, hoping that they will find employment elsewhere. We may go so far as to help retrain them for some imaginary jobs in other industries or occupa-

tions, some of which may be equally beleaguered by imports. Since when, Mr. Speaker, since when, once our foreign friends have more than recovered from the ravages of war do we owe their producers an unfair competitive advantage in our market over our own producers, or their workers over our workers?

Even now, the tariff reductions already provided for under the Kennedy round have not been put into effect the full extent. Yet, it must be obvious even to the blind that imports already enjoy an undue competitive advantage in our market. What then is the purpose of our trade legislation? Is it to be a punitive weapon to be used as a scourge?

There are those, Mr. Speaker, who feel hostile toward business and in some instances perhaps for good reason; but even so business is not the only element of our economy that is afflicted by unfair import competition. Labor feels the impact no less keenly than do the producers. Workers lose their jobs to imports for the same reason that drives producers to seek more and more output per hour. If workers are hurt they are hurt as consumers no less than other consumers. It is not good sense to distinguish between the workers and consumers since the overwhelming number of consumers are themselves workers, which is to say, employees.

The present escape clause is working poorly and haphazardly. Many of the applicant workers and firms are turned down; and there is no appeal from the Tariff Commission. In equally split decisions the President is called on to render the decision. Recently he delayed action on footwear after receiving such a split decision from the Commission. Mr. Speaker, the situation is too serious to suggest postponement of improved legislation. It is needed now.

Last year this body passed a trade bill which, while it was not all that many of us wanted, was nevertheless a great improvement over the existing situation. The bill, while passed by a 50-vote margin did not move through the other body although it was favorably reported by the Finance Committee. Time ran out at the end of the session.

I feel that we should move ahead at the earliest possible date. The long hearings of last year witnessed an outpouring of witnesses from industry, agriculture, and labor that was unprecedented. Contrary to previous years witnesses from large labor organizations were found on the side of import controls. Not a single labor organization representing workers in manufacturing plants opposed the bill.

I am happy to say that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has expressed the need for trade legislation in this session. I am fully in support of that position and express the hope that the legislation may be activated at an early date.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I should like to congratulate the gentleman on his statement and particularly to express appreciation for his bringing this subject to the attention of the House at the present time.

I believe that the most important part about the statement the gentleman is making is to call attention to the fact that this general situation has not improved markedly in spite of some cosmetic changes that have been made voluntarily and, in fact, in some instances in spite of the resumption of certain quotas the situation is getting worse, with reduction of production and increase of unemployment.

The gentleman makes a very good point to the effect that the increase in these imports is still going on and that the statistics show the rate of increase is greater in many instances.

I represent a district which is probably as industrialized as any in the country, and we know only too well the competition which is coming from abroad.

It is not that we want to avoid trade. We realize there must be reciprocal trade in order for all countries to live adequately, but we believe there should be an investigation of trade barriers in other countries and there should be consideration of the rising amount of U.S. capital which is being invested abroad, which is taking away jobs from our own workers.

Finally, it should be mentioned again that the main fact to which the gentleman from Ohio calls attention is the fact that there has not been a material change since we were talking about trade legislation in the last Congress, and that there still is a need to review the problem and to keep it before us is as important today as it was then.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his comments. I personally believe he has made a contribution to our discussion this afternoon of this very important problem and the threat facing not only our own industries but also our labor.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I just wish to point out to the Members of the House that in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, since 1962, 115 shoe factories have closed.

The textile industry has suffered great losses. The electronics industry during the past 6 months had over 10,000 people laid off and when they turned around to look for domestic jobs they found out that in radio and television and in the component parts phase of that industry it has all been taken over by the Orient. We have 184,000 people walking the streets of Massachusetts today who are unemployed. Thousands have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits and are now turning to welfare.

Welfare is the No. 1 domestic problem in our country. Unless we can look at this trade problem realistically as it affects our country and remove the trade barriers, as my good friend from Connecticut has stated, and remove the border taxes and all of the licensing fees that have been put into the laws by those various trading partners of ours, we will transport all of our business in this country within the next 10 years in the industrial complex over to foreign countries.

At that time, instead of 5 or 6 percent unemployment in this country, we will have 20 or 30 percent unemployment. That is when a real chaotic condition will exist and that is when they will start trying to do something about it. But the horse will have been stolen by then.

The gentleman in the well knows about the testimony of the two men who are engaged in the umbrella frame industry. They were the last two left in the Nation in that industry. Their entire industry has been wiped out in the last 10 years. I referred to them as "the last of the Mohicans." One of the witnesses testified, "We are not the last, because I am going to leave pretty soon. My business will be wiped out within 6 months. My friend here who will be testifying will be like General Custer making his last stand."

Mr. Speaker, you cannot buy an American-made baseball glove in this country. The products of our national pasttime are being manufactured overseas. That is what is happening in every industry.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement here today, because it is very timely. The House should be made aware of the problem that this great and beloved Nation of ours faces in the next few years.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I think the gentleman will agree with me that the bill which we had before the Committee on Ways and Means and which was passed on the floor of the House and sent to the other body would have done a great deal toward correcting the problems that we are talking about here this afternoon if it had become law.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. It is too bad that the Members of the other body do not possess the good common sense that our good friend in the well has.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BETTS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I will take only a minute or two of time, because you have already been interrupted several times and we all want to hear your discussion.

I interrupt only for the purpose of inviting the gentleman's attention and the attention of our colleagues on the floor and those who will read the RECORD to the fact that the Department of Commerce today issued a news release, which I placed in the RECORD in a 1-minute speech and an extension for which I obtained permission earlier today. I would like to invite all who are interested in this problem to read this release. I would like for the gentleman from Massachusetts to read it. It was issued by the Department of Commerce today.

It shows that instead of improving the situation and instead of our foreign competitors displaying any restraints on their invasion of our markets, they are stepping up their invasion. With respect to textiles, for example, it shows that the increase in exports of textiles from Japan into the United States in March of this year was 100 percent above the

levels of March a year ago. Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Korea are not displaying any disposition to restrain or limit their exports of textile products into our country. On the contrary, they are all increasing the level of their exports to the United States with each passing month.

Mr. Speaker, the wage levels and production costs of the exporting countries I have named are far below ours. Unless we have some reasonable limitation upon the amount of their exports into our own country, I do not see how we can expect our domestic textile industry to survive this ever-increasing flood of imports.

And, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen is either one of two things: Many of our manufacturing plants will go out of business because the owners do not have the financing or the know-how to start up an operation abroad. Those that are knowledgeable and have expertise and have the capital are rapidly expanding their activities overseas, and one cannot blame them for doing that. If they are going to continue being harassed to death with imports of cheap goods produced abroad in such quantities as to destroy the ability of these companies to stay in business, they either have to go out of business or they have to go abroad and start producing with this low-cost labor and then ship their goods back into the United States. That simply means the exportation of U.S. jobs.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) said, we will either act very soon or we will see very vital industries in this country either destroyed or go abroad. I do not want to see either one of those things happen. I do not advocate erecting a high tariff wall around this country and destroy competition. However, I do recommend that we enact such legislation that will protect our own producers and our own workers in order that they may have a fair and reasonable opportunity to compete in our own market.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BETTS. I think the gentleman from North Carolina is absolutely correct. He points out the fact that the situation is critical and it does not get any better. As the gentleman mentioned and as the gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned, if we had successfully passed the bill which the Ways and Means Committee reported out, I am sure many of the problems would be met and we would be on our way toward solving them.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, permit me to say that I fully and wholeheartedly supported that bill last year. I worked hard for its passage through the House. I regret as much as anyone else that the other body let it die.

Now, a similar bill is pending before the Ways and Means Committee and I would urge all who are interested in this problem to speak to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and to the members of that committee and to take any other steps that are proper to bring that bill back to the floor so we can start it through the legislative process again.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Ohio (Mr. BETTS) for his excellent presentation today.

I know at firsthand the adverse effect that increasing steel imports are having on the steel industry. About a year ago, I attended a meeting of steel industry management people and labor union leaders in Waukegan, the principal city in my district. These constituents are worried about their jobs and the future of their industry. They look to the Members of Congress to protect them from loss of livelihood.

Recently, a report of the American Iron & Steel Institute pointed out that more steel was imported during the first quarter of 1971 than any previous year. Through March 1971, steel imports were running nearly 10 percent ahead of 1968, the previous high year, and more than 62 percent ahead of 1970. Furthermore, imported steel preempted most of the growth in domestic steel between 1965 and 1970, a period of substantial economic expansion in the United States.

Certainly, the increase in imports during the first quarter is due, in part, to the fact that steel consumers were stockpiling steel against the possibility of an industry shutdown when the industry contract expires at the end of July. However, past experience proves that steel imports have not receded very far from the levels attained during such hedge-buying periods. Therefore, it seems quite likely that our problems with imported steel will continue to harass the American steel industry. Congress should look very carefully at this problem and take the steps necessary to stem the tide.

I am not prepared to propose a specific remedy. However, the best interests of the United States require a strong domestic steel industry. Some concrete remedy must be found before serious, and perhaps irreparable injury is done to the steel industry.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in commending the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BETTS). I have prepared a speech which I will put in the RECORD along with the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio.

However, I do want to warn that last year I voted against the bill when it was in the House, and I do want to warn that I hope the Committee on Ways and Means will not mix this bill up with the oil import quota which has cost the American consumer $5 billion a year in artificial prices, because of the quota on oil.

We are in a desperate condition up there. There is the case of Humble Oil which the other day increased the price of home heating oil 10 percent. This has been going on now ever since the quota system was instituted back in 1959. I think these two things are separate and they should not be mixed here. I think if you do mix them and you get into a tight vote, you are going to lose. I hope you will do everything you can to deal with the industries that are in trouble like textiles, electronics, shoes, transformers, and other industries that you have mentioned, but I hope we will not get into the oil situation once again.

Mr. BETTS. I think the gentleman has a point and it certainly ought to be given serious consideration. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

(Mr. BETTS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of Massachusetts has been severely affected by excessive imports stimulated by the deep reductions in duty granted by the United States as concessions to other nations under our trade agreements program. It has proved to be virtually impossible to secure any meaningful relief from this injury. No matter which administration is in power, the foreign policy advisers to the President prevail over those of us who counsel for the exercise of our Nation's rights under article XIX of GATT to withdraw the tariff concessions which have caused the damaging increases in imports.

The five counties which in whole or in part are included in my district, Berkshire, Franklin, Hampden, Hampshire, and Worcester, are suffering from the hardships which have come to workers displaced from manufacturing jobs because of excessive imports.

In Berkshire County, the city of North Adams and the surrounding towns of Adams, Clarksburg, Florida, New Ashford, Savoy, and Williamstown have been declared areas of substantial unemployment. As of December 1970, the situation was so bad that the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration made a "redevelopment area" designation there. The unemployment level now is a staggering 12.5 percent. The principal employment in the North Adams area is in the manufacture of electronic components.

Just 2 weeks ago, in Franklin County, 20 communities in the Greenfield Labor Area were designated by the Labor Department as eligible for assistance under title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as a result of the high overall unemployment rates during the previous year. The unemployment rate here is now 9.5 percent. The principal manufacturing employment in that county is in the machinery industry.

In Hampden County, which I represent, in part, along with my colleague, Edward Boland, the cities of Chicopee, Holyoke, Springfield, and Westfield, and the towns of Agawam, East Longmeadow, Hampden, Longmeadow, Ludlow, Monson, Palmer, Southwick, West Springfield, and Wilbraham have been

designated areas of substantial unemployment. Here again, on May 3—just 3 days ago—the Labor Department designated them for title I eligibility. And the towns of Brimfield, Holland, and Wales have been designated areas of persistent unemployment. These three towns, along with Belchertown and Ware in Hampshire County, are sustaining a disastrous unemployment rate of 17 percent. As of the first quarter of 1969, according to the Department of Commerce, principal employers in Hampden County manufactured apparel, paper products, leather products, steel, cutlery, metalworking machinery, electrical equipment, toys, and sporting goods.

In Hampshire County, the city of Northampton and the towns of Easthampton, Granby, Hadley, and South Hadley have been declared areas of substantial unemployment. The paper products industry is the principal employer.

Textile mill products was once another chief manufacturing item. But just 6 months ago, United Elastic Co. of Easthampton closed its doors, putting 300 people out of work.

In Worcester County, a portion of which I also represent, virtually every city and town in the county has been declared areas of substantial unemployment. Worcester County is a major manufacturing center. The largest employers are the textile mill products, apparel, footwear, steel, cutlery, hand tools, hardware, metalworking machinery, textile machinery, and toys and sporting goods industries.

Mr. Speaker, I and others have worked hard to obtain that kind of Federal assistance now available to aid these stricken communities. But this relief does not go to the roots of the problem. While last year's general economic downturn was a principal cause, a complete solution to the problems of these communities will require a realistic new trade policy to provide some check on the flood of imports.

Each of the industries which I have mentioned has been substantially affected by rapidly increasing imports which have achieved a relatively high level of market penetration. A study recently published by the Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., produced some data pertinent to these industries which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

Industry, increase in imports, 1964–69

	In percent
Electronic products and components	328
Machinery products	174
Textile mill products	29
Apparel	139
Paper products	32
Leather products	183
Steel	141
Cutlery	51
Metalworking machinery	301
Electrical equipment	286
Toys	171
Sporting goods	167
Footwear	311
Hand tools	178
Hardware	306
Textile machinery	196

Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's leading industrialists, Mr. Robert C. Sprague, Sr., chairman of the board of the Sprague Electric Co., North Adams, Mass., made a thoughtful analysis of this problem based on his 45 years of experience in building and managing an industrial business whose product line, electronic components, became seriously impacted by excessive imports. His analysis of the problem was set forth in an address which he made before the New York Capital District chapter of the Industrial Relations Research Association. I believe that Mr. Sprague's remarks should come to the attention of every Member of this body. Accordingly, I am incorporating them in full at the close of my remarks.

Any discussion of import problems affecting my district cannot ignore the serious question of foreign dumping of heavy electrical transmission equipment on U.S. markets.

The matter of dumping, which is the clearly unlawful selling of goods in this country at prices lower than those charged in their country of origin, is a direct threat to 3,000 workers in Pittsfield, Mass., employed at General Electric's Power Transformer Department.

Nearly a year ago, Westinghouse Electric filed a dumping action against heavy transformer manufacturers in six foreign countries.

The administration is working hard to process this complex case expeditiously and a decision is expected in another few months. I am convinced these charges will be sustained.

In the meantime, however, despite substantial evidence of dumping, our U.S.-owned utilities, such as TVA, continue to purchase nearly all of their requirements abroad. In 1967 through 1969, 95 percent of these contracts went offshore. The percentage for 1970 is apparently lower, indicating that the mere filing of the dumping action has had some deterrent effect.

It is still essential, however, to put an end to U.S.-owned utility buying now. I have urged the President to take this step in a letter signed by 17 of my House colleagues.

See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 33, page 44198. And, following a series of meetings held in Washington with leaders of union locals of the IUE, I announced plans to offer a resolution urging the President to exercise the authority he now has under the Buy American Act to stem this flood of unlawful imports.

Mr. Speaker, while the general problem of cheap imports from low-wage countries is a severe one which must be resolved, the matter of unlawful dumping is a subject on which there can be no argument. And a solution is at hand without requiring new legislation.

Unless both problems are resolved, we will be unable to restore the economic health of all these industries, affecting thousands of workers across the Nation.

The material referred to follows:

U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY—ITS DISASTROUS IMPACT ON JOBS AND INDUSTRY IN MANY SECTORS OF THE U.S. ECONOMY

(By Robert C. Sprague)

My involvement with the import problem goes back about 12 years when I was appointed chairman of our industry trade association's (EIA—The Electronic Industries Association) Import Committee.

At that time, manufacturers of electronic entertainment equipment, particularly of radios, became concerned with increasing imports from Japan, notably small portable radios sold here at lower prices than possible with our much higher labor costs. Wages in Japan at that time were one-quarter to one-third of those in the U.S.

I will, later in my talk, have more to say about electronic imports and the schism which later developed between EIA members as to what to do about the problem.

During the 12 years which have elapsed since I assumed the EIA Committee chairmanship, I have been intimately and continuously involved with its increasing import problems.

I have headed up committees of our national trade association and its components division to develop plans and take steps to meet the competition from low-wage countries. I have had personal contacts with every conceivable Federal official who is in a position to help, right up to President Nixon. I have appeared before numerous Federal commissions and committees on behalf of component manufacturers. I have been instrumental in having legislation filed by New England senators. In all my efforts, and those of U.S. component manufacturers, the goal has been to bring about reasonable quota control of imports of entertainment electronic equipment and components.

I have also become acquainted with like problems of other industries and the foreign trade policy of the various administrations in power during the period. It is tragic and, to me, a continuing puzzle that this policy has remained substantially unchanged throughout both Democratic and Republican administrations and so continues until this very day!

While I recognize that there must be trade between nations—others have raw materials and products that we need and we have raw materials and products which they need—I must in all honesty state quite bluntly that I believe our foreign trade policy has been a failure and very damaging to many of our most important domestic industries, to their employees and stockholders, and against the national interest.

This policy has resulted in a *rapidly increasing indirect import of low wage labor*, particularly in recent years from very low-wage countries in the Far East.

Against such a background it is important for you to know that we are the only large industrial nation in the world which does not take steps to reasonably protect its domestic industries. For example, at some Trade Shows in Europe, Japanese manufacturers have not been even allowed to display electronic products of Japanese manufacture.

Japan, for its part, maintains a number of important restrictions and barriers of a tariff and non-tariff nature against U.S. and other non-Japanese trade. These range from quantitative import controls to restrictive licensing requirements, informal Government practices, Government purchasing policies, labelling requirements, etc. In addition, Japan maintains severe restrictions on the freedom to invest within her borders.

To be more specific and to enlarge on the damaging consequences of our national policy, let's start with a few basic facts:

1. For reasons which I do not fully understand, substantially all members of all administrations during the past 12 years, all economists, and many businessmen classify persons concerned with trade as "free traders" or "protectionists". And the "free traders" are identified as the *good guys* while the "protectionists" are the *bad guys*.

This is an over-simplified classification which, in the interests of an effective and viable foreign trade policy, should be elimi-

nated. We should all be working for a *rational* trade policy!

2. The theoretically sound basis for free trade is that if goods are manufactured in those areas of the world where they can be produced with the *least expenditure of human effort* and lowest consumption of raw materials, then the maximum world production of goods would be achieved. Unfortunately, this concept has been prostituted by the "free traders" by converting the meaning of "with the *least expenditure of human effort*" into *"lowest cost"*. But cost is determined by the product of man hours and wages and the lowest cost is almost always achieved, assuming availability of nearly equal technology and adequate capital, where the wages are lowest. For example, in the electronic industry, where technology is diffused throughout the world, a much lower investment is required than, for example, in the steel and chemical industries. And no degree of efficiency in the U.S. can overcome the cost advantage of wages in the Far East which are from one-tenth to one-fourth of those prevalent in the U.S.

3. It is universally claimed by "free traders" that progressively lower tariffs initiated by the U.S. in the early 1930's have been responsible for the large increase in world trade in the ensuing years which has, in turn, made a substantial contribution to our economic growth and well-being. This is completely contrary to the facts. For example, U.S. exports as a percentage of Gross National Product have steadily declined from the early 1930's to the present time. During the years 1929 and 1930 U.S. exports averaged 6.4% of our GNP whereas during the period 1964 to 1967 (the latest available at the time of the study) the ratio was 5.8% of GNP. Further, as early as 1880 (90 years ago) our foreign trade represented more than 12% of our GNP!—as compared to about 4% today. This declining importance of world trade in relation to GNP of the 18 leading nations involved in international trade is further highlighted by a study of the figures available for the 8 most recent years for which such figures are available. Of the 18 exporting-importing nations, only Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, Portugal, Taiwan and Canada have shown a significant increase in the ratio of exports to GNP during the four most recent years as compared with the first four years of the eight-year period considered.

4. Instead of having a substantial favorable balance of trade, we have, in fact, during recent years actually had a deficit in our balance of trade. Our trade surplus averaged about $5 billion from 1960 through 1967. It was only $1 billion in 1968 and 1969 and if one deducts military, PL-480 exports, and AID, most of which are paid for by the U.S. Treasury rather than by commercial concems abroad, and which total between two and three billion dollars, you find that our merchandise trade actually shows a sizable deficit. Further, U.S. imports of manufactures, valued in current dollars, increased at the average annual rate of almost 12% per year during the period 1958–67, in sharp contrast to the rise in U.S. commercial exports of manufactures, which averaged only 5% per year during the same period.

5. And more troublesome is the fact that during these years the *character* of our exports has changed. U.S. exports have registered large *gains* in share of market in raw materials and manufactures with relatively low labor content: Live animals. Fodder and Feeds. Crude Synthetic Rubber. Raw Cotton. Man-Made Fibers. Logs. Paper Base Stocks. Pig Iron. Scrap Iron. Aluminum and other Non-Ferrous Ores.

We have registered large *losses* in share of market in exports of manufactures with relatively high labor content. Shoes and other Leather Products. Rubber and Cotton Products. Products made from Man-Made Fibers. Steel Mill Products. All kinds of machinery except agricultural. All kinds of vehicles except aircraft. Scientific Apparatus. Entertainment Electronics and their Components.

This is true in small industries as well as large. In specific product after specific product imports capture a large share of market where labor content is high. Exports capture a larger share of market only where labor content is low.

The kind of exports in which we are gaining ground are those ordinarily associated with underdeveloped countries. The kind of exports in which we are losing ground are ordinarily associated with highly developed countries. The common denominations of the difference is labor *cost*.

The law tariff policies followed by the U.S. under the Trade Agreements Act have finally caught up with us. Foreign manufacturers, paying wages far below even the U.S. legal minimum wage, and having high productivity by using the latest, most efficient machinery, in many cases provided by the Marshall Plan and subsequent give-away programs, are able to best American manufacturers in our home market as well as abroad—wherever there is enough labor employed to make a significant difference in the cost of the finished product. There is no other conclusion to draw from the facts.

6. Lower prices to consumers are continually cited as a justification for allowing unlimited imports of consumer products from low wage countries. However, the word "consumers" refers to people with purchasing power, and this, in turn, implies the existence of a domestic labor force whose members are gainfully employed. When imports are excessive in amount and rate of increase, workers in domestic plants become unemployed as a result of losing their jobs or under-employed as a result of the cutback in the hours of work available to them. This destroys their purchasing power and converts them from the status of "consumers" to the status of persons on welfare, or at least that part of the idle work force that is existing on the basis of unemployment compensation. In such a case, the failure to achieve some reasonable regulation over the volume and rate of increase of imports can harm the interests of consumers by depriving them of purchasing power.

The protection of jobs in America from destruction by excessive imports is no less meaningful to workers than a floor under earnings and a ceiling above working hours. You cannot logically support such social legislation at home while insisting upon the unregulated importation of goods made under labor conditions abroad which fail to rise to the same standards.

And now with a few basic facts established, let's look at the impact which our misguided trade policy has had on selected U.S. manufacturing industries:

THE STEEL INDUSTRY

U.S. imports of steel rose to 13.62 million tons in 1969, a 71% increase from the period 1964–1965. Total growth of imports averaged 18% per year, exceeding the average rise in imports of all manufactures. In 1969, we had an unfavorable balance of trade in steel of $843.5 million.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

U.S. imports of textile articles rose to 3.6 billion equivalent square yards in 1969, a 102% increase from the period 1964–1965. Total growth of imports averaged 26% per year, far exceeding the average rise in imports of all manufactures. In 1969, the United States had an unfavorable trade balance in textile articles of $1.3 billion.

THE FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

U.S. imports of footwear rose to 283.5 million pairs in 1969, a 72% increase from the period 1964–1965. Total growth of imports averaged 18% per year, exceeding the growth rate for imports of all manufactures. In 1969, we had an unfavorable balance of trade in footwear of $480.6 million.

THE ENTERTAINMENT SECTOR OF THE ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY

U.S. imports of radios rose to 38.1 million sets in 1969, a 128.4% increase from the period 1964–1965. U.S. imports of TV receiving sets increased to 4.0 million sets in 1969, a 358% increase. In 1969, 49% of the radios and 77% of the TV sets imported into the United States were received from Japan. The value of imports of electronic components increased by 216% in 1969, compared with 1964–1965. In 1969, we had an unfavorable balance of trade in entertainment electronic equipment of $787.5 million. And Mr. Joseph Wright, Chairman of Zenith, forecasts that this large unfavorable trade balance will increase to $3.0 billion within the next few years if present trends continue.

THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

U.S. imports of automobiles rose to 1,847,000 automobiles in 1969, a 237% increase from the period 1964–1965. Total growth of imports averaged 59% per year, far exceeding the average rise in imports of all manufactures. In 1969, we had an unfavorable balance of trade in automobiles of $2.4 billion.

The U.S. trade balance of these five major industries (Automotives, Textiles, Steel, Entertainment Electronic Equipment, and Shoes) declined from a small surplus in 1963 to a 5.8 billion dollar deficit by 1969!

In all, there are 100 U.S. manufacturing industries which have suffered a sharp, adverse change in their foreign trade deficit during the past three years, and during 1969 a total trade deficit in the products manufactured by these industries was 12.7 billion dollars!

Now, a little more about the industry I know best—the electronics industry.

When a schism developed in our industry relating from the first purchase of a large quantity of radio chassis made in Japan by a leading U.S. manufacturer, and their merchandising in the U.S. under the U.S. manufacturer's trade name, others shortly felt the pressure of the lower retail prices made possible by the transaction, and progressively followed two courses of action.

First, to also purchase chassis manufactured in Japan and then to set up their own manufacturing plants in low wage countries in the Far East—Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan—where radios and televisions and their components are being increasingly produced by U.S. manufacturers for export to the U.S.

I deplore this trend and have fought against it increasingly for the past 12 years. However, it is an inevitable course of action for survival of U.S. manufacturers of entertainment electronic equipment and its components, unless effective congressional and administrative actions are promptly taken to prevent further penetration of U.S. markets by foreign manufacturers.

On March 9, 1970, Mr. Kenneth L. Davis, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce, gave a very interesting talk to EIA membership. In it he stated in part:

"In the consumer area, it is sometimes argued that we should permit unlimited imports of low cost foreign products such as textiles, oil, or steel because of the beneficial effect on consumer prices. However, from a truly national standpoint, our precarious balance of payments position simply will not permit such a policy. Also from the standpoint of business and labor, the country cannot afford to see its major industries lose their strength just because of the existence of low cost labor or raw materials overseas, or because other countries subsidize their industry or have lax anti-trust laws."

With this statement I fully agree. Unfor-

tunately, he later largely negated this sound statement by saying:

"We should not turn back towards protectionism."

So, on March 13, 1970, I felt impelled to write Mr. Davis:

"The best brains in our industry have spent ten years on this problem and the only answers so far have been to:

A. Attempt to compete by buying low cost Japanese components of inferior quality.

B. Purchase complete electronic chassis from the Japanese or from foreign-owned companies located in other Far Eastern low-wage countries.

C. Set up American-owned plants in low-wage Far Eastern countries to manufacture components and complete chassis for sale in the United States.

The last is the current trend and I see only one possible answer to stem it. Consider that:

A. 92% of all radios, excepting automobile radios, are now imported into the U.S.

B. Over 50% of black and white TV sets sold in the U.S. are manufactured overseas and the percent increases substantially with each passing year.

C. Over 27% of color TV sets are now manufactured abroad and the percentage here is increasing even more rapidly.

So, with the real concern so well stated earlier in your talk, all of us would deeply appreciate a concrete recommendation from you as to just how U.S. manufacturers of entertainment electronic equipment and their components can protect themselves other than:

A. By reasonable quota legislation, or

B. By continuing the accelerating trend of U.S. companies to manufacture or have manufactured for them entertainment electronic equipment and components in the low-wage foreign countries for sale in the U.S.

The latter is equivalent to encouraging, no forcing, U.S. manufacturers to replace U.S. workers with very low-wage foreign labor. This, at least to many of us, makes no sense as a constructive U.S. trade policy."

Shortly after receiving this letter, Mr. Davis came out strongly for legislation to protect injured industries. No longer agreeing with our foreign trade policy, he tendered his resignation to Secretary Stans.

At the end of testimony before the House Committee on Ways and Means, then considering the Mills bill (H.R. 18970), Mr. Herbert Rowe, Chairman of the World Trade Committee of the Parts Division of EIA, accompanied by Mr. Eugene Stewart, Special Counsel to the EIA Committee, made the following recommendation:

"Having invoked every administrative remedy available to us without success, we now come to this Committee and ask, on an urgent basis, that it include in the bill which it reports as a result of these hearings, provisions to impose a system of flexible quotas on imports of entertainment electronic products and the types of components used in the manufacture of those products."

Although, until fairly recently, organized labor has supported tariff reductions and further liberalization of trade by the U.S., and this was particularly true during the so-called Kennedy-round of trade negotiations, during which our negotiators were outmaneuvered by their opposite numbers abroad and many U.S. industries seriously damaged, labor has now finally awakened to the serious nature of the problem and is actively pushing for reasonable protection of their U.S. jobs.

A case in point is a recent remarkable joint presentation by George Collins, Assistant to the President of IUE, on behalf of the IUE, the IBEW, and the IAM, and Mr. Eugene Stewart, Special Counsel for our (EIA) of World Trade Committee, on October 12, 1970, before the U.S. Senate Committee on Finance. Their statement included the following:

"From a peak employment of 590,000 in October 1966, manufacturers of entertainment electronics equipment and their components have been forced to reduce employment by 112.9 thousand by July 1970.

By comparison, employment in the combined textile mill products and apparel industries declined 101.4 thousand jobs, between October 1966 and July 1970. The industry producing leather footwear sustained a loss of employment during the same period of 18.3 thousand jobs.

Relief must be provided by specific legislation rather than offered through the time-consuming procedure of the escape clause, because of the rate at which U.S. producers of electronic products are shifting their plants abroad and either by the statutory imposition of import quotas or by an increase in the import duty to the statutory rate of 35% ad valorem. The transfer of these plants to offshore sites is destroying the jobs of American workers in the electronic industries. Once the plants are established abroad, the jobs in the United States are lost forever. The adoption of the Hartke bill, S. 4198 (or, alternatively, the increase in duty requested by the industries) would preserve the jobs which remain."

The Mills bill (H.R. 18970) can be very helpful if certain technical amendments are incorporated in the bill before final passage. These are being brought to the attention of Senator Russel Long, Chairman of the Committee, and to other influential members of Congress.

And finally, labor must stand and fight in this country. Two choices are open to labor. Labor must either accept lower wages so that foreign workers with high productivity and low wages cannot take their jobs, or it must insist that the advantage which accrues to foreign products in this market, because of lower labor costs, be reasonably controlled by quotas or by sufficiently high import duties which will neutralize that cost advantage. There is no other choice.

No political realist believes that labor will willingly surrender the wage scales for which they have fought so long. Nor is it in this country's interest to have workers receive the marginal wages paid abroad which allow them to buy little more than the necessities of life. The great market in the U.S. for consumer goods has been created by workers' ability to buy. Homes. Cars. Television sets, etc. Our domestic economy would collapse, and our financial institutions would fail if the average wage of U.S. production workers were reduced to the wages paid in Far Eastern locations.

The alternative is within Labor's power. Labor has the strength to demand that their jobs and their wage scales be preserved. Few politicians would fail to heed such a demand, particularly when supported by efforts being made by leaders of the many basic manufacturing industries, being seriously damaged by rapidly increasing imports from low-wage countries.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) and others joined in a discussion of the issue of this Nation's trade policy. The problems explored at that time are of enormous importance to the American people and I regret that the attention of the Members was diverted by the loud and bizarre events going on just outside this Chamber.

The purpose of yesterday's demonstration was explained as an attempt to "hold Congress hostage" until it legislates an end to the war in Vietnam. Regardless of our differing views on the tragic conflict in Southeast Asia, the irrationality of "closing down" this forum of the people's business is obvious.

By indicating that there are other great issues confronting the American people, I do not depreciate the urgent importance of a continuing assessment of the war.

We must deal with these and other great issues simultaneously since, unfortunately, dealing with many of our problems cannot wait until other issues are fully resolved. For that reason, I am glad to join with my friend from Ohio (Mr. BETTS) in his effort today to proceed with this discourse on trade policy. As I see this question, it is more starkly simple than I would like it to be. The question is whether we are to go farther down the road into fantasyland by blindly continuing the trade policy of the last several decades or whether we have the determination and the statesmanship to make the changes essential for our economic survival.

Over and over again during these past 2 days, examples of the inadequacies of our trade policy have been provided in very impressive numbers. Today, the challenge international competition poses to American enterprise is clear for all to see. A tragedy of our time is our refusal to face facts and our continuing faith in "reciprocal" trade which is no longer reciprocal and our foolish insistance that our industries can maintain technological superiority over those of competing nations abroad. That imagined superiority, of course, is supposed to assure that our products will prevail in the marketplaces abroad and at home. Circumstances ought to have demonstrated the fallaciousness of this thinking.

In the 10th District of North Carolina, we have seen the grim results of an inadequate trade policy. Our textile plants which provide a large proportion of our economic strength are under direct attack from foreign-made products. More and more of our mills have closed. Others have searched for other products to produce and still others have had long periods of short workweeks. While the fate of our textile industry is acutely felt in North Carolina, the consequences of this assault by foreign textile products are not confined to one State or region. This is a national problem of great proportion. It illustrates starkly the need to reassess and overhaul the policies of the U.S. Government which are directly responsible for the predicament in which we find ourselves. What is happening to textiles today will happen to other American products tomorrow.

The policies of 1945 will not work in the changed world of a quarter of a century later. Based as they were on the fact that we were the only major industrial power emerging from World War II with its productive capacity in tact, it was in our best interest to rebuild the factories of our former allies and our former enemies. This we did freely. The industrial genius of our friends abroad was encouraged and assisted. Our domestic market was opened to their products and we overlooked the barriers which

they erected to bar American products from their domestic markets. This was and still is our policy. It is shortsighted, destructive of American jobs, and essentially dishonest.

President Nixon is the first American President since World War II to propose realistic changes in policy. He has been steadfast in his efforts to negotiate voluntary agreements with major foreign producers of textile products which will restore reason and order to our domestic market. What he has attempted to achieve is not the exclusion of foreign textiles, but an orderly sharing of the growth of the American market.

When long negotiations with Japan failed, the President turned to the Congress for legislation that would strengthen his hand at the negotiating table. It should be pointed out here that well more than half of the Members of the House last year joined in active cosponsorship of this legislation. Certainly, this is a remarkable demonstration of understanding of and sympathy for the problem of the plight of the textile, apparel, and shoe industries by the Members of the House. I have no doubt that this sentiment still exists in the House of Representatives today.

The broad trade bill written by the Ways and Means Committee late last year contained the elements of our proposal along with additional features. Its passage by the House was a great victory even though it was roundly subjected to scurrilous charges that it represented a return to blind protectionism and high tariffs. These charges were without merit although they bit the nerve of the free traders in the Senate. Amid the confusion existing in the Senate during the last weeks of a lameduck session in 1970, the trade bill was killed and the Congress ended emptyhanded.

Further negotiations with the Japanese failed in a succession of events which ended with the Japanese Textile Federation announcing its plan to unilaterally restrain textile imports to the United States. President Nixon responded that the plan is unacceptable and the American textile industry immediately pointed to its obvious deficiencies. Under its provisions, there is little or no likelihood that the increasing tide of textile imports will be controlled.

It is most unfortunate, I believe, that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee (Mr. MILLS) announced his approval of the Japanese textile industry's plan. My friend from Arkansas has been a stanch friend of the American textile industry. I have no doubt that his approval of the Japanese plan was not intended to harm the industry. The conclusion, however, that great harm has been done is inescapable since his concurrence with the plan has cut the ground out from under hopes for a government-to-government agreement. It has also encouraged the Japanese to continue their textile trade war since they know that without the chairman's approval, legislation to restrict textile imports is not likely to emerge from the Ways and Means Committee.

As things stand today, there is little prospect for the relief our textile industry needs so desparately. We must now work to strengthen this Nation's resolution to take steps to assure that one of our country's great industries will not be destroyed in the systematic trade offensive being waged against us.

It is unacceptable to me and I believe to all thinking Americans that we remain willing for a foreign industry to determine the rules of our marketplace. Certainly, the Japanese would be the first to object to any such effort on our part to impose our will upon them. However, I cannot blame a foreign industry or a foreign government for taking advantage of such a ridiculous situation which we are so supine as to allow to continue.

There is no doubt that if this Congress can find the will to act in this situation, the Japanese Government will come to the negotiating table prepared to bargain sincerely and seriously. In the process of legislating, the President needs the kind of authority last year's trade bill contained so that there will be no doubt that a failure to reach a negotiated settlement will result in the resolution of import questions by law.

Gentlemen, we have a sovereign obligation to the American people that we will not be victimized by any organized foreign trade blitz and that the price of trading in our domestic market is reasonable and that we have fair access to the markets of those countries which would send their products here. This is not the case today and it is our responsibility to begin to set right a disordered and outdated trade policy.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I hope to make clear in my brief remarks today the current realities of the footwear imports situation. During the first 3 months of 1971, 87.5 million pairs of leather and vinyl footwear have been imported into this country, which is an increase of 27.4 percent over the amount that came in last year during the same period. At this rate imports will rise from 235 million pairs in 1970 to over 300 million pairs this year. This will represent 39 percent of the total new supply of footwear, that is, of the sum of U.S. production and imports combined. This volume of imports represents 64 percent of total U.S. production. Last year, footwear imports were equal to 30 percent of the total new supply and 42 percent of U.S. production.

You may recall that I, as well as many others on the Ways and Means Committee, supported the Trade Act of 1970 and also supported with great enthusiasm the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This support represented our conviction that a truly liberalized trade policy must form the foundation of our international trade relations.

I continue to feel strongly that the Trade Act of 1970 now entered as H.R. 20, the Trade Act of 1971, responds to the realities of international trade today and is the only sort of step that we can take in the short run, the next 3 to 5 years ahead. That will enable us to attain a commercial environment that will sustain a truly liberalized trade relationship with our trading partners. More importantly, in the short run, we must not allow the wholesale disruption of our footwear and textile industries to the extent that thousands are forced on to welfare rolls or into the extremely costly adjustment assistance remedy that is now underway. Payrolls, not welfare rolls, are the better answer.

The footwear industry in the State of Pennsylvania has held up remarkably well in relation to other footwear States, and yet the impact of imports is evident.

As you may know, Pennsylvania is the most important footwear-producing State in America, producing as it does nearly 14 percent of the Nation's output. Yet, in the past 3 years, Pennsylvania's footwear production has sagged from 85 million pairs in 1968 to under 77 million pairs in 1970. Since 1968, the number of footwear workers has dropped from nearly 25,000 to an estimated 23,000 workers, although during that time their taxable wages have gone up from $103.7 million to an estimated $108 million in 1970.

But this is not the whole employment story, since we have many tanners and suppliers in this State who employ many thousands of workers. The total number of employees in the leather products industry which combines both nonrubber footwear and tanners has dropped from nearly 30,500 in 1968 to 28,000 in 1970, so the footwear industry in Pennsylvania is now truly imperilled by the flood of footwear imports from abroad.

As you know, the footwear industry in my State is mainly a rural enterprise. I know you are also aware that in this Nation today about 35 percent of the population still resides in rural areas, and that farming in rural America only accounts for the employment of about 2 million families. The combination of agriculture and industry in these areas is essential. As was pointed out a year ago in "The Report of the President's Task Force on Rural Development":

> If this is to be a happy and healthy Nation in the years ahead, our growing industry and our increasing population must spread out instead of continuing to pile people and industrial plants into compacted urban areas.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join with my colleagues today in calling for immediate action on legislation to impose quotas on textile imports. In my section of Tennessee the textile industry is mighty important to the economy, just as it is in the neighboring States of North and South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia. We are seeing the steady erosion of this industry because our American firms cannot compete with the imports, especially those from Japan, where there is such a differential in the wage structure, and such a determination to capture world markets.

There are all kinds of figures to prove what is happening to us under the present policy. The estimates of jobs lost in the textile industry range well over 100,000 and a recent count of American textile factories which have had to close is something like 550.

We all know how imports have soared. Five years ago the United States was importing around 565 million yards of manmade fiber products. As of last year, the total had jumped to 2.8 billion yards

and the textile imports for the first months of 1971 will show an average increase of around 5 percent over last year's all-time high.

We have tried the voluntary limitation route. Unfortunately, it does not help American industry because textile imports are still entering this country in record volume. We face more plant closings and more employee layoffs.

I think the President was correct in rejecting the Japanese proposal in March. He did so on solid grounds, and I think this portion of his statement bears repeating:

Only one overall ceiling for all cotton, wool and manmade fiber fabric and apparel textiles is provided, with only a general undertaking by the Japanese industry "to prevent undue distortions of the present pattern of trade." This allows concentration on specific categories, which could result in these categories growing many times faster than the overall limits.

The overall ceiling would be based on imports from Japan in the year ending March 31, 1971, plus a growth factor. During the two years that we have been negotiating with the Government of Japan, imports of manmade fiber textile products have greatly increased, and in January 1971 they entered this country at a record-breaking level. Moreover, the program magnifies the potential growth of the sensitive categories by including in the base exports of cotton products which are already limited by agreement and which have been declining.

I also feel the President is correct in calling for the prompt enactment of textile quota provisions in the type of trade legislation which passed the House last year, but which failed to get through the Senate. This legislation has been reintroduced and is pending before the Ways and Means Committee. I would hope what has been said on the House floor yesterday and today will have some influence on the committee to report out a bill with realistic textile import quotas. We are at a critical point now and cannot delay much longer.

In support of some of the points I have attempt to make, I wish to include with my remarks an Anthony Harrigan column from the April 23 edition of the Chattanooga News-Free Press:

JAPAN'S TEXTILE WAR PUT 100,000 IN UNITED STATES OUT OF WORK

(By Anthony Harrigan)

The point at which energetic trade practices turn into a trade war sometimes is hard to determine. But it seems clear enough in the case of Japan's effort to sell textiles in the United States that accepted trade activities have been left far behind and that Japanese textile manufacturers, working in cooperation with their government, are in a trade war against the United States as they attempt to monopolize the textile market in the U.S.A.

This economic conflict is in the news again because the Japanese Textile Federation recently announced a plan for limited voluntary quotas on textiles into the United States. Unfortunately, the Japanese proposal appears to be a smokescreen.

U.S. Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) has pointed out that the Japanese declaration "bases its import quotas on the level of imports from Japan in the year ending March 31, 1971, the year of the heaviest imports yet. In 1970, for example, 100,000 textile jobs were lost in the United States."

President Nixon rightly refused to accept the Japanese Textile Federation proposal as a solution to the imports problem. Since 1969, the Japanese government has been negotiating with the U.S. on the situation. The Federation's stand is no substitute for official Japanese agreement. The Japanese government, however, seems desirous of using the Federation announcement as a way out of negotiations.

Both labor and management in the textile industry are opposed to the Federation proposal. The American Textile Manufacturers Institute has said that it is "heartening that the President does not accept the premise that the United States government should rely on a private industry group in Japan to assume for itself responsibility for developing and policing a solution to a major national problem in this country."

The institute added that figures released for the month of January show another all-time record of 453 million yards in that month alone—an increase of 30 per cent over the same month last year. The Japanese self-help plan would lock onto their base this burdensome level of imports and compound it for years.

There's a tendency in some quarters to dismiss the textile industry as expendable and to describe it strictly in regional terms. But as Sen. Thurmond has pointed out, the textile industry "involves about 2½ million jobs in the United States." Textile operations are located in many states. When textile industry suffers, the economy of a broad spectrum of states and communities is adversely affected.

Those members of Congress who are opposed to import quotas take the line that the United States always has stood for free trade. Generally speaking, this has been the American position for many years. The United States has sought to lower trade barriers. But the Japanese don't really subscribe to free trade principles. While they aim at monopolization of American domestic markets, they make it very difficult for U.S. companies to enter Japanese markets. Moreover, they "dump" goods in the American market, selling a variety of products at prices lower than those set for consumers at home.

Until Japan truly subscribes to free trade principles, it should not be free of intelligent restraints on its flooding of U.S. markets. The Japanese Federation proposal isn't an effective restraint. That's why there's need for Congress to enact meaningful import quotas.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the sentiment expressed here this afternoon by my colleagues. Unfortunately the trade bill we passed in this body 6 months ago did not make its way through the other body, even though a modified bill was favorably reported by the Finance Committee.

The sentiment for trade legislation was strong last year in the 91st Congress. The concern is no less today in the country. Imports continue to rise and our industries continue to be exposed to the inroads of foreign goods in our market. At present they have almost open access, but for a handful of import quotas. These mostly apply to agricultural products.

It should surprise no one that our imports have increased twice as rapidly from 1960–70 as our exports. The competitive advantage, with few exceptions, lies almost wholly on the other side. What with wages far below those prevailing in this country, combined with fast-rising productivity abroad, the competitive advantage was and continues to be on the side of imports. Unless we do something soon to halt the trend many of our industries will go under or go overseas. In any event the workers in our plants will suffer. Unemployment will come from three sources: First, actual displacement by imports, second, displacements of workers by more productive machinery installed specifically for the purpose of standing off imports, and/or third, dampening of production expansion plans in this country because of the bleak outlook. This will mean failure to hire any of the workers coming as additions to the existing labor pool, at the rate of nearly 2 million per year.

It must be obvious that this combination will work directly at cross purposes with all efforts to achieve full employment in this country. If it were merely a matter of a few small industries the problem would not bulk so large; but it is not only the small industries that are affected. We have only to look about ourselves: We note the steel industry, the automobile industry, the textile industry, footwear, household electronics, fruits and vegetables, and a long series of other industries.

My own district has a great concern over textile and footwear imports, but I recognize the plight of many other industries. There would be no point in going into detail today about the imports of textiles and footwear. They are well known. Other industries have also given the details of their own troubles.

Right now I, together with many others, am concerned over the delay in getting back to trade legislation. Imports have hit new records in the first quarter of this year; and they are still pointed upward.

Even the Department of Commerce has dropped its former optimism. It now acknowledges the weak competitive position of many of our industries in world markets and in this country in competition with imports. Only recently Commerce Today, published by the Department weekly, carried an analysis of our exports and imports—March 8, 1971, page 16 and following pages. It shows the spreading gap between imports and exports of what the publication calls manufactured products, not technology-intensive. It shows by a chart how imports are running away from exports in this sector of products. Then it shows in another chart that imports of "manufactured products, 'technology-intensive'" have been running parallel though behind exports in recent years, indicating that we cannot rely on these export-oriented products to overcome the heavy deficit in the other category.

More concretely put, we can say that with the exception of machinery, including computers, and transportation equipment, including aircraft; and chemicals, we are in a deficit position with respect to nearly all other manufactured product classifications. Beyond that we are in a deficit in petroleum, fish and fish products, certain fruits and vegetables, certain minerals, such as lead and zinc, and so forth.

Since the export surplus enjoyed in machinery and chemicals is narrowing while imports continue to run well ahead in the other product lines, the outlook overall is all but bright. I may add that

since 1960 through 1970 our imports of machinery and chemicals combined have increased at twice the pace of our exports. That gives us some idea of where we are headed. If the narrow segment of products in which we do enjoy a wide lead in exports finds imports gaining so rapidly, then, Mr. Speaker, our competitive weakness will become more glaring as the months go by.

One of the startling examples of what imports may do to a long and thoroughly established industry is exemplified by the nonrubber footwear industry; that is, shoes, men's, women's and children's.

A few years ago imports were no threat. Once this market was penetrated, however, the flood rose rapidly. In 1960 less than 5 percent of our total market was supplied by imports. By 1965 this share had risen to 12 percent. Imports continued upward and in 1969 supplied 25.2 percent of domestic consumption. In the first 3 months of 1970 the percentage rose to 32. Now, in the first 3 months of 1971 imports are 27.3 percent higher than in the first 3 months of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, no industry can stand up under such a battering. Already in 1969 imports had stopped growth of our industry. Since then they are only taking up all the growth attributable to population increase but are eroding the base beyond the growth.

That the situation is serious is not enough to say. It is fast becoming desperate.

Mr. Speaker, is this country bound to sit idly by while one of its established industries, catering to a universal consumer need, is being undermined and demolished? I cannot believe that we are so committed to the principle of free trade that we cannot defend ourselves against such an economic atrocity. I do not say, nor does anyone else, that the imports of shoes, or textiles, or any other product should be stopped. I do say that they should be controlled, so that they cannot cripple or destroy our industries.

This House passed a bill last year but it did not make its way through to the other body. I am sure that all who supported that bill expected early action in this session. This has not been forthcoming. I join with the other Members in this body, in the hope and the plea that we may get on with the legislation and not let it drift. Trade legislation is entitled to a high priority and I trust that this fact will be recognized.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the erosion of the specialty steel industry in this country. The increase in imports of tool and stainless steels has risen to a point that it endangers a vital segment of our domestic steel industry.

The phrase "specialty steels" in understood in the industry to include stainless steels, tool steels, high temperature steels, and refractory, reactive, electrical and electronic metals. I am also including in this category pressure and mechanical tubing of carbon, alloy, and stainless steels.

These specialty products are designed and produced for use in extreme environments requiring exceptional hardness, toughness, tensile strength, resistance to heat, corrosion, or abrasion, or a combination of these factors. They contain substantial amounts of expensive and critical alloys such as chromium, nickel, molybdenum, titanium, columbium, tungsten, vanadium, cobalt, and other elements which provide their unique characteristics.

Because of their technological properties and alloy content specialty steels are difficult and costly to manufacture. In 1969 the producers of tool and stainless steels in this country accounted for only 1.1 percent of net industry shipments of steel mill products. Their products, however, generated approximately 7 percent of total industry dollar volume. Domestic manufacturers of specialty tubing last year produced 1.6 percent of net industry shipments of steel mill products, which in turn represented 4.5 percent of industry dollar volume. These specialty steels are developed, designed, and produced for specific requirements of specific customers, and are usually sold by the pound rather than by the ton.

Most specialty steel is melted in electric arc or vacuum melting furnaces, and rolled or shaped on special steel mill equipment designed and powered for high alloy processing. Because of the sophisticated nature of our products, however, these processes take a higher degree of technology and considerably more time in our mills than in the basic carbon mills. The man-hours required to produce a ton of specialty steels, on the average, total about six to eight times that required for comparable products of carbon steel.

The U.S. industrial economy is absolutely dependent on these steels. At the most basic level specialty products like tool steels and cemented carbides make the tools that make everything else. This is the most pervasive but by no means the only critical application of specialty steels, in which no economic or indeed existent substitute is known.

Our competitive position in the world is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that imports have taken over 20 percent of the U.S. market for specialty steels, while we are unable to sell our products in volume, abroad. The plain fact is that steel technology and availability is today sufficiently worldwide that the basis for competition in all but a very few exotic steels is price, and price alone.

U.S. stainless steel imports have increased every year, rising from 79,000 net tons in 1964 to approximately 182,000 net tons in 1969. This compares with total U.S. shipments of stainless of 771,000 net tons in 1964 and 909,000 net tons in 1969. The year 1964, of course, was the first in which adequate import statistics were available for specialty products. At the end of 1970, stainless steel market penetration was at an all-time high of just about 21 percent—one-fifth of our market gone. Throughout this period, imports of stainless steel mill products increased at an average annual rate of 18.1 percent, while the corresponding rate of growth for domestic shipments was only 3.4 percent. In these 6 years, domestic apparent consumption of stainless steel increased 276,000 tons. Stainless steel imports captured 103,000 tons, or 37.2 percent of this growth in the domestic market.

Tool steel imports rose dramatically from 9,080 net tons to roughly 15,250 net tons during the 1964–69 period. This average annual growth rate of 10.9 percent contrasts sharply with the growth rate in domestic tool steel shipments of 2.2 percent annually. Market penetration by imports also increased steadily, from 8.3 percent in 1964 to a high of 17 percent at the end of 1970. Domestic apparent consumption of tool steel increased from about 109,000 tons in 1964 to about 126,000 in 1969, an increase of 15.8 percent. Imports captured 6,000 tons, or over 35 percent of this growth in the domestic market.

The industry has had difficulties with the voluntary export limitations assumed by the Japanese and Western European steel exporters in January 1969. Ironically these limitations, designed to relieve import pressures on all American steel producers, have accelerated the problem for makers of specialty steel. In specialty steel, the figures show that foreign specialty steel producers have not complied with the voluntary restraint program and have actually increased tool and stainless steel imports. Instead of declining as they should under the voluntaries, these imports have jumped 4 percent from 1968 to 1969, while overall steel imports declined 20 percent. In the first 8 months of 1970 specialty imports have increased another 7 percent.

These figures illustrate two flaws in the voluntary restraint program as it applies to specialty steel. First, the major foreign producers of some specialty steel products are not participants in the voluntary program; last year more than 40 percent of the U.S. stainless steel imports and three-fourths of tool steel imports came from nonsignatories.

Second, even the signatories have entirely disregarded their stated intent not to disturb the historical product mix and geographical distribution patterns on which the program was based. A few thousand tons of stainless steel do not make a ripple in 14 million tons of total steel imports, but this small quantity can wipe out the entire market of one of our small specialty mills. In the tool steel area, where 5 tons is a big order, 500 tons of high speed wire can have a crippling and demoralizing effect in the marketplace and to the small companies in industry.

As to geographic distribution, in stainless steel we have seen a significant shift in import focus to the Pacific and gulf coast ports. In tool steels the shift has been to the Atlantic coast for high speed tool steels and to the Pacific coast for alloy tool steels. Any such shifts vastly intensify the local effects of increased imports and contribute further to market imbalance and dislocation.

We reach three basic conclusions with respect to the importance of specialty steels to the United States.

First. Our national security starts with our ability to maintain a viable industrial base and civilian economy both in peacetime and in a period of national emergency;

Second. Special steels are an indispensable industrial material; and

Third. Therefore, this Nation must maintain an adequate level of self-sufficiency in specialty steels, not only in production and supply capability, but also in a contemporary reservoir of research technology and a skilled and experienced labor force.

In short, the national security requirements of the United States are best met by providing an economic climate in which the domestic specialty steel industry will continue to grow and expand.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress will take such action as is necessary to slow the devastating flow of specialty steel products into this country thus causing the loss of American jobs.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the manufacturing industries which have plants in the two counties which make up my district employ more than 100,000 of my constituents. I therefore have a major interest and responsibility to be concerned about any situation that adversely affects employment in these manufacturing plants. The principal employers in my district are the steel; china, earthenware, and pottery products; metalworking machinery; meat products; rubber products; electrical equipment; and electronic products and components industries.

My constituents keep me informed on the problems which increased imports are causing in the domestic market and the effect of the inroads which imports are making in the market on employment in these domestic industries. The rapid increase in imports in articles which compete with the production of these industries is very disturbing.

The Trade Relations Council of the United States has compiled data on employment, output, and foreign trade of U.S. manufacturing industries. The third edition of that study, recently published, indicates that the increase in imports in the products which affect the industries with plants in my district has been very rapid, as shown by the following data:

Industry, increase in imports, 1964–69

[In percent]

Steel	141
China, earthenware, and pottery products	90
Metalworking machinery	301
Meat products	90
Rubber products	154
Electrical equipment	286
Electronic products and components	328

Mr. Speaker, the single most important employer in my district from the point of view of the numbers of workers is the steel industry. The study which I have referred to indicates that for the latest year for which all of the necessary data were available for the calculation, 1968, the foreign trade deficit of the United States in basic steel mill products represented the equivalent of 43,048 jobs. This loss of employment has affected every steel-producing area of the country.

SPECIALTY STEEL

Other Members are dealing with the overall problem of steel imports. I wish to touch on the subject only briefly and with reference to a problem I fear is often overlooked. The tendency has been to deal with a lump sum problem which is 13 million tons of steel imports last year. Overlooked is the fact that our foreign competition is turning ever more rapidly from large quantity imports of basic steel to the high cost specialty steels, and it is the specialty steels that are the lifeblood of the industry in my district.

In this category are such sophisticated products as stainless, tool steels, and other high alloy steels. One segment of this category, tool steels, makes the tools that make everything else. Specialty steels require considerably more time and money to produce than conventional steel products and they are sold by the pound rather than the ton.

Since 1964, the first year adequate statistics became available on specialty products, specialty steel imports have increased steadily and now claim 20 percent of the U.S. market. Stainless steel imports have risen from 79,000 net tons in 1964 to 177,000 net tons in 1970—an increase of 124 percent. Tool steel imports have gone from 9,000 net tons to 17,000 net tons during the same period.

In many product lines, the situation is considerably worse than the overall figures would indicate. In the 1964–70 period, cold rolled stainless steel sheet imports increased 203 percent and stainless round wire, 234 percent.

A few thousand tons of stainless steel hardly make a ripple in the 13 million tons of total steel imports last year. But that tonnage is large enough to wipe out the entire market of a domestic specialty steel producer.

In the tool steel area, where five tons is regarded as a large order, 500 tons of high-speed wire can have a crippling effect in the market place.

The specialty steel problem serves to emphasize the urgency for modernizing our trade policies to give our steel producers a fair chance to compete with foreign producers. Such measures, already proposed, must be adopted without further delay.

I could deal at length with other problems in my district such as those confronting the ferro-alloy industry and the producers of ceramic tile. Literally thousands of jobs are at stake and I fear that the people of my district and of the United States generally are not aware of the fact that we are perilously close to a major disaster, not because of our own economic policies, not because we are inefficient, not because we lack skilled mechanics and aggressive business leaders, but simply because a visionary foreign trade policy pursued for nearly 40 years has ignored essential economic differences that make it impossible for our industry to compete against Government-subsidized foreign industries with special tax priviliges, low wages, low overhead and working conditions no American would tolerate.

ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS

These considerations apply with special force to the electronic product industries, and it is ironic that this is also the one major industry in the United States which is completely neglected in governmental efforts to date to correct fundamental import problems. The degree of import penetration of radios, televisions and other consumer electronic products and of the components which are contained in and the type used in the manufacture of such sets exceeds that of steel, textiles or leather footwear.

In 1970, imported television sets accounted for nearly 40 percent of the domestic market. In 1968, the study previously mentioned indicates that a total of 17,084 jobs were lost as a result of the deficit in our foreign trade in radios and television sets, and an additional 7,000 jobs were lost in the foreign trade deficit of electronic components. To assist in a better understanding of the electronic product import problem, I should like to spend a few minutes in sketching the essential facts.

Manufacturers of electronic parts and components are directly and adversely affected by the loss of a large and growing share of the U.S. market to radios, televisions, and other consumer electronic products from foreign manufacturers, principally Japanese. American brand name set assemblers have reacted by transferring the assembly of U.S. brand name radios, televisions, and other consumer electronic products to low-wage foreign countries. While an American firm is able to retain all or part of its share of the U.S. market by this expedient, the sets sold are made abroad, and represent a loss of the market for sale of electronic parts and components in the United States.

These import pressures are driving a very large and growing part of the market for the sale of parts and components overseas, where the domestic component manufacturers cannot compete. Some of these manufacturers have reacted to these events by establishing offshore assembly plants to produce the parts and components required in the offshore assembly of radios and televisions by their customers.

The U.S. manufacturers who attempt to maintain their production in the United States are faced with a shrinking domestic market in which competition from imported components has become increasingly intense. The shrinking production of consumer electronic products in this country is steadily being invaded by imported parts and components. The plants in this country that continue with the assembly of consumer electronic products react to import pressures by doing everything they can to lower their costs. U.S. import duties are so low, and the selling price of articles produced in Asia so far below American costs and prices, that increasingly they have been substituting foreign parts and components for American. The shrinking U.S. market for electronic parts and components is contracting even more rapidly because of this development.

JOB LOSS IS 65,900

The industries producing radio and television sets, and the types of parts and components used in the assembly of such sets, have sustained a major loss of employment, with 65,900 workers losing their jobs between 1966 and 1970.

Imports of foreign brand name radios and televisions have triggered imports of so-called U.S. brand name sets. In 1958, 10.8 million home-type radio sets were

sold in the United States, of which 76 percent were made in the United States. By 1967, the pressure of foreign brand name imports of radios on the domestic market was so great that U.S. manufacturers of radio sets arranged for the offshore assembly of sets to be sold in the United States under American brand names.

The penetration of the U.S. market by foreign radios increased from 24 percent in 1958 to 93.4 percent during the first 6 months of 1970. Sales of domestic sets reached their peak in 1963 and have steadily declined since then. The falloff in 1970 has been especially severe. The domestic radio manufacturing industry seems destined for total destruction, and at an early date.

Now we are witnessing the same distressing spectacle in the largest and strongest part of the domestic consumer electronic products industry, television sets. By midyear 1970, imports of TV sets accounted for 36 percent of the U.S. market, and U.S. brand name sets accounted for 42 percent of total imports. Moreover, the imports have been concentrated in the "not over 20-inch screen size" part of the market where in 1970 they accounted for slightly more than two-thirds of domestic consumption.

The record of rapid market penetration by imports of phonographs and tape recorders is no less dramatic than that for radios and televisions. During the first half of 1970, imported phonographs had captured 43.7 percent of domestic consumption. Foreign-produced tape recorders have dominated the U.S. market throughout the 1967–70 period. The market penetration by imports was 82.8 percent in 1967, and this rose steadily to 94.3 percent during the first half of 1970.

RECIPROCITY?

Notwithstanding the acute peril of the domestic producers of consumer electronic products, the U.S. trade negotiators agreed in the Kennedy round to a 50-percent cut in duty on virtually all electronic products. Our foreign competitors, however, emerged from the Kennedy round with higher duties than ours on consumer electronic products. For those acquainted with Orwellian newspeak, this kind of negotiation is termed "reciprocity." Under the guise of reciprocal trade negotiations, the United States has stripped bare its workers and manufacturers, leaving them exposed to every kind of foreign competition, while accomplishing little or nothing about the reduction of duties and the elimination of nontariff barriers to our exports.

The consumer electronic product import problem is largely, though not exclusively, Japanese in origin. In the first 8 months of 1970, 45 percent of the radios, 74 percent of the televisions, 90 percent of the tape recorders, and 91 percent of the phonographs and record players imported into the United States originated in Japan. It is symptomatic of the unfairness which characterizes our foreign trade relations with Japan in electronic products that her duties on U.S. exports of the same articles are two to three times those which we impose on her exports to the United States.

PLANTS CLOSED DOWN

These developments have affected every sector of parts and component manufacture in the United States. Plant capacity for the manufacture of television picture tubes is more than 50 percent idle, both black and white, and color. Domestic producers of both the glass tube and the phosphors used in color TV picture tubes have closed down production facilities and laid off workers. The direct and indirect losses of jobs in the television picture tube and associated industries, triggered by the soaring imports of television sets, are some 6,500 jobs.

The impact of rising imports of consumer electronic products has affected the domestic manufacturers of electron receiving tubes. Five of the industry's receiving tube plants have been closed down. For the past 3 years less than 50 percent of the existing capacity has been utilized in the production of receiving tubes. Production and sales have plummeted downward, and accompanying that trend has been a major decline in employment, with a loss of 7,610 workers in 5 years' time.

Imports of receiving tubes, both direct and indirect, have increased steadily, rising from 26 percent of the domestic market in 1967 to 41 percent in 1970.

No sector of electronic parts manufacture is more vulnerable, or has been more severely injured, than loudspeakers. Between 1967 and 1969, domestic shipments declined 44 percent, imports increased 71 percent, the import share of the market more than doubled, so that two out of every three loudspeakers acquired by consumers in 1969 were of foreign origin, and employment dropped by 44 percent. During 1970, three out of every four loudspeakers acquired by consumers in the United States were of foreign origin.

The major part of domestic sales of passive components goes into consumer electronic products, so that imports have had a serious impact on these segments of the electronic parts and components industry.

With the perspective afforded by the 1969 ratio of imports to consumption of steel of 13 percent, textiles 11 percent, and footwear 28 percent, imports of tape recorders at 94 percent, radios at 93 percent, phonographs at 44 percent, televisions at 36 percent, electron receiving tubes at 49 percent, television picture tubes at 36 percent, loudspeakers at 73 percent, and passive components at 56 percent represent for the electronic products industries an extremely serious problem.

INDUSTRY DEFENSELESS

Due to the actions of the executive branch of the Government in making repeated and deep reductions in the rates of duty applicable to consumer electronic products, parts, and components, the domestic industry producing these products has been made especially vulnerable to foreign competition from low-wage nations of Asia.

Once made defenseless by the unwise reductions of electronic product tariffs made in trade agreement negotiations under GATT, compounded by the virtually 50-percent across-the-board reduction in electronic product duties in the Kennedy round, the domestic industries producing electronic products have been further plagued by systematic use, especially by Japanese electronic manufacturers, of unfair pricing practices and a Japanese Government-concerted campaign to expand their industry at the expense of U.S. production and employment by capturing the major share of the American market.

If the U.S. Government fails to take suitable action through the adjustment of import duties to realistic levels and the meaningful prohibition of the unfair pricing and marketing practices of the Japanese electronic manufacturers in selling to the U.S. market, the final and total destruction of the U.S. electronic product industries is clearly foreseeable.

1951 FORECAST

Mr. Speaker, it gives me no pleasure to say "I told you so," but the fact remains that my initial speech in this House in early 1951 forecast precisely the developments that I have today described.

American workers have lost their employment and American investors, large and small, have lost their investments because the Congress has permitted economic theorists in the executive branch to establish foreign trade policy. In 35 years of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program, the United States has lost in every international trade conference. We have taken professors from their ivory towers, imbued with the shining ideal of free trade, and sent them into negotiations with hard-headed, self-interested, cold-blooded foreign businessmen who came to trade for advantage. Our negotiators came home in splendor with lofty pronouncements about reciprocity, and the foreign negotiators went home with a larger and larger share of the American market.

In that speech in 1951 I made the following remarks, which I wish to repeat and reaffirm today:

> The Constitution provides that Congress shall regulate foreign trade and shall levy duties and imposts. I believe it is time to reestablish the constitutional prerogative of this great legislative body.
>
> I will perhaps be branded as a reactionary. Well, I do react against exporting the jobs of American workers into cheap labor areas and destroying our standard of living.
>
> I will no doubt be branded a conservative. If that means because I believe in the conservation of America's resources in order that we may have a stable economy, then I am a conservative.
>
> The so-called liberals will want no part of me. If being a liberal means being liberal with the industrial strength of this nation and giving it away in such a way that even the fair trade of competition is destroyed, then I do not want to be a liberal. But if being a liberal means believing in the liberty of the American workingman so that he may produce, earn and save, if it is liberty and freedom for all our people under the Constitution, then I am a liberal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members of the House, evidenced by our passage of the Trade Act last year, are now alert to this problem.

I am greatly encouraged by the understanding and the interest evidenced

by members of the Nixon administration and particularly by the strength of Secretary Stans in his work on the problem. It is very late in the day, but it is not too late to save American jobs and American industries. We should set ourselves to that task.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with growing concern over the plight of many thousands of American workers and the companies employing them that I join today in urging early action on trade legislation in this session of the Congress. The tremendous growth in imports during recent years has not only adversely affected our Nation's trade balance, but is costing the jobs of American workers in many industries. In my own district of Birmington we have steel mill products, cast iron pipes and fittings, malleable iron pipe and fittings, and textile manufacturers, among others, who have directly experienced many problems from unfair foreign competition.

As I have indicated many times in House statements and in committee testimony, with these concrete results of import penetration our country's trade policies can no longer be considered theoretically or in the context of noble ideals of free trade. At some point in time—and I firmly believe that time to be now—we must face up to the fact that the much-cherished "free trade" situation mentioned so often just does not exist. The United States cannot exist as an island of free trade in the middle of a protectionist sea, and what we are calling for in trade legislation is merely the type of support and protection of our domestic industries and workers which most other nations have long provided their industries.

The House of Representatives wisely lived up to its responsibility in this area last year by approving the Trade Act of 1970. With the Senate's failure to act, however, we are still faced with the same responsibility and, unfortunately, an import situation which is still deteriorating.

The bill which was approved by the House last year and which I profoundly hope will obtain passage again this year contained, among others, provisions aimed at assuring our trading partners that the United States remains willing to negotiate for fairer and free trade.

In my judgment, however, the most compelling reason for the bill's passage lay in those provisions to allow American industries and workers to gain more prompt and adequate relief from unusually heavy inroads by foreign imports. In considering these imports, I feel it is important to keep two things in mind. First, there is the fact that many of these imported products are produced by industries which are owned or subsidized by their governments. In most cases, furthermore, these same industries receive far greater import protection and export incentives from their governments than is the case with the U.S. industries.

The second consideration is the fact that the costs involved in producing these imported goods are much lower. This cost differential is, in turn, due largely to the wide disparity in worker compensation between the United States and various other countries, since in our country it is unacceptable for our workers to be forced to receive substandard wages in order to compete with products produced in other countries by workers receiving such wages.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot wait much longer if we expect to avoid irreparable losses and critical unemployment. After 37 years of tariff-reduction, many of our industries are overexposed to import competition. This is particularly true of the steel and textile industries, about which I am especially concerned, but there are scores of other industries that are seriously afflicted as well.

There is another aspect of this same problem which also deserves the urgent attention of the Congress, and that is the general competitive state of American industry in foreign trade—both at home and abroad.

Because of official concealment of the true state of affairs in our trade balance by the Department of Commerce over the years, the public believes that we still enjoy a surplus in our exports over our imports. I am talking about the trade balance as distinguished from the balance of payments. Nearly everyone knows that we have had an adverse balance of payments for years. This balance includes many items other than trade in goods or merchandise, such as tourist expenditures, ocean shipping, marine insurance, dividend payments on investments, etcetera. The trade balance refers strictly to imports and exports of merchandise.

The Department of Commerce has over a long period of time, for example listed all our shipments under AID, food for peace, and so forth, as regular exports. They are shipments abroad, to be sure, but the fact that we ship them does not mean that we are competitive in world markets. We could, of course, double or triple such exports, if we agreed to give more goods away to foreign countries. A surplus of that kind would not be an index of our competitive standing. Also included in our exports are the shipments of agricultural products that we subsidize for the precise purpose of becoming competitive in world markets. Therefore, these exports do not reflect our competitive standing. Yet they are tabulated as exports by the Department and are included as such in the monthly, quarterly and annual trade statstics.

For the year 1970 the Department has reported a surplus of exports in the magnitude of $2.7 billion. However, this total includes approximately $2½ billion of the kind of shipments just mentioned. At the same time 1970 imports are recorded at $40 billion against the exports of $42.7 billion.

These imports of $40 billion, however, actually cost us some $44 billion, because the $40 billion only reflects their foreign value at the point of shipment. It does not include ocean freight, marine insurance and other charges incidental to laying the goods down in our ports of entry. The actual cost of our imports, therefore, is actually nearer to $44 billion than $40 billion.

If we set this $44 billion against our net exports of barely more than $40 billion of real exports, that is, nongovernmental and unsubsidized private exports, we come up with an adverse trade balance of some $4 billion in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, even if we take the Department of Commerce figures at their face value we find that in nearly all broad classifications of goods we are in a serious deficit position. Not only do we have a deficit of over $1.5 billion in textiles, but we are well behind in steel, footwear, petroleum, automobiles, radio and TV receiving apparatus, typewriters, lead and zinc, many fruits and vegetables, sewing machines, toys, glass, pottery, bicycles, and many other articles.

We have a big surplus in our exports of machinery and chemicals. Machinery includes aircraft and computers. Yet, imports of machinery have been rising twice as rapidly as our exports during the past 10 years.

Another fact worth looking at is the fact that in the postwar years our imports have been shifting more heavily to manufactured products rather than raw materials. This fact has a particular message for labor. It is one thing, for example, to import iron ore. It is something quite different when we import steel and different yet when we import machinery and other products of finished manufacture made of steel. Much more labor goes in the finished product than into the raw material; and the impact on employment is much more serious, not, of course, in individual displacement of workers but in the aggregate. One ton of iron ore does not involve nearly as much labor as a machine that weighs 1 ton.

In view of the vulnerable condition of much of our industry to imports, a condition which seldom exists for any reason other than the low wages paid in other countries, we have reason to be concerned and concerned seriously. We have every reason to urge early action on trade legislation and I trust that we will move off dead center very soon.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a growing realization by all segments of our economy of the elementary facts long ago encountered by the American textile community. There is a growing awareness that we must rethink some of the outworn notions of foreign trade, for free trade simply does not work when only one nation practices it. The article which follows, from the outstanding business magazine Forbes is, we believe, indicative of the reappraisal of American trade policy now taking place. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and all Americans:

[From the Forbes magazine, May 1, 1971]

ONE-WAY STREET: HOW LONG WILL THE UNITED STATES CONTINUE GRANTING THE JAPANESE FULL ACCESS TO OUR MARKETS WHILE U.S. BUSINESS IS SEVERELY HAMSTRUNG IN JAPAN?

Where does free trade stop and unfair competition begin?

Or, put it another way: What kind of a game is it when one contestant plays by the rules and the other fellow makes up his own rules as he goes along?

For years the great majority of businessmen turned their backs on the "bellyachers"—largely from the textile and shoe industries—who argued for import quotas and the like.

But that was before the unique business-government conglomerate called Japan Inc. captured upwards of 50% of the U.S. radio, motorcycle, electronic calculator and selected camera markets (to name a few), and began widening its annual trade surplus with us to around $1.5 billion. Today Japan controls 15% of the total U.S. import market. And it's shooting for 20% by 1975.

U.S. businessmen aren't turning their backs anymore—not even traditional free-traders. Says du Pont President Charles McCoy: "We don't want to build walls to hide behind. We only want *fair* free trade with Japan." In that sense, the growing sentiment among U.S. executives for some measure of trade restraint is the antithesis of America-first protectionism. The new plea is for equal trade laws for all.

"We have to stop kidding ourselves," says President Ely Callaway of Burlington Industries. "The Japanese don't play by our liberal rules. What industry, let alone company, can compete with an economic system that fosters monopolies, price-fixing and disruptive trade practices?"

"Unless there is a major change in our trade policy," says Joseph Wright of Zenith Radio Corp., "about 80% of the U.S. home electronics industry will be produced overseas within three or four years." Other businessmen estimate that by 1976 imports could cause unemployment in the U.S. car industry to increase 15%.

To those who argue that U.S. restrictions would trigger a trade war, duPont's McCoy says: "In the give and take of international trade, there is always a trade war under way."

Not everyone favors trade protection. Indeed, the Nixon Administration considers Japan an indispensable trade partner and key political ally. Also, many companies have adapted to the flow of excellent and low-priced Japanese imports by relocating factories abroad where labor is cheap. Others are hedging by either buying shares in Japanese competitors or even licensing them. Such licenses yield RCA about $30 million a year.

But others with few ties to Japan, including powerful unions and companies like duPont, Monsanto and U.S. Steel, are speaking up loud and clear for some degree of trade restraint. What particularly irks them is that we have opened our market to the Japanese, while allowing them to block the flow of U.S. goods and investments into Japan. That is taking its toll. For the day is gone when clearly superior U.S. companies could win out no matter what the competition did.

By and large, the last thing the Americans want is stiff tariffs and import quotas. They would prefer really free trade with an open Japan. Only if Japan drags its feet, and only then, do they favor trade restrictions. Unfortunately, the Japanese continue to drag their feet.

In Japan, as the gross national product moves toward $400 billion by 1975, economic growth is a national mania. To continue growing over 10% per year, the single-minded Japanese are seeking a big share of every market in sight. Profits are secondary. And the government is right in there, as a sort of import-export manager.

"Everybody there," says a U.S. executive, "sings from the same sheet of music." You will not find the strict dividing line there—nor the antagonism—that has traditionally existed between the government and business in America.

Take television sets. The Japanese have captured 30% of the U.S. market largely by selling their excellent sets here at very low prices. How did they manage that? According to Treasury Department investigators, since 1968 (at least) the Japanese have been dumping. That is, they have reportedly been selling their sets here at 15% to 20% cheaper than they do back in Japan. So, in effect, Japanese consumers are subsidizing the exports. And since the government blocks the import of foreign-made TVs, consumers have little choice but to pay the inflated TV prices—or listen to radio.

But, in fact, most Japanese pay willingly to help their companies penetrate the U.S. market.

The U.S. TV makers tried to counterattack in the mid-Sixties by exporting their relatively inexpensive consoles to Japan. But Zenith, Motorola and others got nowhere against the country's welter of official and unofficial harassments. For example, regulations serve to bar the free entry of necessary repair parts.

Zenith, among others, has now reluctantly begun building plants overseas. Says Chairman Wright, somewhat bitterly: "Lacking some change in government trade policy, more and more of our productive facilities for the U.S. market will be located in foreign countries."

The U.S. television industry, down from 50 to about 15 companies, hasn't surrendered yet. Under the industry's urging the Treasury Department seems close to imposing punitive tariffs on dumped TV's. Also, National Union Electric Corp., which folded its Emerson and DuMont plants last year, is seeking $360 million in damages from Japan's seven leading TV makers for dumping. And the plants' 1,500 former workers are suing the same seven for $68 million. The suits name Sony, Toshiba, Sharp, Matsushita, Hitachi, Mitsumbishi and Sanyo.

Interestingly, coordinating defense counsel for the Japanese is reportedly Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander, the former law firm of President Nixon and Attorney General John Mitchell. Mitchell has the duty of enforcing the criminal statute on dumping. In that same vein, the President's assistant for international economic affairs is from Bell & Howell, a company with ties to Japan.

Apparently, Japan's general trade strategy isn't limited to TV's. Since 1970, U.S. businessmen have filed complaints accusing the Japanese of dumping about ten items. For example, Allegheny Ludlum President Roger Ahlbrandt charges flatly that the Japanese are dumping stainless steel products.

PLANES, COMPUTERS AND CARS

What Japan did in labor-intensive fields like textiles, it is now trying to duplicate in even richer industries:

In aircraft, Mitsubishi is building its MU–2 in a Texas factory. Meanwhile, U.S. light aircraft are on Japan's import quota list (along with 128 other products ranging from integrated circuits to canned pineapple). That means Japanese buyers must seek import quota certificates from the Ministry of International Trade & Industry (MITI) for every U.S.-made plane. In the process, it is safe to assume that friendly MITI officials might remind the buyers that Japanese companies make planes too.

In computers, these same import certificates are needed. Because of such barriers, U.S. companies like Digital Equipment Corp., which controls about 70% of the world mini-computer market, has only a 2% share of Japan's market. Even IBM, one of the few foreign firms with a profitable 100% subsidiary in Japan, has its troubles. To date IBM has agreed to license its Japanese competitors, and it has limited its Japanese production to small- and medium-sized machines. Reportedly, it also destroys used computers returned to the company. Not surprisingly, IBM's market share has steadily shrunk to about 25%. At the same time, the government is pressuring its six fledgling computer makers to consolidate and enter the world market. One company, Fujitsu, is already selling here.

In semiconductors, the government has prevented both Texas Instruments and Motorola from establishing wholly owned subsidiaries there. Fairchild Camera is trying an end run by creating a 100%-owned subsidiary in Okinawa which is expected to soon become part of Japan. But one Japan-watcher says: "The Japanese will boot Fairchild out. When they own the land, they make the rules."

In autos, everybody knows about the U.S. growth of Datsun and Toyota. But our Big Three's move into Japan is another story. For years, they got nowhere. Then, appropriately enough this April Fool's Day, MITI "liberalized" its investment regulations. But now it seems that the Detroit auto makers will have to wait about three years to buy up to 35% of Japan's weak-sister car makers. By then, some experts predict, the Japanese market will be saturated.

The Japanese plead for patience and stress that they *are* changing. They add that if they threw open their doors today, big U.S. companies would overwhelm their fragile economy. Apparently, the Japanese don't realize that they are big boys *now*.

Despite the obvious trouble of dealing with the Japanese, executives from a score of companies interviewed by Forbes put a good face on their experiences—on the record. Off the record, however, they called their trade partners names that would make Spiro Agnew blush.

Why are so many U.S. businessmen reluctant to speak out? Some are honestly unaware of any basic threat from the Japanese. Others hesitate to buck government policy, which has favored free trade—with the notable exception of President Nixon's promise to aid textiles. Still others are afraid of encouraging old-line protectionists and actually damaging free trade. Also, it may be tough for some Americans to admit—out loud—that foreign competition is something to worry about. Though it is.

More than 100 years ago, Commodore Perry's gunboats forced the Japanese to let foreigners do business on their soil. Perhaps the more modern but equally blunt weapons of tariffs and quotas will have to be trotted out to do the same job today.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with this effort to call attention to the troubles plaguing America's textile industry. Few economic problems facing this Nation have affected as many people. We all know the name of the chief problem: Cheap imports.

The record is a dismal catalog of the failure of this Government to protect the industry and to protect American jobs. Last year 100,000 jobs were eliminated in the textile and apparel industry. Last year 50 mills closed throughout the country. Last year was a bad year, to say the least, for one of the Nation's largest industries.

And 1971 appears to be worse. The Commerce Department announced today an all time high of 523 million yards of imported textiles for the first quarter of 1971. This figure represents an incredible 43 percent increase over the textile imports in the same quarter last year.

Mr. Speaker, if a year which saw 100,000 jobs eliminated is running 43 percent behind this year's imports, is there any question of the impact of this situation upon the industry in 1971?

Forty-two of Alabama's 67 counties have textile mills. Their annual payroll in Alabama is $220 million, making this the second largest industry in the State. In my district, the reduced man-hours worked because of import competition are causing a loss in payrolls of $13,000 per week. This is little short of scandalous.

Mr. Speaker, this body must go on

record in a meaningful way to demonstrate to the world that American jobs come first. We have paid enough of the price to help our neighbors for the better part of this century. It is not too much now to expect some consideration for our own people here at home.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEGICH). Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, PRESIDENT TRUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my pleasure to say to former President Harry Truman, happy birthday.

It has been my privilege to step into the well of the House 12 times in former years to lead the House in its birthday greetings to a man of towering prominence.

This Saturday, May 8, the former Chief Executive and beloved statesman will celebrate his 87th birthday. As has been the custom in recent years, his birthday will be celebrated at his home in Independence in the company of members of his family.

It is altogether fitting and proper that at 11:00 a.m., that day, at the Harry S. Truman Library in Independence, the Missouri sesquicentennial stamp will be presented by appropriate ceremonies in the presence of Postmaster General Winton M. Blount, who will be the principal speaker.

This commemorative stamp will honor 150 years of Missouri statehood. This is a region that gave America many of its writers, artists, patriots, and statesmen, at the forefront of which is Harry Truman.

Most Americans recall the Truman years as a momentous time of fateful and awesome decisions, as indeed they were—the decision to shorten World War II by deploying the atomic bomb, the successful effort to curtail Communist expansion in Europe, the Berlin blockade, and the meeting of North Korean aggression.

In our 12 previous acclamations to honor a great American the entire record of his administration as President has been alluded to at one time or another and those that have spoken over the years in making deep praise have said just about everything that could be said good about the man Truman and his sterling character.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention today to dwell upon a facet of his character that was recently underlined and underscored by conversation which I enjoyed with him during the Easter recess.

For a long time I have known of the sense of modesty possessed by our former President, Harry S. Truman.

But it was not until this recent conference with him at his home that I came away completely convinced that here was a kind of man who is truly humble, and one who would never seek nor ever accept an inordinate amount of praise, even though all of his friends knew all along that he well deserved it.

Our visit with Mr. Truman was prompted by the fact that along about the first of the year the radio commentator Paul Harvey had been proposing in his newscasts that the Congress should award to Mr. Truman the Congressional Medal of Honor. When I heard of this, my staff immediately researched the subject. After contact with the American Law Section of the Library of Congress, we concluded that an exception or a circumvention of the present law would have to be made in order for President Nixon to make the award to one who had not been recently engaged in combat, and been given the award for heroic action.

About the end of March our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON), circulated a letter to all of his colleagues announcing that on March 16 he had introduced a bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to former President Harry S. Truman. In that letter he informed the membership he would reintroduce the bill in the near future and invited other Members to join in the sponsorship of this effort. According to the latest count, there are about 13 Members of the House who have introduced separate bills, all of which follow the Paul Harvey suggestion to amend title 20 of the United States Code to permit the medal to be awarded to Mr. Truman.

Knowing of Paul Harvey's suggestion and the bills that have been introduced, I prepared House Joint Resolution 526. My resolution was different from the several House bills in that it provided not only that President Nixon be authorized to make the award, but that the medal be presented to Mr. Truman at Independence, Mo., on May 8, his 87th birthday, or as soon thereafter as practical.

Therefore, I commenced some carefully guarded inquiries with the staff of the Truman Library at Independence as well as several of his close friends and associates living in our home city. From these very first inquiries I learned that there was some doubt whether Mr. Truman would be happy to accept this medal. Then, on our trip home during the Easter recess, I was able to have a good visit with former President and Mrs. Truman at their home on North Delaware in Independence, Mo.

Now I can report there is no doubt about it, that Mr. Truman will not accept the medal under any circumstances. He does not feel that he deserves it, and if he were to entertain any thought of accepting it, he believes that would mean a downgrading and eroding of the exceptional and most extraordinary award our country can bestow upon one of its fighting men.

In our conversation with the former President and Mrs. Truman, I learned that my most famous constituent entertained just about as strong personal feelings against accepting the Congressional Medal of Honor as General Sherman's strong statement against running for President. As you remember, the General is quoted as saying that if he were to be nominated, he would not run, and if he were to be elected, he would not serve. Mr. Truman's views about accepting the Congressional Medal of Honor are about that strong. He told me he did not want to put anyone into an embarrassing position. He added that he hoped the Congress would not amend the law to authorize the President to award him the Congressional Medal of Honor, because he said he did not feel that he deserved it. In our conversation he had made it clear that he believes that to continue to make exceptions for the award other than to our brave fighting men for heroic action in combat would lower or lessen the exceptional nature of the award, and he would not want to be a party to this sort of thing.

Perhaps I should mention that at some time before our conversation in the Truman home, I had written a letter to Mr. Truman pointing out the content of the Paul Harvey broadcast, and that I had asked the American Law Section of the Library of Congress to brief the law to see whether the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor could be granted without a change in the law.

I mentioned in our letter to Mr. Truman that he had commented many times on those occasions when he had presented the Congressional Medal of Honor to recipients that he said:

I would rather receive the Medal than be President of the United States.

In our letter I expressed the hope that he would approve of the actions and efforts of some of us in the Congress which could amend the law and would amend the law to permit him to be the recipient of the medal. In that same letter I asked that he let me know, by letter if possible, his feelings and preferences about the matter in order that I could share his views with our colleagues.

Now, on this the eve of his 87th birthday I will share with my colleagues the following letter from President Truman concerning the facts set forth during the visit:

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Independence, Mo., April 8, 1971.

Hon. WM. S. RANDALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Your visit with me about the proposed award of the Congressional Medal of Honor was most pleasant and I greatly appreciate your interest in this matter. I am writing this to confirm my views and reasons and my unwillingness to accept one.

In the first place, I do not consider that I have done anything which should be the reason for any award, congressional or otherwise.

Next, the Congressional Medal of Honor

was instituted for combat service. This is as it should be and to deviate by giving it for any other reason lessens and dilutes its true significance. Also, it would detract from those who have received the award because of their combat service.

Therefore, I again confirm what I told you—I would not accept it.

This does not mean I do not appreciate what you and others have done, because I do appreciate the kind things that have been said and the proposal to have the award offered to me.

Therefore, I close by saying thanks, but I will not accept a Congressional Medal of Honor.

Sincerely yours,

(S) HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague from Missouri yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I am delighted to yield to the dean of our delegation and our neighbor to the west, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the gentleman from Missouri has chosen this day as the occasion to make clear to the Members of the House and to all the country the former President's attitude on this matter. It seems to me a most timely statement and revelation.

I want to join with the gentleman, at the same time, in expressing the very best wishes of Mrs. Bolling and myself to both the former President and Mrs. Truman on the occasion of his birthday.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and the remarks of the other gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), in extending best wishes to one of the best Presidents the United States ever had.

On a personal note, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I remember when I first came to Congress, President Truman met with a number of freshmen Congressmen, and he was introduced to us as a great statesman. President Truman in responding said:

A statesman is nothing but a dead politician.

He also said:

I am far from dead yet.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the United States will have the benefit of many more years of political life of this great American.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I know you who are Members share my regret that we will not be able to confer the Medal of Honor to one who so richly deserves it. I am sure we will all agree, however, to defer to his wishes in this matter. I am equally sure no Member of Congress will go ahead with the plans to confer the medal on Mr. Truman against his wishes, even to honor so great a President of the United States. I ask on his behalf that his wishes be followed in this matter.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to join with the gentleman in wishing this great man, this great American, a happy birthday, and I also wish for him many, many years of good health and happiness with his wife and family, whom he has loved so much, and who have made such a great contribution to the whole country. He happens to be one of my favorite Presidents.

I listened with great interest to what you said, and perhaps I should have spoken to you about this earlier. I did go to Congressman TEAGUE of Texas at the beginning of the session. I was going to file a bill, because I remembered as a young man when I came back from the war hearing the President's speeches so many times when he conferred the Congressional Medal of Honor. He said:

You know, I think this is the greatest honor that can be bestowed on a man. I think it would be the greatest honor that could be bestowed on me.

I went to Congressman TEAGUE and said:

You know, I think we ought to get a bill in here for President Truman that would confer the Congressional Medal of Honor on him.

Congressman TEAGUE thought this was a great idea, and said:

Why don't you do some research on it.

Well, I did begin that project.

However, I am really pleased that I had the opportunity to hear you today, because the last thing I want is to do something that would go against this great man's wishes. I hope the next time you see him you will tell him of this ex-GI's gratitude. Had it not been for his initiative, I do not believe I would be here in the U.S. Congress, because I would never have been able to go beyond high school. Had it not been for the GI bill of rights, I would never have gone on to college and completed law school. So, as one of many grateful citizens, I hope you will give him my best wishes.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusets. We certainly appreciate your comments, and I know Mr. Truman will appreciate them.

We all know the details of the Truman Presidential decisions. However, this letter, if it does not tell us anything really new, does reveal again with clarity a most admirable trait of his personal character. Here is a man who said several times he would rather be the recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor than be President. Here is a man who also recognized that in order to receive that medal, which is explicitly limited to members of the armed services who distinguished themselves at the risk of their lives above and beyond the call of duty, it would require special legislation to waive the requirements. Stated differently, to make the award of the medal to him would require an exception be made in the law.

Remember Mr. Truman was a combat veteran himself in World War I. In fact, he led his artillery battery in several heroic actions.

To have the revelations of this letter, in my opinion, shows a face of this great American that has not heretofore been considered sufficiently; that rare and exceptional trait of character which we call humility. Here in one and the same person is a man who said he would rather be the recipient of this medal than be President. The very same man now says he does not think he has done anything that should be a reason for obtaining this award whether it is the Congressional Medal of Honor or otherwise. Think of it. Such self-abatement, such modesty. Then he adds that to deviate in any way from the law would lessen, and dilute, the true significance of the medal. This kind of unobtrusiveness is a personal characteristic that will hopefully not become a rarity among those in public life today, tomorrow, or in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in this birthday greeting today, after the receipt of this letter, which I shall always cherish, it is my high honor to salute our former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, not only as a great American but as a man of great character, because he has proved once again that he is possessed of those rare traits of character which we know as modesty, self-abasement, unobtrusiveness, all summarized in one word—"humility."

The Truman years will always be remembered for great strides made in peace and social justice, the ratification of the United Nations charter, the establishment of an International Court of Justice, the desegregation of the armed service, and the pursuit of the national Fair Employment Practices Act.

No one will ever be able to forget those 7 eventful years or the man who led us through them with courage and honor.

There are those in the House and in the Senate today who are fortunate to have known Mr. Truman as a colleague in the years prior to events which suddenly catapulted him to the Presidency.

As a U.S. Senator, Harry Truman is remembered as a stanch supporter of military preparedness in international relations and for social reform and justice in domestic affairs.

He came to the Senate in 1934 and in 3 short years was named chairman of the Interstate Commerce Subcommittee that drafted the Civil Aeronautics Act. A man of seemingly boundless talent and dedication, Senator Truman oversaw the drafting of the Railroad Transportation Act as chairman of another subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Overwhelmingly reelected in 1940, Senator Truman immediately called on the country to rally to meet the threat and terror of fascist terrorism.

Following entry of the United States in World War II, he headed the Special Committee to Investigate Contracts under the national defense program.

Launching an intense investigation of wartime contracts, the "Truman Committee" revealed millions of dollars had been lost in waste and mismanagement.

The country came to know him as a man of courage and integrity, and public support played a key role at the 1944 Democratic Convention which named him the party's candidate for Vice President.

But he was never allowed to enjoy the relative obscurity and safety from difficult decisions afforded other Vice Presidents. Who will ever forget that day in April 1945, a few months after a fourth national triumph at the polls, when the word went out from Warm Springs, Ga., that President Franklin D. Roosevelt was dead.

Despite the following he enjoyed, to many Americans Harry Truman was a man they did not know. Indeed, here was a man who had proclaimed that he did not seek the Presidency nor the Vice Presidency. Yet President he was, near the conclusion of one war and, though few knew at the time, at the opening of a more precarious and prolonged conflict—what was to become known over the years as the "cold war."

We all know now what measure of man Harry Truman was. He had the foresight to rebuild Europe with American resources in an alliance against Communist aggression. He met the Communist challenge with equal courage in the Mediterranean, in the Middle East, in Europe, and in the Far East.

The Truman's "Point Four" policy—to share the technical, cultural, and economic wealth of the United States with friendly underdeveloped countries of the world—became the healthy alternative to the foreign subjugation offered by international communism.

And behind this policy lay a vision of peace, evidenced by the full weight of his office behind the successful effort to create the United Nations and strengthen an international court of justice.

When President Truman left office in January 1953, America, its allies and the free peoples of the world were equipped to meet the challenge of any foe.

I know that everyone in the House can understand and appreciate the tremendous pride I feel to be able to call this great American a citizen of Missouri's Fourth Congressional District.

Many have known Harry Truman as a leader and as a personal friend, but I am the only Member of the House who can additionally and proudly count him as a constituent.

But I know that in the larger sense he is a constituent of every Member of this body, which is why I know I speak for all my colleagues, without regard to party, when I say happy birthday, President Truman, may God bless you for years to come.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE ATTEMPT TO BAIL OUT LOCKHEED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today on the Associated Press teletype the following bulletin appeared:

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon asked Congress today to provide a $250 million loan guarantee to keep Lockheed Aircraft Corporation from collapsing because of soaring costs on a jet airline program.

Secretary of the Treasury John Connally said the loan guarantee, long expected, was needed to keep the nation's biggest defense contractor from going broke.

Connally told reporters that he feels certain Lockheed would go into bankruptcy if the government failed to put its backing behind Lockheed's Tristar Airbus program.

The Tristar program got into jeopardy when soaring costs on the engine for the jumbo jet forced Rolls-Royce, Ltd., into receivership.

Connally said allowing the company to go into bankruptcy would have an enormous impact on the U.S. economy. He said it would have a substantial impact on funds flowing into the Treasury due to the lack of jobs and the bankruptcy of a big industry.

However, there may be substantial opposition in Congress to the idea of a federal loan guarantee.

Bankers have already put up $450 million in loans for the Tristar project, but have refused to go any further without government backing, Connally said.

He said he regarded chances of passage of the legislation as "quite good" on the basis of soundings he has made in Congress.

"I've been very encouraged by the soundings we have taken," he said.

Mr. Speaker, I charge that this action of bailing out a large corporation on a commercial program, because of its lack of judgment, mismanagement, and game playing, is scandalous. In many respects, the Lockheed case is similar to the SST. We are being asked to guarantee federally what should be a private endeavor at a time when we can least afford it, considering other pressing needs. The L-1011, like the SST without the technological trappings is not an economically feasible venture at this time. If it were not so risky, additional private capital could be found. I only hope that my colleagues will look beyond this immediate action to both the short- and long-run implications of such a course. For the Congress to approve such an irresponsible request on the part of the administration will constitute a giant step toward the demise of the free enterprise system as we have known it. This administration request is no more than a run on the national Treasury by a politically well-wired corporation. The taxpayers of this country deserve to be protected from such a raid and the wholesale corporate looting that will follow if the flood gates are allowed to be opened by this unprecedented administration action.

Recently, I have had a number of executives from large aerospace firms come to me and privately warn that if the Government guarantees loans in this case so Lockheed can avoid bankruptcy "it clearly signals the kind of game it will take to win major procurements in the future, that is, going in and doing anything to win an award with the full knowledge and confidence that the Government will bail us out later." Some of these executives will be testifying before Congress in the next few weeks—unfortunately, others because of the realities of defense contracting and fear of retaliation must remain mute on the sidelines.

In effect, what the Government and taxpayers are buying with these loans is only the retention of Lockheed's top management. Admiral Rickover, in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee last week warned against rewarding bad management:

We in this country pride ourselves on the superiority of our free enterprise capitalistic system and we proclaim hatred of the Soviet Communistic system. . . . However, when men in Communist Russia fail in government or in industry, they are summarily dismissed. We, on the other hand, protect those who fail and grasp them to the government's bosom. We let them privatize profits and socialize losses.

I am reminded of Herbert Spencer's altruism that "To protect men from the res ults of their folly is to fill the world with fools."

You should bear in mind that there are about 10,000 business failures in the United States each year. And almost all of these involve very small businesses where a man loses all his savings and faces the situation on his own. If, as is being claimed, the Government has an obligation to rescue a giant defense firm, then the Government has the obligation to see that the firm is properly managed. This will inevitably lead to state socialism.

When the admiral as the head of Navy's nuclear submarine program was asked what effect would result from a Lockheed bankruptcy, he responded:

My personal opinion is the work would go on the same, because people who do the work are not affected by this. What happens when the president of any large corporation or the officials go? The work goes on. It is generally the financial people that change.

The Congress need not be reminded that this is the same Lockheed management that has brought the American taxpayer such performances as:

One. The notorious $2 billion overrun on the C-5A cargo plane—whose unit cost has skyrocketed from $27 to $60 million each—and only last week was reported by the GAO to be unable to perform its major mission.

Two. According to sworn testimony in a Securities and Exchange Commission investigation, Lockheed management deliberately misled the Pentagon and reduced its bidding price by 10 percent on the C-5A program in order to underbid Boeing and get the original contract.

Three. For years Lockheed management has withheld information from the Pentagon on the C-5A program relating to both cost and technical problems.

Four. There are strong indications that many of Lockheed's corporate management used their intimate knowledge of the company's financial problems to sell large portions of their own personal stockholdings before the company's problems became public knowledge and stock prices went down.

5. The SEC also investigated Lockheed for less than full disclosure on a debenture issue—thus misleading the public.

6. Lockheed management underesti-

mated the cost and technical problems on the Cheyenne helicopter program which was to have been deployed by now, but which is still in R. & D. In this case the taxpayers have bailed Lockheed out of a fixed-price contract on this program.

7. Lockheed has severely overrun a contract on the SRAM rocket motor and according to the GAO this motor is still technically deficient—Lockheed was also bailed out of a fixed-price contract on this program.

Considering this dismal record over the last few years one would think that a good portion of Lockheed's management would have been summarily fired. Surprisingly, however, there have been no notable changes in management. As a result, one has to admire Mr. Daniel Haughton, chairman of the board of Lockheed, who by sheer guts and bailing wire has kept his group of incompetents afloat by intimidating the Federal Government with threats of corporate suicide and then walking out with the taxpayers' money. He even got the Army to buy the tooling for the Cheyenne helicopter—a craft that may never be produced. This has got to rank with some of the all-time-great commercial con games such as selling refrigerators to Eskimos or carrying coal to Newcastle. In view of this corporate strategy, it is not surprising that Chairman Haughton in a most audacious move a year ago threatened David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense, with cessation of work on the C–5A program if the Air Force did not cough up untold additional hundreds of millions of dollars—in defiance of the legal contractual agreement between the Government and the corporation. I might add that such an action would be in direct defiance of the Defense Production Act under which a contractor has an obligation to finish work on a weapons system. In effect, Lockheed was threatening to break the law unless its demands were met. I might add parenthetically at this point that many within the administration who preach respect for the law and who decry the threatened illegal action of minority and dissident groups of our citizens are blind and fail to see the analogy when it comes to a large corporation blackmailing the Federal Government.

Chairman Haughton's tactics have won thus far—we are still funding the C–5A. However, funds for the C–5A evidently are not enough to keep this corporate dinosaur alive. Of late, Lockheed has let it be known that unless hundreds of millions are forthcoming from some Federal source, it may cease production of the commercial L–1011 airbus. Not producing the L–1011 would further complicate the British Government–Rolls Royce dilemma and create additional hardship on our domestic airlines. For example, Eastern Airlines would probably lose upward of $73 million it has paid on deposit for the L–1011.

Quite frankly, what it amounts to is that these corporate bandits are using Rolls Royce, the British Government, other subcontractors and the airlines as hostages in this latest raid on the taxpayers' purse. And what, my colleagues, has been the administration's response? Have they acted to preserve contract law and order? Have they acted in the interests of preserving the free enterprise system? Have they even performed detailed analyses or come up with other alternatives to submitting to this blackmail?

The President just the other day on the shores of southern California stated:

> We need a strong airframe producer like Lockheed in Southern California.

Perhaps it escaped the President that southern California already has two strong airframe producers in the McDonnell-Douglas Co., and the North American Rockwell Corp. which is building the new Air Force B–1 bomber. The President's statement, I am afraid is a "cheap shot" to use one of his own favorite expressions. It is an appeal to the public on the single simplistic aspect of jobs while at the same time refraining from discussing the long range implications of the administration's request. Next week when I am back in Pittsburgh I suppose I could announce that "we need a strong airframe producer in Pittsburgh"—to help our unemployment situation. Why not? How does this man, who is supposedly President of all the American people, determine that the Nation's taxpayers are obliged to prop up an airframe maker in southern California that has produced a string of failures to the exclusion of any other region of the country? This is the sort of sophistic reasoning that this administration deals in.

It would seem to me that McDonnell-Douglas would be about ready to climb a tree over this action.

According to a Wall Street Journal article on May 3, McDonnell-Douglas is currently faced with the cancellation of $540 million worth of options and orders on their DC–10 trijet by American, National, and United Airlines. This firm however, in the face of an extremely adverse business situation has had to fend for itself financially. It has not yet been selected for perpetual care by the administration.

The Lockheed L–1011 which will be built with funds acquired under Federal guarantees will be in direct competition with the McDonnell-Douglas DC–10. McDonnell-Douglas just floated a major bond issue last week for production money for the DC–10—like any other good capitalist company would have to do.

Meanwhile McDonnell-Douglas sees its orders cut back because of the current condition of the aircraft market which at the present time is glutted with capacity. In other words, if Lockheed could not back it on their own those L–1011 orders probably would be DC–10 orders. This is an unacceptable inequity to McDonnell-Douglas which has had to seek its own funds.

The underlying point that my aerospace friends impress on me is that if the L–1011 is commercially viable it could be financed in the commercial money market. This situation is most peculiar since Republicans, until the current administration, always have been known as dogged free enterprisers and have traditionally opposed intervention of the Federal Government in the affairs of business. Yet now they suggest that the Government not only take over the risk of investments on the part of corporations but also of the banks—in the long run this will mean a greater management role on the part of the Federal Government in the management of these companies.

I would like to warn my colleagues that if this is the road we choose to travel it could well lead to the demise of the free enterprise system and we should be aware of the full consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that no financial analyses have been made of the Lockheed Corp. by the Treasury or the Department of Defense. We do not know what alternatives such as Lockheed's bankruptcy or forcing the sale of parts of the corporation have really been considered. I know, for example, that several firms are interested in purchasing Lockheed's Sunnyvale operation. Other corporate entities faced with similar financial difficulties would first have to think of liquidating assets that were readily salable. Why not Lockheed? Are Mr. Haughton and his associates immune to the laws, regulations, and exigencies that other businessmen face? Bankruptcy—has it seriously been considered? In cases such as the Penn Central business did not cease. The railroad is still running. Only top corporate and financial people were involved. In Lockheed's case the same would be true. Only Mr. Haughton and his merry band of thieves would be affected. We would still get the Poseidon and other military hardware. We could even still obtain necessary C–5's. It would appear to me that the least we should do is to insure that the GAO conduct a full investigation of the company's finances before we obligate the Nation's taxpayers to guarantee Lockheed's commercial ventures.

The fact of the matter is that we should not ask the taxpayers to underwrite this endeavor. If the free enterprise system is to work, we must let it—no matter how painful it might be. If we do not, we in Congress, the President of the United States, and the large corporations of the country will have undermined that system of economics and commerce that we outwardly profess to believe in.

The economy is in trouble. We all know that. However, the remedies prescribed thus far are no cure. They are aspirins at best to treat symptoms. They will not effect a cure. If measures such as the one by the Treasury Department to bail out Lockheed are enacted, it will open the floodgate and numerous other troubled businesses will seek the same sort of relief. If this happens, industry of the United States will have taken one more step toward relinquishing its independence from the Government. My colleagues, I commend these thoughts to your serious attention.

ISRAEL TODAY: A NATION OF CONTRASTS LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 23d anniversary of Israel's independence, I was gratified to note that the Chicago Tribune devoted an entire section to a study of the richness and diversity that is Israel.

The Tribune has performed a notable public service in bringing this record of Israel's unparalleled achievements to the attention of the people of Chicago. In order that future historians, scholars, and interested people might also appreciate this information, I have taken a special order today to insure that this material is placed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a permanent historical record.

Israel has accomplished so much in the brief span of two decades. It is a new Eden being reclaimed from the desert and as the decades continue to pass, its achievements will expand as well. This early permanent record of Israel's modern history is, therefore, an important document for those who will study Israel in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Chicago Tribune for this important anniversary edition and believe my colleagues will appreciate it, as well.

The series follows:

ISRAEL TODAY—A NATION OF CONTRASTS LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

Twenty-three years ago next month, the Jewish National Council and the Central Zionist Council, meeting in Tel Aviv, announced the formation of a new state, to be called Israel. From that day to this, the Massachusetts-sized nation at the east end of the Mediterranean has rarely known an uneventful moment.

War—or at least warlike tension—with the surrounding Arab states has been almost constant . . . Jews from thruout the world have been drawn to Israel, tripling its population in less than a generation . . . Collective and cooperative farm villages have flourished in the deserts, bringing irrigation, hard work and the resultant rich crop yields to previously barren lands. . . . Skyscraper office and apartment buildings have sprouted in Haifa and Tel Aviv, making them look more like modern San Francisco or Acapulco than like cities of the Middle East.

In this special section, a salute to 23 years of Israeli statehood, we have attempted to capture the flavor, the spirit and the diversity of this new-yet-old land of contrasts, a land so solidly rooted to its historic yesterdays, but a land that is such a part of today's world—and a land that eagerly awaits its tomorrows.

MIDDLE-EAST PEACE WOULD BENEFIT ALL, SAYS ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER GOLDA MEIR

(NOTE.—Michael McGuire, chief of the Tribune's Rome Bureau, traveled to Israel for many of the articles appearing in this section. Following is his exclusive interview with Prime Minister Golda Meir, 72-year-old head of government and a long-time political power in Israel.)

(By Michael McGuire)

TEL AVIV.—Peace can readily be achieved if Arab leaders are sincerely prepared for it, but Israel must guard against thinking wishfully that Middle East hostility can be ended with the wave of a magic wand, said Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir.

"Everything should point to the possibility of peace," the premier said, "because of the fact that for eight months there has been no shooting, you can see how the people here feel about it, and I'm sure that is how the Egyptian people feel about it."

Mrs. Meir expressed her hopes and ideas about her country's future during an interview in her office inside the gates of Israel's central military headquarters in Tel Aviv. She spoke of hopes for a peace that would eventually permit token borders between Israel and its Arab neighbors, a resettlement of Palestinian refugees thru Israeli aid on vast lands in Jordan and of a Middle East in which Arabs and Jews could develop and rise to heights of prosperity together.

"All this can be done," Mrs. Meir said, "but certainly not immediately after signing a peace agreement. Naturally, we will have to be on our guard because of the sad experiences we have had. But that is where the nature of peace comes in.

"If [Egyptian President Anwar] Sadat and [Foreign Minister Mahmoud] Riad say they never, never, never will have diplomatic relations, or that after peace is established they will not have trade relations, and so on, then of course, we will only have a formal peace. It may be kept or not kept. But that isn't real peace.

"But if they begin with this and there is no shooting for a few years, and if the borders open up and there is movement between one country and the other, eventually it would develop into a real peace situation. . . ."

Mrs. Meir said she would like to see Arab-Israeli frontiers open in a way similar to the relaxed border crossings between the United States and Canada.

"I know that this cannot happen over night," she said, "but eventually this really would be the guarantee for peace in the area. Not when every border is watched by others—such as the United Nations—but with borders open and development projects under way in a peace arrangement."

She said continuing hostilities make no sense whatsoever, because there is nothing Israel has that is "essential" to Arab existence.

"If they throw us out of here," she said, "not a single Arab will be any happier, really. Egypt will still have children who are underfed, undernourished and dying for lack of medical care unless they take hold of themselves and decide it is more important to worry about their own people than to kill us. It is as simple as that. Once they have reached that point, then I would say the outstanding problems can easily be solved.

"Until the Arab leaders accept the basic fact of life that we cannot be thrown out of here and, therefore, we will have to live together in this area, they will have to choose: Is it going to be constant war at the expense of their development or is there to be peace for the good of all?"

Mrs. Meir illustrated her remarks by recalling an experience she had while walking to a Jaffa marketplace three days after she arrived in Palestine from the United States 50 years ago this July.

"There were these Arab women sitting in the sand and dirt with little children around them. The children's faces were black with flies because they had trachoma. It was a terrible sight. But trachoma was expected just as the sun was part of Israel. So were malaria, dysentery and typhoid. Nobody questioned this, as it belonged the country. You don't see it anymore. Nobody in Israel suffers from these diseases anymore, so it CAN be done."

The future, Mrs. Meir said, depends on the Egyptian leadership. They tried to shoot their way to a solution before and could not do so, she said.

"And they know very well if they tried it again, it would end with the same result," the prime minister said. "It would only mean more misery and more casualties. If they are prepared honestly and sincerely for peace, or if they are prepared to sit down and negotiate, then I think peace can be readily achieved, but one must not have an illusion and allow himself to be overcome by wishful thinking that something which has lasted for decades can ge ended by a magic wand."

Mrs. Meir said she is confident that ordinary Arab people want to see peace in the area.

"I want to tell you something very interesting," she said. "A short time after the Six-Day war, we went thru the occupied area on the Western Bank and up to the Golan Heights. We came to the Arab town of Jenin. We stopped our cars and walked down the town's main street. The storekeepers recognized me. I wasn't in office then, but they remembered me as the Israel foreign minister.

"They all came out of their stores and said 'Shalom.' I have a beautiful picture showing me walking in Jenin with my two grandchildren and hundreds of Arabs walking behind us. They were not saying anything wrong or disturbing us in any way. The older people were standing on the sidewalk saying 'Shalom.' I was greeted as tho it was really after peace, when we had nothing against one another. And this was immediately after the war when one would think feeling would have been resentful.

"Then there was the unification of Jerusalem," she continued. "There was no tension at all. The gates were thrown open. They streamed into the new city of Jerusalem. Jews and Arabs who hadn't seen each other in 20 years met as friends.

"That doesn't mean the Arabs in the occupied areas love us and want us to stay, but I wanted to express here that their instinctive reaction was not one of hatred or resentment. They recognized me and there was curiosity, but no hatred.

"So if Sadat or Riad or anyone else would walk down Allenby Road in Tel Aviv," Mrs. Meir said, "I assure you nothing would happen to them. Any one of them can come shopping here."

Mrs. Meir said the Palestinian refugee problem could easily be solved by having the "vast majority" of them resettled in Jordan.

"We would be delighted to share with them the experience we had," she said. "After all, we were 650,000 Jews in 1948 and we brought hundreds of thousands more from the Arab countries and the camps in which they remained after World War II. They have become farmers and factory workers and they go to school. We have experience in settling refugees. We would be delighted to share with them our experience in agricultural development, industrial development, the building of schools and the eradication of illiteracy. All we have to do is step across the Jordan River and help them out. We would be very happy to do it."

In contrast to the Jews, Mrs. Meir said, the Arab states and wealthy Palestinians have not tried to help their refugees, but have kept them in miserable conditions in camps.

"They didn't do anything for them and didn't want anything done for them. They preferred to keep these refugees as political pawns.

"Look at the poor people in the Gaza Strip. Egypt wouldn't allow them in Egypt or allow them to move anywhere. They had to stay there in their misery so they could be constantly incited against Israel. That is how their children were taught. Their textbooks would read: 'There were five Israelis and we killed three. How many are left?'

"With these noble thoughts they were raising their children. Now they say we should take these refugees back. Take back children that have been raised for 20 years

on this kind of intellectual food. Can you imagine what they would do here?

"When I took over the labor department in 1949, we had 200,000 people in miserable camps. There were no houses, no food. They were in rags, without skills and stricken by disease. We cured the diseases, began building houses, put them to work; now you don't see anyone barefooted or needing food."

Altho Mrs. Meir said she dreamed of a day when open borders could exist between Israel and neighboring states, the country would have to maintain borders that guaranteed security.

"After fighting for 20 years," she said, "we have decided we must have borders which would not necessarily guarantee there would be no more wars, but borders which would make an enemy think twice or three times before attacking us.

"All you have to do is look at the Golan Heights and realize the difference," she continued. "When the Syrians were there for 20 years pointing their guns at us, our fields and settlements were laid out like a map for them. If it had been the other way around and if we were the Syrians and had the same attitude they had, there wouldn't have been anything left there. Over and over again these houses were shelled.

"Anyone who expects us again to be in a situation of that kind either is an enemy of Israel or should have his head examined. One doesn't even have to be a military expert to understand.

"All one has to do is go up there and look down and see. The United Nations observers were there. The guns had no right to be there. But nobody did anything. The maximum the United Nations did was to report what happened. But nobody did anything.

"Why should people expect us to go thru it again—as tho our children do not have the right to live above ground as all children in the world—I cannot understand. Is it natural for our children to be underground?"

BEN-GURION: "OUR POPULATION MUST GROW"—ISRAEL'S "PATRIARCH" URGES IMMIGRATION

(By Michael McGuire)

SEDE BOQER.—"There is enough land within the area we had before the Six-Day war to take care of all the Jews if they would come—all the Jews in the world."

David Ben-Gurion sat on the edge of his wooden chair in his Negev desert kibbutz home and spoke with a vitality and enthusiasm that might be considered rare for a man half-way towards his 85th year. "There is a small country in Europe called Belgium," he said. "It's not much bigger than the pre-1967 area of Israel and they have 10 million people. If they can have 10 million, then so can we. We need five or six million more Jews here," he said, emphasizing every word. "There are 14 million Jews in the world. We must have the majority of them living here—especially the younger ones. And they are coming. There is immigration today from countries where there was no immigration in the beginning. Last year, the largest number came from the United States. We will keep having an increase. Of that I am sure. But I don't believe that all Jews will come."

The short, sturdy man whom many call Israel's patriarch spoke in the living room of his small, wooden, green bungalow that has been his home since he retired as Israel's first premier. Dominating the room were three objects representing the greatest influences in his long struggle for an independent Jewish state—a browning old map of Israel, a charcoal sketch of his late wife, Paula, and a modestly designed menorah, the ceremonial candelabrum symbolic of Judaism.

Pushing down the unruly hair lining the sides of his famous pate, Ben-Gurion sat back in his chair and allowed his thoughts to flow. "We must settle the desert," he said. "If you take the country as it was before the Six-Day war, you will find less than 20 per cent of the area is settled. We cannot have a country that has deserts.

"So I believe we should give back all the territories in the Six-Day war—except for Jerusalem and the Golan Heights—if there is peace. Real peace. But you must understand what I mean by peace. I don't mean the signing of papers. Papers can be signed today and torn apart tomorrow. By peace I mean there must be a real friendship wherein both parties help each other. We don't necessarily need Egypt's help in science or certain other areas, but they could use our help. Now they badly need the help of Russia. We can help them because we have learned many things they cannot do yet.

"If peace doesn't come this year, it will come within the next 10 years," he said, pausing to listen to the twittering of birds that had descended to the adjacent trees kept moist by sprinklers.

"Only the Egyptians are the key to peace," he continued. "The other Arab countries will do what Egypt calls for. The Russians, even tho they are the most anti-Semitic country in the world, do not want to see Israel destroyed.

"If Isreal is destroyed, they know they will lose the Arabs. They don't like Israel, but they are interested in keeping Israel here so the Arabs will need them. I haven't the slightest doubt that in spite of the differences between us, our two peoples, Arabs and Jews, could still get along," he said. "When I came to this country, I met many of the Arabs. I never met any Arab who said we must not let Jews in. That was in 1906. They were friendly.

"They became unfriendly only after the British came to Palestine. Not all of them became unfriendly, but many did. When the British came, nationalism began to grow among the Arabs. They could tolerate and live among the Turks, because the Turks were Moslems. The British were not. When nationalism began to grow against the British, it began to transfer onto the Jews.

"In the beginning," Ben-Gurion said, "there was some hostility between Arabs and Jews, but for another reason. When I came here there was complete anarchy. The Turkish government was very weak. There was a war going on between the Bedouins and the peasants. When the first Jewish village was built in 1878, it was attacked. But they attacked not only Jewish villages; they attacked each other. Likewise, I'm sure a friendship can develop and exist between the Jews and the Egyptians.

"I haven't been to Egypt since the state was established in 1948, but before that I had been there very often. I even had my friends among their leaders. In those days they didn't call themselves Arabs, they considered themselves Egyptians. Many of them came to visit here. They were friendly to us.

"This current attitude toward the Israelis began early in the '50s. After the Egyptian revolution," he said, "there was no anger for the first two years. They were friendly. Then came Nasser. The name of Egypt was changed to the United Arab Republic. The official language became Arabic, but the old Christian Egyptians continued to speak a form of their own Egyptian-related language.

"When Nasser accepted Rogers' peace proposals, I asked myself: 'Why did he change his policy?' I couldn't find any answer to it except that apparently he realized he made a mistake. In the last year of his life, he realized that the greatest part of the Egyptian people, the poor Fellaheen peasants, were in a terrible state. More than 60 per cent of them were not healthy. They had no education. They were very poor and getting poorer from year to year. Their number was growing larger and larger. So the last year of his life, Nasser came to the conclusion that he must change his policy. The destruction of Israel took second place to improving the position of the majority of his people. But he died."

Ben-Gurion said the American people want peace in the world, but complicated the Middle-Eastern muddle by making the mistake of not recognizing Communist China. "America made a terrible mistake and now she should try to win China," he said.

"I had a long talk with the late President Kennedy on this subject. He told me: 'After I am reelected I will change this policy.' But he was killed. He was a great man, Kennedy. If the Americans were friendly with China, then the Russians couldn't do the things they are doing in the Middle East. The United States can win the friendship of China. For more than 150 years, Russia, Germany, France, England and some smaller countries did terrible things to China. But America never did.

"The Chinese people are not real Communists," he said, "but the Chinese people admire Mao Tse-tung. He saved them from those other countries. They don't want to dominate the world, but they badly need the land taken from them by the Russians. The Russians since the czars have wanted to rule the world.

"I have heard the Chinese are making good progress in science. Thruout history they have been leaders in science. In a few years they will have the same arms level as Russia. The time will come when they will make war on Russia to take back the 800,000 square miles the Russians took from them. Then Russia will be destroyed."

The voices of children at play coming from another part of the kibbutz brought the thoughts of the aged man from the lofty world of political speculation to the soft solitude of his surroundings. Moving toward the doorway, he surveyed the expanse of desert before him.

"It's a good, healthy climate here. In our country it's one of the best climates.

"I selected to come to the Negev mainly because the Negev occupies 60 per cent of our country as it was before the Six-Day war. It's been a desert since creation. However, our settlement here shows how it can be changed. We must settle the desert."

1948: THE BRITISH LEAVE AND THE ARAB-ISRAELI BATTLE LINES ARE DRAWN

(NOTE.—Arthur Veysey, chief of THE TRIBUNE'S London Bureau, has followed Middle East developments for more than 25 years, and has frequently gone to the Holy Land to cover fighting between Arab and Jew. Here is his description of the fierce struggles that resulted in Israel's independence in 1948, and also [on page 6] the Six-Day war 19 years later, in which Israel captured all of Jerusalem, the Golan Heights and the Sinai Peninsula.)

(By Arthur Veysey)

LONDON.—I can see him now, the plump, soft Arab, sunning himself at Lydda Airport that lovely spring day of 1948. The bright Holy Land sun glistened on the polished buttons of his uniform as an officer in his Britannic majesty's customs service.

He watched a half-dozen Jews walk eagerly from the plane that had brought them from Europe.

"They won't be here long," he said. "Soon the British will leave Palestine. Our armies will come and the Jews will all have to get out."

"Where will they go?" I asked.

"Who cares," he said, "so long as they go?"

I wonder where he is now. In a refuge camp at Gaza? In Kuwait, in a new customs uniform? Perhaps in Jerusalem, collecting taxes for the Israeli treasury?

I can see, too, a Jew, wiry, worn, looking much older than his 32 years, working in a Tel Aviv boarding house. I asked what he would do when the British left.

"Stay right here," he said, flatly.

"Won't there be a lot of trouble?" I asked.

He shrugged. "I suppose so." He looked out over the Mediterranean, the sun silvering the tips of winter's last gray wavelets.

"A person never really knows what to expect," he said. "When I was in law school back in Germany, everything seemed fine. Then along came Hitler and the war. . . ."

He picked up some dirty dishes and carried them to the kitchen. Soon he was back. "They are all gone," he said, softly, "my parents, my four brothers, my sister, my uncles and aunts. I am the only one. Now I am here, here I shall stay."

The Arab customs officer conceded that Jews probably would be hard fighters. "But a good big man can always beat a good little man," he said firmly. Looking around, he could see only 650,000 Jews. Palestine's Arabs were twice that many, and around them were 40 million more. The Jews could count on little physical help from the 10 million Jews elsewhere, whereas in Egypt, Trans-Jordan, Syria, Iraq and Lebanon boastful armies, mostly British-trained and equipped, some still with British officers, proclaimed their eagerness to rid the Holy Land of the Jewish scourge.

For 30 years, ever since Birtish troops moved up out of Egypt in the First World War to crack the Ottoman Empire, Britain had ruled Palestine. Its grip on the Middle East had tightened in the Second World War. Two years after that war, Britain still had 100,000 armed men in Palestine, 200,000 elsewhere in the Middle East.

Suddenly, in that freezing, hungry, hope-killing February of 1947, Britain tired of empire and, in three days announced it would cast aside India, abandon Greeks fighting Communists and let the new, untried United Nations fix the fate of Palestine.

The chief of the imperial general staff, Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery, assumed that when Britain left Palestine, Jews and Arabs would fight, but Arabs would quickly dominate and the Jews would yell for help to the U.N.

After all, David Ben-Gurion, Jewish Agency security chief, in a hasty check of weapons could count only 10,078 rifles, 1,900 Sten guns, mostly homemade, 640 light machine guns, 768 small mortars. No cannon. No tanks. No planes. The striking arm, Palmach, did have weapons for its 3,000 fighters, a third of them girls, but the 3,000 reserves trained with sticks.

The U.N. pondered for six months and then proposed giving the Jews a narrow strip along the coast, a finger reaching to their settlements in Galilee, and, in the south, the big, almost empty Negev Desert, with a pointed tip on the Gulf of Aqaba. All the rest of Palestine would go to the Arabs. On Nov. 29, the U.N. assembly voted 33 [including the United States and the Soviet Union] to 10, confirming the division. Ten, including Britain, did not vote.

The shooting began at dawn. The Arabs, who had been harassing the Jews ever since the first Zionist settlers arrived in the previous century, meant to have all of Palestine. The Jews had to defend their more than 300 settlements, widely scattered and often isolated amidst Arab villages, and their large Jewish communities in Jerusalem, Haifa and Tel Aviv. They had somehow to join them together. Perhaps, too, the Jews could push outward the U.N. line, to add security and gain room for future immigrants.

Many Jews didn't think the British would really leave. The militiants, such as the Stern Gang and the Irgun, continued harassing British troops, blowing up a wing of the King David Hotel, hanging two sergeants.

For both Jews and Arabs, terror was the most powerful weapon. Each side sought not only to hold or acquire territory, but to clear it, as much as possible, of people of the opposite group.

In the beginning, the terror was relatively small, a bullet into a passing truck, dynamite hidden in the irrigation pump. Some Jews wanted to consolidate for self-protection, abandoning isolated settlements, but Ben-Gurion said no house or field should be given up without a fight.

As the British troops withdrew, Arabs and Jews raced to take over their camps, buildings, power plants. The fortress-like police stations, usually poised above a vital crossroads, were special prizes. Often the British tipped off the Arabs so Arabs could come in one door as the British left thru another.

The fighting quickly grew. In mid-January, hundreds of Arabs surrounded the Jewish settlement of Kfar Etzion between Jerusalem and Hebron. The Jewish families fought for every house, every wall. The Arabs faded away, leaving 140 dead, but pounced on 35 young Jews, mostly collegians, hurrying to help the villagers, and killed all. In Galilee, vounteers of the Arab Liberation Army ringed Mishmar Haemek with cannon. British troops intervened. The Arabs claimed a mighty victory.

Arabs lay in wait along roads. Jews traveled in convoys, with guns, but 40 died in one Galilee ambush. Doctors and nurses were slain during a five-minute drive from Hadassah Hospital atop Mount Scopus to their homes in Jerusalem. The Arabs set their deadliest traps in the narrow, twisting, steep valley thru which the road from Tel Aviv begins its climb to Jerusalem.

In February, only two convoys got thru. In March, just one. In April and May, none. For the 100,000 Jews in Jerusalem, electricity went off, water lines dried. Before the siege ended four months later, food was rationed at two slices of bread a day.

The Jewish farm settlements all had been built with defense in mind. All had guns. All had supplied young men and women to Haganah, and now sent more to the new companies and battalions getting arms being smuggled in, mostly from Czechoslovakia. The Stern Gang and Irgun raided Arab villages. At Deir Yassin, they killed 200 men, women and children. They won the surrender of Jaffa, the old Arab port adjoining modern Jewish Tel Aviv.

In Haifa the British commander summoned Arab and Jewish leaders to announce his departure time. Only the Jew came and, with 500 fighters, he took over in two days Palestine's best harbor. The Jews went on north to take Acre, the old Crusader port that had defied Napoleon.

Everywhere the Arabs were fleeing. They magnified the massacre of Deir Yassin. Arab radio stations cried alarmingly that Jews would slaughter Arabs. An Arab, however, need not admit to himself he was running away in fear. He could say he was merely carrying out instructions of Damascus radio to make way for Arab armies which would arrive when the British left.

On May 15, the armies, the radio boasted, would sweep the Jews into the sea in two or three days and then the Arabs could return to their homes—and share the land, houses, trucks, furniture, clothing, even gold and gems, abandoned by the Jews. Altho the Jews gained from the flight, sometimes Jews urged Arabs to stay. In Haifa, the Jewish labor unions promised Arab dockers their jobs and their lives.

Of all Arab rulers, the most eager to move into Palestine was King Abdullah. The British had awarded him the sparse land east of the River Jordan for help he and his brother, Feisal, sons of the Sherif of Mecca, had given during the First World War. Feisal, made king of Iraq, died in 1933.

Abdullah's army, the Arab Legion, under its British commander, John Glubb [known as Glubb Pasha], was the most highly rated of all Arab forces. In November, Abdulla had met secretly with Golda Meir and proposed they divide Palestine and then make peace.

As the British left the Jordan Valley, Abdullah sent his Legion across the river and up the hills toward Jerusalem, Abdullah's desired prize. The legionnaires diverted to unfortunate, isolated Kfar Etzion. With their cannon, they crushed the stone houses until only 15 people could walk. These came out, hands up. An Arab tommy gun blazed. All but four died.

When the news reached Jerusalem, Arabs rang church bells in joyous victory. The date was May 14. On the nearby Hill of Evil Counsel, the British commander lowered the Union Jack from the fortress palace of the departed British governor. In a museum at Tel Aviv, Ben-Gurion proclaimed the rebirth, after two milleniums, of the nation of Israel.

The official war began soon after dawn as three Egyptian planes dropped bombs at the Tel Aviv power station. From the south, 10,000 Egyptians moved out of Sinai, one column heading along the coast for Tel Aviv, the other across the Negev Desert, past Beersheba and up the Hebron Hills toward Jerusalem. From the east, Abdullah's 4,500 legionnaires swarmed toward Jerusalem and, on their northern flank, 3,500 Iraqis scampered thru Arab settlements in Samaria toward the narrow coastal plain north of Tel Aviv to cut the new nation in half. In the north, Syrians and Lebanese, 3,000 each, hoped to pinch off Galilee. The armies had set up a joint command, but rivalries soon appeared.

Israel's new government had taken over Haganah forces and expanded them into an army of 19,000. Immigrants were sometimes sent straight from ship into battle, given guns still in their Czech cases.

The Arab armies passed gaily thru cheering Arab communities. The Egyptian coastal column quickly reached Gaza but the Polish settlers of Yad Mordechai held it up for a week, giving the Givati Brigade time to get set. The brigade stopped the column 20 miles short of Tel Aviv at a cost of 200 men. In the unofficial earlier fighting, it had lost 250.

Similarly, the inland column bypassed the few, small, scattered Jewish settlements in the desert and reached the Hebron Hills. The farmers of Ramat Hahel held it up for a week, giving Jerusalem time to prepare. Abdullah's legionnaires surrounded Mount Scopus, isolating the Hadassah Hospital, and moved into the mile-square warren of domed houses within the ancient walls, trapping some 1,200 Jews in their quarter near Mount Zion. Israeli soldiers broke into the Old City, but couldn't do much and on May 28, two old rabbis surrendered the quarter.

As Jews left the Old City for prison camps, the Arabs blew their homes, synagogs and shops into rubble. The Arabs declared the Wailing Wall, the western foundation of Solomon's Temple, closed to all Jewish worshipers, forever.

Legionnaire tanks tried to break into modern, Jewish Jerusalem. Israelis stopped them near the house of a merchant named Mandelbaum. The tanks tried to slip along Suleiman's north wall and break directly into the Jewish business district. Israelis stopped them at the Convent of Notre Dame.

The Iraqis reached the coastal plain 10 miles from the sea but Jewish settlements there held fast.

In the north, the new army broke the pincer prongs, drove the Lebanese home and chased the Syrians back to the River Jordan but could not dislodge them from a river bridge. An Israeli column, after sweeping the grain plateau west of Galilee, turned south into Arab country, toward Jerusalem, but was summoned to help clear the highway from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. It cleared the hilltops but the Arabs held the police station at Latrun, at the valley's entrance. In one attack, 137 Israelis died, some only hours after reaching the promised land.

At the United Nations, the United States early proposed a four-week truce. Israel ac-

cepted but the British and Arabs stalled while the Arabs thought they were winning. On June 11, the fighting stopped. Both sides were exhausted, but knew the lull was only temporary. The U. N. sent a Swede, Count Folke Bernadotte, to mediate. Arabs and Israelis assembled new men, new weapons, dug trenches and shelters, planned sweeps.

On July 8, the day before the truce expired, the Egyptians, shouting that the U.N. had robbed them of certain victory, attacked. The Arab armies numbered 40,000 but Israel had 60,000.

Moshe Dayan led his commandos in Jeeps, guns snapping, on a dash thru Lydda and Ramle, gaining the airport. Israelis tried once again to drive the Arabs out of the Latrun police post, but again failed. The road remained closed but Israelis completed a bypass around Latrun, lifting the siege of Jerusalem.

They also completed a new water line. But Arab guns ringing the Holy City continued to pour in shells. Altogether, some 8,000 shells killed 400 Jerusalem Jews. In the north, Israelis resumed their sweep, capturing Nazareth.

After 11 days, the U.N. drew a second truce. It, too, was fragile. Bernadotte began redrawing proposed borders. Jews thought he was being too generous to Arabs and on Sept. 17, as he crossed from Arab Jerusalem to Jewish Jerusalem, he was killed, probably by the Stern Gang. The U.N. replaced him with Dr. Ralph Bunche, an American.

In the Negev, Egyptian troops gradually resumed harassing Israeli settlements. By October, the commander in the south was certain his forces could clear Egyptians out of Gaza, the Hebron Hills and the Negev. He sent a convoy thru the U.N.-policed Faluja Crossroads, supposedly neutral ground.

When the Egyptians ambushed the convoy as expected, Israelis took the crossroads, cutting off Egyptians, including a major. Gamal Abdel Nasser. But before Israelis could mount the hills, Abudllah sent into Hebron enough legionnaires to let Israel know that an attack there would reopen the fighting all along the eastern front. The U.N. arranged a third truce.

By late October, the commander in the north was certain his troops could clear all of Galilee. He was told to be quick. His troops did the job in 60 hours.

Egyptians in Gaza still worried Israelis. Just before Christmas, Israelis swept across the 1901 border between Palestine and Egypt into Sinai. They turned north to the sea, cutting off Gaza. Britain sent planes to protect the Egyptians. Israel's new air force shot down five. Israel faced war with Britain. The United States strongly advised Israel to get out of Egyptian Sinai. Ben-Gurion yielded, but let the troops attack Gaza from within Israel. On Jan. 7, the Egyptians cried they had had enough. The U.N. arranged peace talks on the island of Rhodes.

Israel now had an army of 100,000 cock-a-hoop, eager, confident, skilled soldiers. The commanders were certain they could quickly sweep thru the Samarian and Judean hills and win all of Jerusalem. But the Israeli government said no. Israel had lost 5,000 citizens. It must get on with bringing in Jews from all over the world and building a nation.

Israel had lost only 13 Jewish villages and the Jewish quarter of Old Jerusalem, while its forces had captured more than 300 Arab communities, a third of them in areas that the U.N. had in 1947 allotted to Arabs. Of the 750,000 or so Arabs living in the territory now held by Israel, two-thirds had fled. Among those staying behind were about 50,000 Christian Arabs, mostly in Nazareth, and some 30,000 Druses.

Before Israel agreed to the armistice with Egypt, there was one thing more that had to be done. In 1934, Ben-Gurion had stood on the hot, empty sands of Eilat at the head of the Gulf of Aqaba. To the east, the old Arab port slept. Only a few fishing boats disturbed the blue waters, but in his mind, Ben-Gurion saw Eilat as a busy port, a gateway to the far east, to southern Asia, to the east and south Africa.

So one day in March, two Israeli columns scurried thru the desert, bypassed Arab legion posts, and raised the Star of David on the gulf. Now Israel could look both east and west.

On Rhodes, Israel signed the armistice.

1967: Six Days That Changed the World

(By Arthur Veysey)

London.—Jerusalem was a strange city in May of '67. Only now and then did a car dart along Jaffa Road, untroubled by traffic lights, all set solidly at yellow. Stores were open but shoppers had vanished and only an elderly clerk or, perhaps the manager himself, stood looking out the door. The King David Hotel had just one American guest, a splendid woman who had come for her grandson's bar mitzvah and wasn't going to be put off by war.

In houses and apartments, wives cleaned out those solid basement holes the law demanded as cisterns, to prevent a water shortage such as that during the siege of '48, or as shelters from bomb and shell. For years, the spaces had served as handy depositories for cribs, old magazines, broken chairs, scratchy, well-worn 78 records.

Everybody in Jerusalem knew war was coming and they couldn't understand what held back Levi Eshkol, the prime minister. Certainly he and Abba Eban didn't really believe all that nonsense about the Arabs finally showing "a new realism" and willingness to be good neighbors?

It had all blown up quite suddenly. On April 7, Syrians atop the Golan Heights had shelled a Jewish tractor driver in a vineyard beside the Sea of Galilee. That sort of thing had gone on, now and then, for years, for generations even.

The Syrians were safely out of reach of Israeli forces in the valley below, so Israel had begun sending its planes to bomb and strafe the gunners. It did so on April 7.

But this time, Syria sent some of its new Russian MIG planes. The two quadrilles chased one another thru the sky. The Syrians fled. The Israelis chased them all the way home to Damascus, only 5 minutes in a a jet fighter.

Syria protested. The Israeli government said it would strike even harder if the Syrians didn't cease harassing the Galilee settlements.

The Russians took up the Syrian cause, claiming Israel was massing an invasion force in Galilee. Eshkol invited the ambassador for a personal tour. The ambassador declined.

In Egypt, President Nasser spoke up for Syria. He had steadily refused to demand the U.N. withdraw its Sinai and Gaza patrols as almost certainly bringing a new war.

Now he suddenly asked the United Nations to quit. Secretary General U Thant did so, at once, saying he had no legal alternative. He also took U.N. guards from Sharm el Sheik and Nasser promptly reestablished Egyptian guns there. Eilat was again blocked. Quickly assembled in Sinai were 100,000 men, 1,000 tanks, 500 guns, 300 war planes.

In Washington, President Johnson talked of sending an international flotilla to Eilat, daring the Egyptians to shoot. In Paris, President de Gaule, seeking reconciliation with North African Arabs, told Eban, "Do not fire the first shot." In London the Socialist government wanted no part of a Middle East fight.

In Jerusalem, the massing of Egyptians so close to Tel Aviv preoccupied political minds, blotting out rivalries. Eshkol brought back Moshe Dayan as defense minister. Dayan toured his troops and publicly said the problem was still one for diplomats. On that Sunday in June he said: "Look at all the soldiers on the Tel Aviv beach."

Late in the evening, he arrived at the King David Hotel. Long before dawn he slipped away, to appear at an airfield and announce to the Knesset's Foreign and Defense Committees that, unfortunately, he could not take them on a tour of military bases because, minutes before, the war had begun.

As in 1948, Israel faced war on all fronts, not only with Egypt as in 1956. Although Israel's forces had increased mightily, they had to deal with each enemy in turn. The Arabs had, again, set up a joint command. If they struck first, fast and hard, they could do great damage. Israel hoped the Arabs would dither and divide.

The first Israeli task was to destroy the Arab war planes, some only 5 minutes away.

The air attack was meticulous. A traditional surprise air raid comes at dawn. The Israelis waited until 8:30, breakfast time for Egyptians, and then flew far out to sea, bypassing the Soviet radar along the canal, and came in from the rear. Total surprise! The pilots slowed to make sure each bomb, each rocket struck. Pilots returned home, reloaded, and went after Arab bases east of the Jordan as far as Baghdad. In their morning's work, they destroyed more than 400 planes, mostly Russian. Sirens screamed in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, but not one bomb dropped on any Israeli city.

The tanks already were moving into one column along the coast, another across the heart of the wilderness. This time the paratroops dropped at Sharm el Sheik. Israeli planes swarmed over the desert, pouncing on Egyptian tanks. As in the 1956 war, small rockets exploded tanks and often the sight of a plane was enough to send Egyptian tank crews running. In the Mitla Hills, the planes caught an entire Egyptian armored division. I shall never forget the sight of all those blackened hulks sitting in little pools of scorched earth.

As Israeli planes blitzed Egyptian air bases, Prime Minister Eshkol asked the U.N. truce supervisor, Gen. Odd Bull, to tell King Hussein that Israel would not attack Jordan if Jordan did not attack Israel. But about 11 o'clock the war came to Jerusalem. Rifles cracked. Then mortars crunched. Planes swept over, in pairs; everyone ducked but could not understand why no bombs fell.

Soon Jordanian soldiers scrambled up the Hill of Evil Counsel to the former British governor's palace, now occupied by Gen. Bull. The general told them the palace was neutral ground. The soldiers established themselves in its gardens. So up the other side went Israeli soldiers. There was a sharp skirmish. The Arabs fled down their side. The Israelis put a shell thru the palace's thick front door, found Gen. Bull under a desk, advised him and his men to leave. They drove down to a hotel in Jewish Jerusalem.

By night, big guns joined in the battle, a holding operation for Israel until guns, tanks and planes could be brought up from the Sinai after dealing with the Egyptians. The dueling for Jerusalem continued the next day altho gradually the Arab guns fell silent, smashed by Israeli planes. In the afternoon Mayor Teddy Kollek, touring shelters, said: "It will all be over tomorrow."

I remember that second night of the war as tho it were yesterday. From atop the King David, we looked across the no man's land of 19 years to the walled old city. A great searchlight flowed over the walls. To the right, burning timbers fell, in sparkling showers, from the cone-shaped roof of the church on Mount Zion. To the left, the roof of Victoria Augusta Hospital blazed brightly. On the

southern horizon, a golden ribbon testified of fields burning at Ramah Rahel.

Then planes whistled over and seconds later there were great bursts of light as bombs exploded along the eastern slopes of the Judean Hills. From an armored car, Israelis called thru loudspeakers to the Arabs to surrender.

On the third morning, Israeli soldiers captured Mount Scopus, swept along to the Mount of Olives and came down thru the Garden of Gethsemane. An armored car pushed down the thick planks of the Lion's Gate. Paratroopers flooded across the stone plateau where Abraham prepared to sacrifice Isaac, on into the narrow streets. Soon they were praying at the Wailing Wall. A sniper bullet brought down one soldier at his prayers.

Israeli columns dashed south to Bethlehem and on to Hebron, north to Nablus, east to Jericho and the Jordan River. By the end of the fourth day, Jordan was beaten.

Now came Syria's turn. That army, so boastful a week earlier, had sat tight on its rocky plateau high above Galilee, content to lob shells and mortars down on to the settlements. By Thursday night, Israeli convoys streamed along all roads north, past the Sea of Galilee, thru the drained Hulah Swamps, up to the slopes of Mount Hebron where, like a miracle, cool clear water gushes from a rock wall to form the Jordan River.

For Israel, total victory was within grasp. The only question was: Would the U. N. intervene too early and save Syria?

The Syrians were deeply dug into the black basalt escarpment. Russia had helped design the bunkers, the trenches, the mine fields. Up the slope the Israelis went. Sometimes, they said later, they came upon Syrian soldiers locked into gun pits, abandoned by their officers. Soon an Israeli armored column was dashing across the grain fields. Syrians fled, soldier and civilian alike.

How can one describe victorious Israel? It began breathing again. It rejoiced. The events of the week seemed too good to be true. Had Jews really won the biggest military victory in their thousands of years? Had David brought down a host of Goliaths? Israelis had willingly gone down into hell. They had paid. But the fewer than 800 dead was much less than the toll even the most optimistic had expected.

Israelis had rounded out their country, they had taken almost all of their people out of Arab gun range. They had shortened their land borders from 600 miles to a manageable 160 miles.

Certainly at last the Arabs would see the **value of peace. "And we now have** room," said Mrs. Ben Zvi, widow of the second president. "All we need now is a million more Jews."

But gradually, Israelis awakened to the hard realities. There was to be no peace. The Russians sent more and better arms to the Arabs. In the next three years, Arab harassment was to take as many lives as the six days of war.

The Jews in Russia and Eastern Europe who wanted to come could not. Those in Western Europe and the Americas who could come sent money, but came only to visit.

It all goes to show, Israelis told one another, that if you've got something big to do, you must do it yourself.

1971: 4 YEARS LATER, AN UNEASY PEACE—WAR MEMORIES LINGER DURING LULL

(By Michael McGuire)

TEL AVIV.—Tall, tanned and appearing like a figure cut of an Israeli beer poster, the hitchhiking woman soldier stood beside the busy highway between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.

Beside her stood a young paratrooper, his right arm in a cast and his red beret cocked rakishly askew. Further down from the intersection, a dozen more uniformed men and women stood with thumbing arms stretched and anxious looks on their suntanned faces.

Scores of autos, many carrying only their drivers, sped past. "It seems people don't stop for them as they did this time last year," a foreign visitor said to Danny Csasznik as the Israeli driver accelerated his car.

"That's true," said Csasznik, a 26-year-old veteran. "But the Israelis look at it as a good barometer to measure tension. When the fear of war is down, the soldiers wait longer for lifts. When the shooting starts, they become the heroes again and ride."

Some of the hitchhiking soldiers waited for long periods under a burning sun seemed not to mind the transition which eased them down the scale of motorist popularity.

"I'd rather be standing beside this highway than be under heavy fire along the canal," said a radio operator who accepted a ride with an American driver. "We've had eight months of peace and we like it."

Words similar to those of the young soldier can be heard with greater frequency across the country, which is experiencing the first taste of relative peace it has had in two decades.

"It was the funerals," said a 28-year-old engineer in Jerusalem. "Last year this time I was getting worn down emotionally by having to attend so many funerals. It seemed that every week I had to go to one."

A drive along Israel's Jordanian and Syrian borders, which one year ago were reaching the sizzling point with Fedayeen and Arab army activity, now makes the area appear as normal as the Illinois countryside on a Wednesday morning drive to Rockford.

A kibbutz farmer balanced his small son on his knee as he drove his tractor along a Galilee road which came under constant rocket and shell fire one year ago. Cement walls 10 yards or so long spaced along a perilous road climbing the Golan Heights appears as innocuous as trees. In April, 1970, half-tracks and Jeeps loaded with grim-faced Israeli soldiers were parked behind the shelter walls, their occupants peering across a deep gorge into Jordanian hills saturated with guerrillas who today are not there.

In the Golan Heights, the crew of a Centurion tank basked in the sun a short distance from a Syrian army camp. A few miles further on, young Israelis photographed one another atop a Stalin tank captured from the Syrians during the June, 1967, war. The tank's long gun pointed down in ironic symbolism towards an Israeli settlement north of the Sea of Galilee far below.

"We used to say: 'Never a dull moment'," a colonel said in an army office in the capital, "but now, newsmen itch for something to do."

The radio which David Rothchild used to turn on in his Jerusalem bar every hour to pick up newscasts has gone silent. So have the radios that used to blare loudly in other bars and restaurants.

"Everyone, or at least a great many people, used to carry transistor radios with them to listen to the hourly news to hear if anyone they knew was among the casualties," said a Tel Aviv taxi driver. "Today nobody carries them."

"Israel is a different place than it was during the war of attrition a year ago when every day brought new casualties and downed aircraft," said a United Nations worker. "The Israelis seem to have a new spirit. They have tasted peace and they like its flavor."

Some Israelis feel their government should try harder to meet Egyptian President Anwar Sadat in rounds of talks directed toward peace. Others believe the government is doing the best it can.

"I say give back the (Golan) Heights, the West Bank (of the Jordan), Gaza and the Sinai," said a young office girl in Jerusalem. "It's worth the chance for peace."

"We got to hold on to all the land we can," said a Haifa factory worker. "I was born here and I know Arabs. You can't rely on a gentleman's agreement. Look at (King) Hussein. He has made 20 agreements with the guerrillas and has broken every one. We're not going to let that happen to us. We want guarantees."

Perhaps the most impassioned expression for a lasting peace came from an Arab father of five who lives in the West Bank town of Rammallah.

"Some nights I remember that terrible day back in June, 1967," he said, "and I say to myself, as I lie awake at night, 'Please, God, let there be no more war again.' When the explosives started dropping around my home, I went to the basement with my family for shelter. My wife was clutching my neck in terror and one of my little boys was pulling on my shirt and crying, begging 'Please, Daddy, please don't leave us.'

"When the shooting stopped," he said, "I remember passing the bodies lying in the street. These thoughts keep occurring. Please, God, not again."

FINANCE MINISTER SAPIR PLANS FOR FUTURE

(By Michael McGuire)

JERUSALEM.—If peace settles over the Middle East, Israel will become economically independent within 10 years, said Pinchas Sapir, minister of finance, commerce and industry.

"If there is a lasting peace," Sapir said, "we should be able to consider ourselves independent in a decade, but this will come about gradually, step by step."

Sapir said his nation is standing at the beginning of a road in which the relative weight of allocations to defense will gradually decrease and the portion of the budget devoted to public services, immigrant absorption and development will grow.

"If we have a real peace," Sapir said, "our economy will jump very fast. More people will come to Israel. We will increase our production and export. On the horizon we can see a very real economic independence."

Sapir, who also oversees Israel's ruling Labor party, is considered the key man behind Israel's bounding economic and industrial growth. Increasing numbers of Israelis view the bald, bespectacled and heavily-built cabinet man as a leading contender for premiership if Mrs. Golda Meir steps down in three years.

With peace over the next decade, Sapir foresees a military manpower cut from the current 20 per cent to a point close to 5, a population doubling to 6 million, an expanding labor market providing jobs for more than 800,000 additional employes and a dramatic leap in the nation's industrial development.

The role of defense expenditures in the gross national product is expected to decrease from today's 30 per cent to 11 or 12 per cent, he said. Exports will increase fourfold with a figure reaching close to 6 billion dollars.

Industrial production during the decade will increase three times to 11.4 billion dollars, exports will top 3 billion dollars and the annual trade deficit will reduce from the 1.3 billion U.S. dollars of 1970 to between 900 million dollars and 1 billion in 1975.

Sapir aims to keep the level of the state's foreign currency reserves at approximately 600 million dollars thru 1975, compared with the present 430 million dollars. The current figure is 70 million dollars below the 500 million dollars which the Bank of Israel describes as "comfortable" but is in fact enough to pay for less than three months' imports.

"I firmly believe peace will come," Sapir

said. "I'm much more optimistic than a year ago. Today I believe there will be a settlement sooner than later."

Sapir said he hopes someday soon to see the exchange of Israeli assets with those of the Arab world. "If I could close my eyes and tell you what my dream is," Sapir said, "I would tell you it is to help the Arab world develop and prosper. You know we are sending more than a thousand technicians, engineers and water and agricultural experts to Asia, South America, Africa and the West Indies. We are prepared to give this same help to our neighbors if peace comes."

The Israeli taxpayer, the heaviest hit in the world, could also look toward getting a break, Sapir said. "Were it not for the immense defense burden [which accounts for 80 per cent of taxes collected], everything would look different."

Personal income taxes—which are slated to bring the state some 842 million dollars this year—when combined with other taxes drain 50 per cent of a paycheck away from an Israeli father of two children.

Because prices rose along with wages during the last two years, large sections of the population have been elevated into higher tax brackets without any significant change in their real incomes.

Autos and other import goods are taxed higher than their value. Immigrants and young married couples seeking homes discovered during the last four months in 1970 that the prices of plots in new building areas rose by between 7 per cent and 12 per cent because of land shortage. Building plots in Tel Aviv rose by 25 per cent between November, 1969, and November, 1970, with two-thirds of this increase occurring between September and November. In the Tel Aviv area, flats range from about $5,700 to $10,000 a room. In Jerusalem, prices are higher.

"But they are buying them up," said a representative of a private real estate firm. "Many of the luxury flats are being bought up as second residences for Jews in the United States and elsewhere. They can invest in the property and collect rent when they are not occupying them."

Sapir said he based his optimism on Israel's "tremendous" development in the past. "When we look back at what has been done," he said, "we see that our population has grown more than three-fold since 1948 and we are now a state of three million people. The per capita income has reached $1,600, a figure not less than that of developed European countries, and this is as compared with a per capita income of $300 in the early years of austerity—the years of food and other rationing."

Sapir said Israel has built an essential structure for the economy without which no development would be possible. Electric power production has increased almost 20 times since 1950. A network of roads stretching across 6,000 miles has been built within the same period. Telephone expansion has gone from 19,000 instruments in 1948 to close to a half-million in 1970. Israel's merchant fleet has risen from a few creaking ships to a modern fleet of 120.

"By 1974," Sapir said, "we will have a shipping capacity of more than 5 million tons. By 1975 a million tons more will be added. This will come in handy when we get into the heavy metal industry. This we will do even without the natural resources. Japan has no raw materials. They bring in iron ore and scrap iron so why can't we?"

Agriculture has developed from a cultivation of 400,000 acres to 1.05 million acres while the growth of irrigated areas has risen from 75,000 to 425,000 acres. This is enough to supply almost all the nation's food requirements, and allowed exports which, excluding citrus, last year earned 42 million dollars.

Immigration, Israel's lifeblood, remains the relatively unknown factor in Israel's economic future. If Russia throws open its doors to mass Jewish emigration, the economic shock will hit Israel hard.

Soviet Jews were allowed to immigrate in greater number this March than in all of 1970, reports from the Soviet Union indicate, bringing the total number of departures for the first quarter of this year to about 1,400. If this rate continues through the year, Israel will have received about 5,500 Soviet Jews by 1972, or three times higher than the average of about 1,500 Jews that have been permitted to leave for Israel from Russia each year.

"Hundreds of thousands could come," Sapir said. "It is our duty to begin preparing the necessary plans now, even tho the matter is, as yet, only a vision of the future."

CHICAGOANS HAVE MADE GREAT CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF ISRAEL

(By Jacob M. Arvey, who has been prominent in Chicago's political and civil life for a half-century, and modestly omits mention of himself in the following article on Chicagoans who have contributed to Israel's development. Few here have been more vigorous on behalf of Israel, however; Mr. Arvey for years has taken an active part in Israel Bond drives, Combined Jewish Appeal, and other groups which have aided Israel, and there also is a 500-acre forest dedicated to him near Tel Aviv. He is honorary chairman of the 1971 Israel Bond Drive)

The celebration of the 23d anniversary of the State of Israel focuses attention on the crucial role that Chicagoans have played in the economic life of the country.

The role of American Jewry in general, and specifically the Chicago Jewish community, in providing the financial support for the country's great accomplishments over the last two decades is a major part of the story of Israel's economic, cultural and social renaissance. In these 20-plus years, Chicago has become a leading city in providing aid to Israel and its various institutions. For instance, it is the number one community for Israel Bonds on a per capita basis.

Among Chicagoans who have played key roles in Israel's development is the late Max Bressler, founder of a suburb of Jerulsalem called Keryat Menachem, which now has a population of more than 35,000. Bressler also was responsible for the establishment of the John F. Kennedy Memorial in Jerusalem [see cover photo], which each year is visited by hundreds of thousands of Israelis and foreign tourists.

My good friend Philip M. Klutznick, former United States Ambassador to the United Nations, is another Chicagoan who has been of inestimable aid to Israel. It was he who helped to develop the new port of Ashdod on the Mediterranean, which will soon become Israel's leading seaport.

A thousand years before the Christian era, Ashdod was a metropolis of power, the dominant city of the Philistine Confederation. Since the seventh century, however, its glories have been buried in antiquity. With Klutznick's assistance, Israel has re-established this ancient city and has made it an integral part of the country's economic lifeline. One of the most recent projects to be undertaken there is the new oil refinery, which will be a part of the new pipeline from Eilat.

Another Chicagoan who contributed mightily to Israel's economic growth was the late Jacob R. Sensibar, the engineer who developed and constructed our Lake Shore Drive. Sensibar went to Israel about 20 years ago to help drain the Hula swamps in the Galilee, a mosquito-infested area which wasted much of the waters of the Jordan River. Today that region is a productive farmland of 15,000 acres.

Henry Crown, one of this nation's financial and industrial giants, has helped to culturally enhance Israel. Among his many enterprises there is the national Israel Museum in Jerusalem, which he and other members of his family were instrumental in building. He also was responsible for bringing the Hilton Hotel to Tel Aviv, which has helped the country's tourist industry to prosper.

Samuel Bernstein, another of Chicago's industrialists, was responsible in great measure for enlarging the facilities of the Technion Institute in Haifa. This institution of higher education, Israel's equivalent of M.I.T., is one of the world's leading scientific and engineering centers.

In the field of music, Israel has been fortunate in obtaining the services of Max Targ, a retired business executive and one of the deans of the Jewish community in Chicago. He is president of Americans for a Music Library in Israel, which maintains six musical libraries and academies thruout Israel. It also provides musical instruments and scores as well as other materials for Israel's symphonic and student groups.

Dr. Theodore K. Lawless, a leading Chicago dermatologist, has visited Israel on numerous occasions to help train physicians in his own field. A clinic in his name has been established at the Beilinson Hospital in Tel Aviv, which he visits from time to time. He was the prime mover in its establishment.

Another long-time friend of Israel is Patrick E. Gorman, international secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union. Pat helped to set up a vitally needed cold storage plant in Eilat at the southernmost tip of the Negev Desert, and a cultural center in the Galilee in the north.

Joseph M. Levine, a noted Chicago manufacturer, has visited Israel many times. During one of his trips to Jerusalem several years ago, he noticed a lack of adequate play facilities for children. Today, as a result of his efforts, scores of playgrounds and gardens for youngsters can be seen thruout the Holy City. He provided the financial resources and plans which made them possible.

Industrialist Harry Lasky was responsible for the construction of the highly-acclaimed planetarium in Tel Aviv, which has become a popular attraction for its citizens. He also established hundreds of scholarships in every university in Israel for the country's needy high school graduates.

With tourism now Israel's No. 1 earner of foreign currency, it is not surprising that its government leaders called on top business executive Martin Sandler to help found the Israel Hotel Corporation, which brought the Sheraton Hotel to Tel Aviv.

Samuel W. Sax, president of the Exchange National Bank, is another Chicagoan who was tapped by Israel to provide a vital service for the country. He was requested to open up the first branch of an American banking institution in Israel, which he did in September. Exchange's Tel Aviv operation remains the only Israel branch of an American Bank.

Oil distributor Milton Lambert also has helped Israel. As head of the Chicago Chapter of the Mogen David Adom, the official Red Cross service in Israel, he personally raised the funds which provided 25 ambulances and numerous hospital facilities for the people of Israel.

These men and others like them have forged an unparalleled pattern of humanitarian effort that well can serve as a model for other cities thruout the country.

ABBA EBAN: HELP FROM UNITED STATES IS ESSENTIAL

(By John H. Thompson)

The most important thing the United States can do in the Middle East is to keep Israel strong militarily, particularly as it has in the last two years. That is the basic element for peace and stability. Without it, all else collapses.

Maintained in this strength by America,

Israel will endure, with or without peace with the Arabs. It will continue to stand firm, yielding neither to pressure from friend nor foe, but is prepared to negotiate any and all issues with Egypt, even including the Sinai fortress of Sharm el Sheik and withdrawal from the Suez Canal.

But if Israel is willing to negotiate the future of such life-or-death national security interests with an Arab enemy, Israel is not willing to turn these interests over to the tender mercies of any United Nations "peacekeeping" force which would be both pro-Soviet and pro-Arab.

This was sometimes tough-minded Abba Eban expounding on Israel's security problems on the eve of her 23d anniversary as a 20th-century state.

The urbane foreign minister, a Churchillian master of the English language, was at his most eloquent recently as he relaxed in New York's Plaza Hotel shortly before returning to Tel Aviv.

Asked how he thought the United States could best contribute to Middle East peace, Eban said that the most important thing—"and I come back to this again and again"—is to keep Israel strong, "because without that everything collapses."

Then Eban said that the second most important thing for the United States to do is "to create conditions for a free negotiation, and not to say before we have begun negotiating that we must accept the principle of total withdrawal."

This is the bone in the Israeli throat. Many members of Congress also felt that this principle of withdrawal first had been proclaimed by Secretary of State William P. Rogers at a press conference where he also advanced the idea of an international "peacekeeping" force to insure Israel's security.

Subsequently Rogers assured a closed-door session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that Washington had not asked Israel to accept the withdrawal principle in advance of negotiations. As for the international force, Eban, who had just conferred with Rogers, said it was important to keep clear that Rogers only envisaged such a force "if the parties want it."

Eban suggested that the third thing the U.S. can do "is to use its influence with the Soviet Union to deter Soviet intervention."

The fourth thing to be done by Washington "is to tell the Arab states that if they want a settlement they must turn to Israel. And not think that they can get outside pressures on Israel to work."

As Eban noted, Israel is skeptical about the effectiveness of any U.N. force to keep the peace. It was the abrupt disappearance of such a U.N. force—under Egyptian pressure—from Sharm el Sheik, the desert fortress that controls Israel's vital Strait of Tiran and the entrance to its only Red Sea port—Eilat—that precipitated the 1967 war and "proved that a U.N. force is not able to prevent any country from doing what it wants."

Expanding on this theme, Eban said: "We know that a United Nations peacekeeping force would be under the United Nations' control. And that very largely means Soviet-Arab control, because the Soviet Union and the Arabs are in a very preponderant position [in the U.N.].

"The U.N. is like a business firm in which the Arabs have 40 shares and Israel one share. No one is going to tell me that the board of governors will make decisions against the majority shareholders. In other words, to give vital and crucial Israeli interests over to United Nations control is to say that we give crucial Israeli interests over to what is largely Soviet-Arab control."

Eban suggested that the idea of placing a Soviet contingent at Sharm el Sheik, as an example, makes as much sense as giving the Soviet Union and the U.N. a hand in running the Panama Canal. "If I were to suggest that, you would think I was off my head," he laughed.

For Israel, the issues at that tiny hunk of Sinai desert known as Sharm el Sheik are enormous—so enormous that Eban said he is unable to understand why Israel's former prime minister and wartime leader, David Ben-Gurion, is willing to abandon the fortress and withdraw as part of a peace settlement with Egypt. Ben-Gurion said this in a recent Saturday Review interview.

All of Israel's oil, including that which she exports to Europe, comes thru Eilat and the Gulf of Tiran, which the Arabs call the Gulf of Aqaba. It is Israel's window to Asia and East Africa. Without that maritime outlet, Eban said, the development of Israel's Negev desert northward from Eilat would have no meaning.

"It has the issue of peace and war because, if somebody else is there, by action or inaction they can turn on the tap of peace or war," Eban said. "So here, on that little piece of desert, the issues for Israel are peace, war, development, oil, Africa, Asia, the Negev. What country in the world would walk out of there and hand it over to forces of the Soviet and the French under the control of an Arab and the majority of the United Nations? . . . Therefore, in the peace agreement with Egypt, we would like to negotiate our continued presence there."

Eban did not explain what form the negotiations would take, should they come to pass. Presumably they would involve some kind of trade-off, such as an agreement that Israeli forces might return to Sharm el Shiek if Egypt denied Israeli ships passage thru a reopened Suez Canal.

The canal, quiet since Secretary Rogers achieved a cease-fire as the first step in peace talks being conducted thru Ambassador Jarring of the United Nations, remains the front line between Israeli and Egyptian armed forces. Whether it might be reopened, simultaneously with a pullback of the opposing military forces, has been proposed as a possible subject of negotiation, exclusive of a larger peace settlement.

Prime Minister Golda Meir has said that Israel is willing to discuss the Suez issue, which was first broached by Egyptian President Sadat. Eban said Israel is prepared to go even further and discuss with Egypt the occupied geographical areas from which Israel first said she would not withdraw. They include Sharm el Sheik, the Golan Heights in Syria, part of the West Bank of the Jordan River and East Jerusalem. This so-called Israeli "hard line" had been attacked by Moscow and Cairo.

"Our position is that everything can be discussed," Eban said. "Our position in the negotiations will be that Israel will concentrate on these points [its original claims]. That is not being inflexible. What is inflexible is for the Arabs and the Soviets to say that there is no inflexibility, to insist on reconstructing the precise divisions that brought about the war. That's inflexibility."

War, as the foreign minister and philosopher observed, always changes things. Boundaries are never the same after a war as before. No war has ever left the relationships—or boundaries—of contending countries precisely as they had been.

This view of war and the alterability of boundaries does not mean Israel seeks more territory, Eban said. Ben-Gurion, the old desert pioneer, had also said the same, asserting that with proper irrigation the Negev has enough room to absorb all the Jews in the world. The problem was to open wider the doors of immigration from Russia and other Iron Curtain and Arab countries.

"The strength of the country is its people," said Eban, "especially the vitalizing force of Jewish immigration. It can only make the country economically and socially stronger. This has nothing whatever to do with space."

Israeli expansion has been a fear of the Arabs. The Gahal, the opposition party in Israel, makes no bones about its intentions. It would hold on to all the occupied Arab lands. If given the chance, it would even seek more land at the expense of the Arabs. This right-wing viewpoint, however, is reportedly held by only a handful of Israelis; certainly not by the government.

"Look at Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Great Britain," Eban said. "All have a higher density of population than Israel. Most of them do not have much in natural resources. But they achieve momentum and dynamism and advanced standards of culture thru the creative force and vitality of their people."

In the same manner, that is the way Israel looks at her people, even when they are under siege. It will be the same, said Eban, in war or peace, or in what Eban called the transition period, a segment of time that may have no foreseeable end.

If there is no peace settlement, is war with the Arabs inevitable "Not necessarily," he said. If "military options are closed down by the maintenance of the balance of power," he foresees room for an intermediate period in which "the quest for a peace settlement goes forward."

Eban pointed out to some of the other unsettled problems of the world, such as Berlin, Korea and Cyprus, as evidence that war does not have to be the result of no-peace. "I don't believe that the non-solution of problems means that there has to be war."

Since 1948, said Eban, the world has "come to terms with Israel and integrated Israel into its community." Israel has diplomatic relations now with nearly 100 other nations, close relations with the European Economic Community, and a broad network of cooperative development arrangements with Latin America and Africa.

"I look at the future with confidence," said the Israeli foreign minister. "There are many clouds on the horizon. Our destiny is still a destiny of struggle. But it seems to me that struggle is an energizing force on our youth and our society. To sum up, I don't think we have an easy future, but I think we have a great future."

Exports to the United States Steadily Grow

(By James Mateja)

When it comes to trade partnerships, Israel and the United States are on more than friendly terms, the United States—with 21 per cent of the imports to Israel—the largest single contributor to that nation's import picture.

And not only is the United States as a whole important to the economc growth of Israel, the Midwest plays a particularly prominent role in this growth, according to Dan Meiry, Israel consul for economic affairs, whose office is located in Chicago.

In 1970 the United States accounted for $323 million of Israel's imports, compared with $310 million in 1969, and the Midwest was responsible for 30 per cent of the 1970 total.

And as proof of the economic growth Israel is experiencing with the aid of such countries as the United States, the total value of imports in 1970 was $1.4 billion, up from $1.2 billion in 1969.

The Israeli export picture also is promising. In 1970, $149 million in goods were sent to the United States, up from $136 million in 1969. Total value of all Israeli exports in 1970 was $736 million, a substantial increase from $689 million in 1969.

Israel depends on the United States, and heavily on the Midwest, for automobiles and parts, aircraft and parts, raw materials for the diamond industry, iron, steel and other metals, plants and vegetable products, Meiry said.

Leading exports Israel sends to the United States are ready-made fashions, tires, foods, cutting tools and molds, and medical electronic equipment. The United States is Israel's No. 1 export trading country, followed by the United Kingdom and Germany.

In Israel's favor is its geographic location, touching on Syria, Jordan, Egypt and Lebanon, Meiry said. Because of its location and low-cost labor force [an Israeli laborer will start at between $1 to $1.50 an hour, compared to about $2 an hour here], many United States companies have established facilities there and use Israel as an export base to other countries.

Midwestern companies, subsidiaries or their affiliates operating in Israel include: Baxter Laboratories of Morton Grove; Miles Laboratories, Elkhart, Ind.; Solpek Steel Corp., Ltd., Cleveland; Monsel Electronic Industries, Ltd., St. Louis; Packard Instruments Co., Inc., Downers Grove; Manpower, Inc., Milwaukee; Astronautics Corp. of America, Milwaukee; Pioneer Engineering & Manufacturing Co., Warren, Mich.; and Brunswick International, Motorola, Inc., Sharon Youth Hostel, Inc., and Sheraton Hotel Corp., of Israel, all headquartered in Chicago.

"One factor Israeli workers have to live with, tho, is war," Meiry said. "Workers may be called at any time to serve in the army for 3 to 6 weeks.

"This, naturally, disturbs production, but we have learned to live with the situation. We don't like it, tho. We prefer to be peaceful and would rather put our resources to other uses. The worker in Israel, however, has the attitude that, despite war, life must go on." Meiry said.

In 1948, when Israel attained statehood, it was almost totally reliant upon imports, but now is strong enough to make many of its own goods and has a thriving export market, according to Meiry. Exports in 1950 equaled only 12 per cent of imports and totaled $35.1 million. In 1969, exports equaled 57.5 per cent of imports and had grown to $683 million.

And the Midwest is a big customer. Israel sends hosiery, wines and liquors, ready-made fashions, shoes, fruit, diamonds, cutting tools, molds for plastic injectors, seamless pipes, tires, Formica laminated plastic and electronic equipment here.

Products Israel imports from the Midwest include seeds, wheat, flour, beans, powdered milk, iron and steel, copper ingots, aluminum, scrap metals, road building materials, cars, tractors, metal-working and electric machinery, data processing machinery, hides, fire bricks, incubators, agricultural implements, clay, dental plaster and chemicals.

To handle the country's imports and exports, Israel relies on El Al Israel Airlines, the country's only international air carrier, and Zim Israel Navigation Co., Ltd., its shipping line.

El Al, which has 10 jets currently and two 747s due in May, has been in operation for 21 years, and has been instrumental in Israel's agricultural and industrial export business, according to Michael S. England, the airline's Midwest district manager. El Al is Israel's biggest single foreign currency earner, he said, with a total volume of $85 million in 1970, up 15 per cent from 1969. Freight traffic accounts for 20 per cent of volume.

El Al is publicly-owned, and altho the government has controlling interest, it is operated like a private business and has been in the black since 1956, England said.

The Zim line is one which serves the Midwest. Its ports of call include Montreal, Toronto, Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee and Cleveland. Major cargo includes wines, tires, flour, hides and machinery, according to Abraham Sharon, Zim's midwest representative.

While world trade has been of so much importance to Israel's economic growth, the State of Israel Bond Drive, begun in 1951, "is the most important factor to the development of Israel," according to David Zysman, executive director in the Midwest for the State of Israel Bonds.

The bond drive contributes 85 per cent of the country's development budget, which includes expenditures for power plants, roads and airlines, while the normal budget covers education, defense, and welfare.

Bonds brought $210 million into the economy in 1970, Zysman said, with the goal at $400 million for 1971. The increase is to come from institutions, banks and profit-sharing plans, he said.

Metropolitan Chicago accounts for the bulk of Illinois' bond purchases and on a per capita basis, Chicago is the United States' major bond buyer.

Zysman emphasized that the money from the bond drive doesn't disturb the United States balance of payments because the money doesn't leave the country.

"There is no export of capital. The money is used to buy United States goods here to ship them to Israel," he said.

In 1953, $2.6 million in bonds was sold in Chicago; in 1970 $16 million was sold.

Zysman said that altho the United States was experiencing a recession in 1969 and 1970, bond sales increased substantially in both the Chicago area and the United States—from $11.3 million in the Chicago area in 1969 to $16 million in 1970, and from $158 million for the United States in 1969 to $210 million in 1970.

There are 102 Chicago area banks which purchase the bonds, with Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. serving as the fiscal agent for the Midwest. Chase Manhattan Bank in New York is the fiscal agent for the United States.

The Druses: A Unique Amalgam of Religions

(By Eleanor Page)

Ussafia, Israel.—"Americans are nice people," said Kamal Mansour, a chief of the Druse tribe, "but you are encouraging the Palestinian refugees to become parasites by sending them so much money. You give money without asking why. You give money for nothing. And people hate you for it."

Mansour was speaking in the spacious reception room of his house in Ussafia on the highest part of Mount Carmel, not far from Haifa. A row of windows in the frame dwelling overlooked the village. Chairs and sofas lined the walls. A handsome tapestry hung on one wall; book shelves filled with everything from "Exodus Revisited" to Saul Bellow and a jeroboam of champagne were at the opposite end from the windows.

The room gradually filled with villagers from their teens to their middle years, all listening respectfully as Sheik Kamal, a leader in this sect which had its origins 1,000 years ago, attempted to explain to a group of American women editors how a minority group can get along with the Jews in Israel—as well as with previous conquerors of that territory.

Indeed, how the sect has managed to retain its close-knit identity and distinctive religion thru 1,000 years of turbulent history is remarkable.

Kamal credited their religion, and the understanding that the Middle East is based not on logic, but on emotion, with the sect's survival. They practice taquiyah, which is "concealment." or dissimulation, a principle which permits or even enjoins them to profess publicly the creed and when expedient to conform externally to the mores of any group among whom the Druses may find themselves.

For 500 years, Kamal's family has lived on that mountain top, "not for the air, or to be close to God, but as a minority fighting for the freedom of half a million people," said Mansour. Druses don't accept converts to their religion; you must be born one. "God promised us paradise, and our forefathers said let's not bring foreigners into it!"

Their religious system—which embraces elements of Judaism, Christianity and Islam—is kept secret from the outside world, and not even all members participate fully in the services. That is reserved for an elite company of intimates who also are the only ones with access to their scriptures.

Altho the Druses raise fine tobacco and grapes, the religious do not smoke or drink. They can be identified from the nonreligious by their head covering.

Kamal's father is religious leader of the village, a post that is not necessarily hereditary. Kamal, a former newspaper man, is adviser on Druse and Arab affairs to the president of Israel. Fifteen hundred of the 5,000 villagers are members of the Mansour family, including Eisenhower Mansour. Mansour means victorious, he explained, and Eisenhower was born at the time the general defeated Adlai E. Stevenson for the Presidency.

The 20th century has been catching up with Ussafia since 1947. At that time there was no running water and no electricity, and the lone phone was in Kamal's father's house. Now the women no longer carry water in jars on their heads; there are 60 telephones, cars, taxis, good roads, three schools and two clinics.

Women have progressed in their rights, too. Girls go to school; women have the right to become political or religious leaders.

Women have the right to divorce, too, but in Druse law the husband and wife who have been divorced may never remarry each other—or indeed, even see each other. "If they find themselves in the same street one must turn and go in the other direction."

There are a quarter million Druses in Lebanon, 50,000 in the United States and 80,000 in South America, according to Kamal. The 1971 World Almanac lists Israel's Druse population as 33,000.

Altho primarily agricultural people, Druses have been leaving their farms to work elsewhere, with only 12 per cent remaining to work the land actively. This change has caused a revolution between the old and new generations, differences that are apparent within Kamal's own close family. His wife and mother, in their shapeless black robes and white scraves wound around their heads, look more like his mother and grandmother. His teen-aged daughter and the younger children wear Western dress.

Kamal believes the Middle East does not need more subs and guns, but more tractors and homes. "Outside, you ask why shouldn't we have peace? Why shouldn't the Arab and Jew make peace? But the United States is in the same boat. Why don't you settle differences in Viet Nam and China?"

Kamal sees Israel as the most stable country in the Middle East. He says the Arabs ask one another, are they managing themselves well? He sees a social and educational revolution in the Arab world, where with 130 kids born every hour "it's a challenge for a leader to provide food and education."

Peace must come, said Kamal, because "No humans can live forever on hatered."

Missile Sites Grow in Egypt

(By Ray Wilkinson)

Cairo.—For the price of a $10 train ride to Alexandria on the Mediterranean Sea, a visitor can see at first hand some of the Russian-built antiaircraft missile bases Egypt has established to defend itself against Israeli warplanes.

One surface-to-air missile [SAM] site stands on a breakwater in the center of Alexandria, surrounded on one side by fishing boats and pleasure craft and on the other by fishermen and bathers on a sandy beach. The

rockets are called SAM–3's and are quite sophisticated.

Visitors strolling along the seafront can approach within 100 yards of the site, its entrance at the neck of the breakwater protected by a couple of Egyptian soldiers, several strands of barbed wire and recently erected battleshipgray steel doors.

Scores of seaside hotels given an even better view. Two high earthern bunkers contain the control center. One of them is topped by the radar mast, the most obvious sign of a SAM–3 site. This mast is about 50 feet high with a radar scooper on top and is visible from afar.

Nearby is the "low blow" radar, a squat bowl-shaped structure, which is a vital part of the fire control apparatus for the missiles. The missiles themselves are camouflaged under netting.

At the far end of the site, some of it pleasantly lined with trees, is a helicopter pad and a jetty for small boats.

The curious can approach even closer to a second site near Agami, a pleasant resort area on the outskirts of Alexandria frequented by diplomats, especially military attaches.

One attache who regularly visited Agami once was startled to find a huge antennatype structure he had never seen before suddenly appear at the Agami site. Military circles in Cairo were mystified about this new equipment, but on his next visit the attache solved the mystery. It was the pole of an umbrella the Russians had erected to shade themselves in the blistering Egyptian heat.

The Soviets constructed about 60 sites thruout Egypt early last year as a deterrent to Israeli air raids and Russians still control and man the sites themselves.

The missiles and crewmen were brought into the country in secrecy. When word first circulated about them, the Egyptians categorically denied the presence of both the missiles and men. Cairo later acknowledged missiles were in the country but obliquely indicated they were manned by Egyptians and controlled by the Egyptian military command.

Western military officials said Russians are still in complete command of the sites, personally manning them and controlling the decision to fire the missiles.

On the other side of the road at Agami is a large airfield occupied by about a dozen Soviet-made helicopters. Daily, a Russian-built MIG fighter trainer screams low over Alexandria, swooping and diving. Pink-skinned Russian swimmers wave happily to the plane, piloted by another Russian.

Halfway thru the 2½-hour train ride from Cairo to Alexandria, a visitor sees from the righthand window near Quesna a huge airfield with MIG fighters sitting on the strip or training overhead.

At the start of the 1967 war the Israelis destroyed most of the Egyptian air force sitting in the open on the ground. Following the war the Russians took over aerial planning, constructed new runways and heavily reinforced steel, concrete and earthern hangars, many of them clearly visible from the train.

JERUSALEM: FOR ISRAEL, A GROWING CAPITAL

(By Gwen Morgan)

JERUSALEM.—"We will make Jerusalem the most beautiful city in the world," said the mayor, Teddy Kollek.

The Six-Day war ended the 19-year division of Jerusalem, and, for the first time in 2,000 years, the city is totally in the hands of the Jews. "People will judge Israel," the mayor said, "on how we deal with Jerusalem."

If a visitor looks quickly, he can still see the golden-stoned, cypress-shaded, walled town that met the medieval pilgrim when, staff in hand, he surmounted the last of the limestone Judean Ridges, 2,500 feet above the sea 50 miles away.

A century ago Jerusalem was still confined within the walls raised by Suleiman the Magnificient 300 years earlier to guard the warren of domed stone houses and their 15,000 inhabitants.

Today Jerusalem has more than 200,000 people and has jumped from hilltop to hilltop for miles around. Kollek foresees a city of half a million.

For Kollek, Jerusalem has three roles—its ancient one as a holy place for Jews, Christians and Moslems, its designation since 1949 as capital of Israel, and—Kollek hopes increasingly in the future—an important world place in culture and education.

If Kollek has his way, Israel will discourage commerce and industry from coming to Jerusalem but will continue to expand those livelihoods at Tel Aviv and Haifa on the coast.

As a holy place, Jerusalem is unique. For the Jews it was Abraham's place of sacrifice, the promised land of Moses, the city of Solomon and David, the site of the Temple. The mighty, squared stones which formed the western wall of the great platform from which rose the temple have for centuries been a Jewish place of prayer.

Most of the wall was buried but now archeologists are carefully uncovering sections of it and are digging downward to reveal the chariot-worn roadways of Herod's day, and incidentally finding 18,000 coins. Workmen are clearing rubble from the old Jewish quarter destroyed in the 1948 fighting and rebuilding synagogs, schools and hostels, in the old manner.

Kollek is determined that no harm shall be done to the glorious mosque, one of the world's loveliest buildings, which stands over Abraham's sacrificial rock and each Friday summons Moslems to pray. Suleiman's magnificent two miles of walls and gates have been cleared of centuries of waste, and at night floodlights add to their drama.

For the Christians, too, Kollek stands guard over their 300 structures. He encourages the Christians to care for their buildings, even to improve them and beautify them for the greater service to pilgrims.

Jerusalem is beginning to acquire the physical appurtenances of a national capital. The Knesset, Israel's congress, has erected a distinguished, square-columned building for itself on its own hilltop, a sort of Hebrew-Grecian temple. It, too, is proudly floodlit.

Government ministries have all moved here, except defense. That was kept in Tel Aviv while Jerusalem was divided and exposed but, those perils removed, it too may soon move here. Ministry buildings, however, are utilitarian blocks, designed to provide maximum space in the shortest time at least expense.

The major nations still retain their embassies in Tel Aviv. They operate under the 1947 decree that Jerusalem would be an international city. The United States maintains its own diplomatic representative to Jerusalem. For 19 years, the office was divided, half on the Arab side, half on the Jewish side. Now it is reunited, but diligently keeps separate from the embassy in Tel Aviv.

The city already glories in its structures dedicated to culture and knowledge. The museum is a prize, drawing masterpieces from all over the world to add to its unique local treasures, such as the Dead Sea Scrolls. For a while, the old Hebrew admonition against graven images delayed the exhibition of human sculpture, but that has been overcome.

The university already packs its hill and, despite a shortage of places, welcomes foreign students. The New Hadassah hospital, on its hill, is creating a reputation for medical research, even before its original home on Mount Scopus recovers from its 19-year siege. Both work closely with the Weizmann Institute, down on the coastal plain, which is acquiring renown far greater than its size. Jerusalem takes pride also in its small but brain-heavy academy of science. It has hopes for the Harry Truman Center for Peace.

Old monasteries and libraries are yielding unmatched treasures in manuscripts and scared handicrafts, long hidden and forgotten.

The city has more than its share of concert halls. There are signs of a healthy theater life. The amphitheater atop Mount Scopus has a spectacular view down to the Dead Sea and the Mountains of Moab beyond.

Israel has maintained a British decree that all Jerusalem structures must be faced with the local golden limestone. So far, buildings have been kept low. Jerusalem is still a city of domes and spires.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 26, 1971]

INCREASED MIGRATION TO "PROMISED LAND" BRINGS NUMEROUS SOCIAL PROBLEMS

(By Michael McGuire)

JERUSALEM.—Suez guns have been muffled for more than eight months and the taste of living without hourly newscasts telling of death has suited Israelis well.

But during recent weeks of calm, social problems based primarily on a class gap and immigration have surfaced into public and official concern like debris from a depth charge that waited thru a quarter-century of border strife before detonating.

Social problems common to most nations have been smouldering in Israel since its early days of statehood, many Israelis contend. But they were kept under the rug by a people fiercely united in a primary struggle of survival amid hostile Arab neighbors.

Before the cease-fire, urban social protest in Tel Aviv, Jerusalem or Haifa would have approached treason in the minds of many Israelis. But with the absence of war came cries common to peace. Children of Oriental Jews from North Africa and the Arab states—calling themselves Black Panthers—have taken to the streets to protest alleged discrimination in jobs and housing. The young Orientals have launched a campaign to win their full share of wealth and responsibility.

Many of the nearly 80,000 families living in cramped or slum quarters have taken uncomfortable note of the new immigrants, especially Russians and Americans, being moved quickly into modern flats provided by a government anxious to absorb them rapidly into Israeli life and attract thousands more.

"Israel's administration is 100 per cent European—mostly Eastern European Russians and Polish from Golda Meir on down—with blacks (Orientals) having no influence in the army, the government or Parliament," said one government official. "Soldiers coming home to the slums see new immigrants entering new houses and don't like it.

"It's going to be our No. 1 problem and the sooner we face it the better," the official continued. "There's going to be a lot of shattered illusions. This can be the key project for the United Jewish Appeal. Donations can help the Russian Jews immigrate and build houses for those already here."

The suggestion was echoed by Arie Pincus, director of the Jewish Agency, which organizes immigration, directs immigrant absorpton and masterminds the inflow of funds donated by Jews and others around the world.

"My concern is not whether we can stand our ground militarily or rely on arms assistance from the United States," Pincus said. "My concern is the development of an independent Israel in which the social and cultural gaps can be closed. This, together with meeting the needs of immigration, will be our principal task."

Reduced tension in the Middle East has created concern in some Jewish circles that generous donations from American Jews and Jews of other nations thru the United Jewish Appeal and other programs will slack off. Any reduction would be crucial at a time when Israel faces its greatest demands for cash to solve its city problems and reinforce state budget funds earmarked for maintenance of a strong defense system at full alert.

United Jewish Appeal donations and Israel Development Bonds together have brought Israel a total of $4 billion, according to the Finance Ministry.

"Obviously," Pincus said, "the urgent drama of military defeat or victory—which for us is measured in terms of survival or annihilation—has all the elements to evolve a very positive reaction from Jews.

"But," he said, "there are hundreds of thousands of Jews who still need help to get here. How much money will be needed is anybody's guess. The Israeli taxpayer, no matter what the political situation may be, will be heavily burdened. We are primarily concerned about the Jews who need to come."

Have the Jews in the free world the financial capacity and desire to help in their immigration and solve other social problems? The answer is "yes," Pincus said, "because Israel and the maintenance of immigration is very close to them emotionally. Future absorption, especially from the Soviet Union, will be a backbreaking job."

Nathan Peled, Israel's absorption minister, said large developments toward solving the social problems can be made once peace is established. Defense costs currently approach half the state budget and 30 per cent of the gross national product. Expenditures for defense are four times larger than the defense budget on the eve of the June, 1967 war, a Finance Ministry official reported.

During the 30 years of the British Mandate, Jewish settlement grew from 50,000 to some 650,000 inhabitants. The number of Jews in Israel totally has passed 2.5 million. Since the 1967 war, Peled said, about 124,000 immigrants have been settled here.

Projections indicate an additional 250,000 Jews will move to Israel during the next five years. If Russia opens her borders to Soviet Jews, the number could climb by hundreds of thousands. Because newcomers are absorbed into a more developed economy, the cost of settling them into Israeli society has gone up considerably since the mass migrations of two decades ago. In 1949, for instance, Israel was compelled to settle 225,000 immigrants in tents and barracks, instead of apartments.

Unlike the days of mass migration of illiterate and unskilled Orientals, today's average immigrant is a skilled and educated person.

In 1970 alone, Peled said, 700 medical doctors and 1,200 engineers were among the newcomers.

Peled said that because there has been eight months of quasi-peace, Israel's social problems are coming to the forefront.

"We spend too much money for security now. It's a very heavy burden. We'll have to build at least 50,000 new apartments to meet part of the problems of the Orientals and others.

"I am trying to explain to the discontented that it would be a great mistake to see a social conflict develop between the newcomers and the old-timers," Peled said. "In any society, there are social problems that must be faced up to and solved."

"I think Israel is able to do it," he said, "because it is a new society with traditions of social differences that are not as strong as in other societies."

AND FOR CHRISTIANS, A GLORIOUS CITY OF CHURCHES

(By Malkah Raymist)

JERUSALEM.—The Arab mason, perched high in the Crusader Arch within the church of the Holy Sepulchre, hammered away at century-old plaster roughly painted with saintly figures.

"It will be quite lovely," he said, "when we get all the rubbish cleared away."

For five years, workmen have been trying to bring some sort of order and clean beauty to the massive structure that has grown up during 1,600 years on Calvary—Golgotha in Hebrew—the Mount of the Skull, so called because here, it is said, was buried the skull of Adam, the first man.

In a chapel, priests point to a hole in the rock where they say Romans raised the cross on which Jesus died. In another chapel, under a massive, flaking dome held up since an earthquake by ugly steel girders, a marble altar denotes the cavern tomb where Jesus' body briefly lay.

In Roman days, Calvary was a cemetery, outside the walled town. The exact sites of the cross and the tomb were fixed by Helena, mother of Constantine, the first Roman emperor to become a Christian.

Helena came here in 316 and built the first church on Calvary and, at Bethlehem, 10 miles to the south, the first church over the grotto birthplace of Jesus.

For 300 years, Christian pilgrims came to Jerusalem and Christian communities thrived here. Then Persians raided and, a generation later, new converts of Mohammed seized the Holy City. Crusaders came in 1099. They rebuilt massively and, tho they were driven out after less than a century, their main structures survive on Calvary and in Bethlehem.

In the last century the Russian Czar encouraged the Orthodox church to enlarge its communities here and erect lovely onion-towered churches. Later Kaiser Wilhelm rode into Jerusalem on a white horse and helped German Lutherans build a church on Mount Zion and a hospital on the Mount of Olives.

The British captured Jerusalem in 1917, restoring Christian rule to the Holy Land after more than 700 years. The English Episcopal community flourished. Christian authority lasted only 30 years.

Today about 30 Christian communities have about 300 churches, chapels, monasteries, schools, hospitals and libraries in and around Jerusalem which are used by about 100,000 Christian residents of the Holy Land, almost all Arabs, and the ever-growing number of pilgrims.

The Roman Catholic community [Catholics are called Latins here], is the largest—about 54,000—as well as the richest and most active, with 400 priests and monks and 1,500 nuns of 45 orders. The Vatican, tho not yet recognizing Israel as a nation, has a permanent representative here.

The Orthodox church, second largest, was cut off from its main source of funds and clerics by the Russian revolution in 1917, and since 1948 has been divided, the Moscow hierarchy having authority over the community which fell into the new state of Israel and a New York-based exile hierarchy having authority over the community that found itself in Jordan. Since the Six-Day war, the Moscow and New York hierarchies both claim authority over the former Jordan community.

Rivalry among the Christian communities here has persisted for centuries, sometimes erupting into bitter feuds. Copts, Syrians, Chaldeans and Armenians, some claiming direct descent from the first Christians, vie with the later, larger groups for rights in holy places and conduct services in ancient languages that survive only in their liturgies. In Arab days, two Arab families acted as custodians for the church on Calvary.

Only the ecumenical spirit of the 1950s made possible the start of a thoro restoration of the cluttered, dilapidated partitioned, shored-up Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Not yet, however, may all Christian groups conduct services on Calvary or in the Bethlehem grotto.

The Israeli government operates a policy it calls "respecting the status quo," while supporting the principle that all faiths have a right to worship as they please. Israel frees from taxes all places of worship and welcomes groups wanting to establish places of worship, but does not encourage missionary efforts.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 26, 1971]

THE GREATEST INVASION OF ISRAEL TODAY

(By Alfred Borcover)

Eight months ago, before the cease-fire, you could feel the tension in Israel. Soldiers going to the Suez for active duty went with apprehension. Every hour on the hour, life stopped as Israelis turned to the nearest radio to listen to the news. Israel was in a precarious state.

Today the feeling is relaxed. Soldiers going to the Suez find it a time to relax and get some sun. No one is shooting. Life goes on at its usual fast pace, but with time to pause, gossip and enjoy a break for tea and cake. You can feel the difference, even tho there is no cease fire now. For the moment, peace prevails.

The only invasion imminent is from tourists. It is an invasion that Israel loves and welcomes because tourism is Israel's biggest and fastest growing industry. It is obvious, too, that visitors consider Israel a safe place to visit.

An Israeli put it best when he told an American:

"You have secure borders and insecure cities. We have insecure borders and secure cities."

And so the tourists flock to the State of Israel by the thousands. This year might see a half million tourists in the "Land of the Bible." They come not only from the United States but from Canada, Scandinavia, Britain, South America, everywhere. For here they find the roots of all civilizations.

It becomes apparent that visitors come not only to see Israel but to feel it. You sense the feeling, for instance, when you arrive at Lod [Lydda] Airport, 28 miles from Jerusalem and 14 miles from Tel Aviv. You sense it in the emotional reunions that take place in the terminal, and you can see it in the faces of your fellow passengers. It is a feeling that is difficult to define but it is there. Perhaps because Israel has stood, since its birth as a nation in 1948, as a David amid Goliaths. The blend of biblical past and courageous present, linked by 4,000 years of history, makes this land unique.

The spirit is evident everywhere, from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea and from the Sea of Galilee to the Red Sea. New towns and villages flourish. Rich farms and orchards bloom on transformed swamps and arid wasteland. Lush forests cover once-barren hillsides.

In contrast, Bedouins roam the desert and flock to the markets of Beersheba as they did when Abraham and his family trekked into this land more than 4,000 years ago.

Faces tell the story of Israel, too. There are the Western and Eastern European Jews who survived the Nazi reign of terror, North Africans from Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia; Oriental Jews from Yemen, Iraq, Kurdistan, Iran, Afghanistan, and the Cochins from southern India. There are Moslems who never left the Holy Land and young Americans with a pioneer spirit, and, of course, the native born "Sabras," named after the fruit of a cactus that's hard and prickly on the outside, but sweet on the inside.

Today, 2.8 million Israelis, different in custom and dress and even language, but bound by a common faith, perform daily miracles in this land.

Altho the visitor can launch his tour anywhere, it is difficult to resist traveling your first 28 miles from Lod Airport to Jerusalem, the capital and second largest city after Tel Aviv.

Jerusalem's history is awesome. From its beginning the city has been coveted by Babylonians, Macedonians, Mongols, Turks, British and Jordanians, to name a few. Jerusalem means City of Peace, yet it has been fought over by all. It remains as sacred to Christians and Moslems as it is to Jews.

"Nothing about the serene air of Jerusalem today recalls its 33 centuries of turbulent history, including earthquakes, 19 military sieges, two total destructions by conquerors and many rebuildings," writes Jean Comay, in "Israel," an excellent guide book.

"The existence and stubborn survival of an important city at this spot at first seems to defy reason. It is far from the seacoast or any river basin, and off the great caravan routes of early times. Surrounded by bleak hills, it is difficult to reach and in past ages had scanty water sources—a single natural spring below the eastern wall, and underground cisterns hewn out of the rock to hold rain water. But its position on the great divide between the coastal plain and the Jordan Valley, and the heart of the highland of Judea and Samaria, has always made Jerusalem a strategic prize."

Until the Six-Day War in June, 1967, Jerusalem was a divided city, the new sector in Israel; the Old City in Jordan. Today it is reunited, all in Israel.

It is in the Old City where one finds the holiest of Jewish holy places—the Western Wall. It was known as the Wailing Wall after the Romans razed Herod's Temple, which was rebuilt on the site of Solomon's Temple and conquered the Jews. The Western Wall formed part of the retaining wall of the Temple, which was on the summit of Mount Moriah. The wall's nearness to the destroyed sanctuary has made it so hallowed.

The wall and gates of the Old City date to the 16th century. Within the walls are the Moslem, Christian, Armenian and Jewish quarters and numerous sacret shrines. The Church of the Holy Sepulcher, the most sacred shrine in Christendom, stands on the site of Calvary, where Jesus was crucified, interred and resurrected. The Via Dolorosa, with its 14 Stations, follows the route of Jesus from Antonia Fortress, where He was condemned, to where He was crucified. On Mount Moriah, where Moslems call Harmaesh-Sharif, are Dome of the Rock and El Aksa Mosque, which make this Islam's holiest shrine after Mecca and Medina.

The traditional sites in the Old City are a must but it is important to see the Old City as it is now, with its bazaars and colorful assortment of people jostling thru the narrow streets.

Near what was once a no-man's land separating the old and the new is Mount Zion; here rests the tomb of King David, who conquered Jerusalem 3,000 years ago and made it his capital and a religious center.

On the upper floor of the building with David's tomb is the Coenaculum, traditional site of the Last Supper. The Gothic-Crusader style hall also has served as a mosque. It has a niche and inscriptions from the Koran. Such are the intertwining of different times and faiths in the Holy Land.

Perhaps the easiest way to put Jerusalem and Israel in an understandable perspective is to visit the Israel Museum. The museum, a sprawling series of pavilions on a 22-acre rocky hill dotted with olive trees, houses archeological treasures, art and Jewish ceremonial objects from thruout the Diaspora, modern sculpture and the priceless Dead Sea Scrolls. It actually is four museums in one—the Bezalel Museum of Fine Arts, the Samuel Bronfman Biblical and Archeological Museum, the Billy Rose Sculpture Garden, and the Shrine of the Book. It is the one place that tells fully the story of Israels turbulent past.

Altho there is so much to see in Israel, it is difficult to leave Jerusalem and its wealth of sights—the Sanhedrin tombs; the Holy Land Hotel Museum with its large scale model of Jerusalem in ancient days; the Mea Shearim, quarter of the extreme Orthodox European Jews who live, pray and dress as their ancestors did for centuries and await the Messiah; Central Jerusalem itself with its shops, restaurants and cafes; Hebrew University with its new campus and old campus on Mount Scopus; the Knesset [Parliament]; the Hadassah Hospital with its small synagog famous for its stained windows by Marc Chagall; and Mount Herzl, burial place of Dr. Theodore Herzl who predicted and worked for the birth of Israel in 1896, and Yad Vashem, a stark and moving monument to the six million Jews who died at the hand of the Nazis in World War II.

It was the Jewish Sages who said:

"Ten parts of beauty were allotted the world at large and of these Jerusalem assumed nine measures and the rest of the world but one . . . ten parts of suffering were visited upon the world—nine for Jerusalem and one for the world."

Since that fateful Six-Day war, visitors can venture north, south and east of Jerusalem to Bethlehem, birthplace of Jesus; Hebron, along the road followed by Abraham, Joseph and King David; and Jericho, which bills itself as the oldest city in the world. This occupied area on the west bank of the Jordan River is known as Judea and Samaria.

In sharp contrast to Jerusalem is Tel Aviv, Israel's Fun City. Tel Aviv is young [founded in 1909], brash, lively, prosperous and modern. With 385,000 residents, it has a seventh of Israel's population, Jerusalem is the governmental and spiritual center; Tel Aviv is the hub of culture, commerce and entertainment. It also is cosmopolitan. Walk along tree-shaded Dizengoff Street and you'll hear chatter in French, English, Arabic, Hebrew, Russian, German, Italian, Polish and Yiddish. And you not only can sample peeta, felafel, tahina, humus, shashlik and kababs, but chopped liver, roast duck, stroganoff, egg roll and pizza.

Next door to Tel Aviv is Jaffa, the ancient port from which Jonah sailed and encountered the whale. The old Arab district near the harbor has been transformed into an attractive artists' quarter.

Twenty miles south of Tel Aviv is Ashdod, which typifies Israel's modern development. In the time of the Philistines, it was one of five important cultural and religious centers. But thru the ages Ashdod disappeared. Fifteen years ago Israel decided it needed a new deep water port to help develop the southern half of the country and in 1957 Ashdod was reborn; today it is a modern city of 32,000.

To the north of Tel Aviv-Jaffa along the Mediterranean extends the coastal road to Haifa thru the lush Sharon Plain and beyond thru the Zebulum Valley to Acre and the Lebanese border. Along the way are Herzlia, a resort town; Natanya, a citrus and diamond center as well as resort; and Caesarea, a resort area with Israel's only 18-hole golf course and ancient ruins that include a Roman amphitheater used for the Israel Festival.

Forty miles north of Caesarea, on Mount Carmel, is Haifa, Israel's third largest city and its main seaport. From atop Mount Carmel the cream-colored city unfolds in three tiers toward the sea, broken only by tall green pines and cypress, red-tiled roofs and the golden dome of the Baha'i Temple. [Haifa is world headquarters for the Baha'i faith, which also has a temple in Wilmette.]

From Paris Square near the harbor, the Carmelit, Israel's only subway, can lift you to the heights of Mount Carmel in 10 minutes. Among the city's other landmarks are the cave of Elijah the Prophet, Technion Institute and the Carmelite Monastery.

Across the bay from Haifa is Acre, an ancient Crusader city that has changed little thru the centuries. The citadel, the Jazzar Pash and Sand Mosques, the crypt of St. John, the harbor and oriental market are part of the old color in Acre.

Both Acre and Haifa are good jumping-off points for the Galilee, Israel's lush breadbasket in the north. It is a land of ancient and modern miracles. It was in the Galilee that Jesus grew up and preached and healed the sick. Today the Galilee bears the fruits of modern miracles engineered by the hands of settlers who have turned swamps and rocky, unproductive land into fertile farms and orchards.

The Galilee, which extends from Haifa north to the Lebanese border and east to the Jordan River, adjoins the Golan Heights, captured from Syria during the Six-Day War.

A favorite stopping place on a Galilee tour is Ayelet Hashahar, a pioneering kibbutz in the Upper Galilee at the southern edge of the Huleh Valley. The kibbutz, founded in 1915 by young Russian settlers, is among 15 that have guest accommodations.

South of the kibbutz and overlooking the Sea of Galilee is Israel's only dude ranch. It is operated by Yahuda Avni, a former Chicagoan who also has a penchant for growing roses. Thus Vered Hagalil [Rose of Galilee] dude ranch which consists of a restaurant, stable and several cottages.

Close by are such biblical places as Capernaum, Mount of Beatitudes, Tabgha and Tiberias. Tiberias is a winter resort, famous for its hot mineral springs. On the opposite shore from Tiberias is Ein Gev, a kibbutz with a delightful outdoor restaurant where you can lunch on freshly caught fish of St. Peter. At the southern end of the Galilee is Degania, Israel's first kibbutz, founded in 1909.

En route back to Tel Aviv you can visit Cana, an Arab village, where Jesus is said to have performed His first miracle, and Nazareth, the largest Arab center in Israel. Nazareth's Basilica of the Annunciation stands on one of the most sacred sites mentioned in the New Testament, the place where the Archangel Gabriel announced to Mary the birth of a son, Jesus.

Beyond Nazareth to the southwest is the Emek Jezreel, the biggest and lushest of Israel's valleys.

Beersheba and Jerusalem are departure points to tour the Dead Sea area and such places as Dimona, Sodom, Ein Bokek, Arad, and, of course, Masada. A new highway opening this month links Jerusalem and Masada, the most dramatic of Israel's ruins.

Masada is a 20-acre, boatshaped plateau 1,400 feet above the Dead Sea and the Judean wilderness. Herod built and fortified this incredible mountain retreat 2,000 years ago. It was in 73 A.D. that 960 Jewish Zealots, after three years of seige by the Romans, elected to take their own lives rather than become Roman slaves.

Today visitors can climb the Roman seige ramp to the top or even climb the tortuous Snake Path. Or you can reach the top the easy way—via a newly installed cable car.

As one Israeli put it: "If you want to see Masada you take the cable car. If you want to feel Masada, you walk."

Masada is hallowed ground in Israel. It is on the heights of Masada that most soldiers in Israel's defense force receive their personal rifle and Bible and swear their oath of allegiance:

"Masada shall not fall again."

Perhaps this is the source of the spirit that you feel in Israel today.

MEET A REMARKABLE ARAB WOMAN WHO HAS MADE HER MARK IN ISRAEL

(By Eleanor Page)

NAZARETH, ISRAEL.—A woman is prime minister of Israel. A woman is president of the International Council of Building Materials and built one of the country's big bridges. A woman conducts two orchestras

and a chorus. One is an authority on metals, another on pollution. Eight are members of the Knesset [parliament].

And another—Inham Zuabi—is the only woman member of the labor council in Nazareth, president of the woman's club, a member of the broadcasting authority, active in social organizations and busy election campaigner for her husband, who is the deputy chairman of the Knesset and former mayor of Nazareth.

What is remarkable about Inham Zubai is that she is an Arab, the perennial delegate of Arab women to conclaves in Israel and in the world outside as well.

Altho it was an important feast day when a group of American newspaper women arrived in Nazareth, Mrs. Zubai took a couple of hours from her family feast to tell us what it's like to be in the Arab-Moslem minority in Israel.

"Compared to women elsewhere in the Middle East, we have many blessings. Despite obstacles, we have made important achievements in the 23 years since Israel became a state. Israeli law helps us, tho it was not designed especially for Arab women.

"We benefit and enjoy the fact that women are legally equal, tho we must use tact, we must be wise. Man wants his supremacy at home!"

Mrs. Zuabi doesn't want progress to spoil the structure of the Arab family. Even her "tenth aunt" is considered a close relative, and a family can mean 500 persons. One of her brothers was minister of economics in Jordan, another was minister of information in Syria.

Part of the Arab woman's wisdom in adapting to the new laws has been taking her independence by stages. The men were not too unhappy to accept monogamy—"after all, several wives are more expensive to maintain"—and the law against polygamy gave the women more peace at home and a better chance to secure their own happiness and future. A boon, too, is the law which put the age of marriage at 17 "so fathers can't force their daughters to marry at 14."

The mother of six, Mrs. Zuabi said younger couples are planning families of only two or perhaps four children. Babies born in hospitals have zoomed from 4 per cent to 84 per cent among the non-Jewish tribes, including the "shy Bedouin who never even went to a doctor." Thanks to compulsory education for girls, 80 per cent are now in schools as opposed to 15 per cent 20 years ago. The Pioneer Women received praise for operating centers which teach reading, writing, and other subjects such as dressmaking and personality improvement.

Arabs outside Israel don't know the facts about Jews, which is why they hate them, said Mrs. Zuabi. "Our experience [Arabs living in Israel] shows coexistence is possible." She wants young Arab and Jewish men to build, not to fight and die, and "to exchange technical experts, and use them for life and prosperity." She also feels that women would be more effective in international relations.

"Look at it from a motherly point of view," she urged. "There would be more understanding and less fighting if women represented their countries."

KIBBUTZ SHORTAGES: WATER, BACHELORS

(By Michael McGuire)

SEDE BOQER.—Elishah Zurgil and his kibbutz hands have no doubt they grow the finest peaches and chickens in Israel—and perhaps, they say, the world. But the widespread fame of their kibbutz named Sede Boqer has nothing to do with fruit or fowl. "We don't mind in the least," said the young farm manager. "Our primary attraction is a great old man. He's mad about our children, takes part in all our weddings and circumcision ceremonies and spends an hour with all of us at dinner every Friday."

David Ben-Gurion selected Sede Boqer in the heart of the vast Negev desert south of Beersheba to homestead in his retirement years after a life-long struggle towards establishing a homeland for the Jews. "But he keeps so terribly busy," said Zurgil, a freckle-faced 25-year-old who puts one in mind of a grown-up Tom Sawyer—Israeli style.

"He keeps busy 14 hours a day writing his memoirs," Zurgil said. "He gets visitors from all over the world and letters come here by the hundreds. Every day he takes a walk around the kibbutz and into the edge of the desert. Sometimes he walks twice a day. It keeps him happy and alert.

"He's rugged and vigorous for a man of 84," Zurgil said. "There are times when I walk with him to discuss kibbutz matters. I often find myself out of breath because he walks so quickly."

The presence of the often-called Father of Israel and his passion for settling and reclaiming the desert has had little effect in raining special privileges from the government for the kibbutz. Ben-Gurion's presence likewise has had little effect in drawing much-needed labor volunteers or settlers.

"Our problems are getting workers and water, with the main problem getting enough water for irrigation," said Zurgil. "We have 200 acres here, but we've had to cut down to farming half of it because of lack of water," he said.

"We are the last kibbutz on the water line that brings the water 250 winding miles south from the Galilee. The pipe thru which the water flows is old and full of holes. It's an old oil pipe that dates back from the days before the kibbutz was founded in 1952. As soon as we patch up the dozen holes another dozen spring.

"We've tried to get the government to put in a new line, but it's a budget thing and our kibbutz is low on the priority list," Zurgil said. "So we've had to cut down on our farming and concentrate on raising chickens. They use water. We've got 70,000 here now.

"What we need next is more bachelors," he said. "There are only a few single men here now. The rest of the kibbutz is composed of married couples.

"If there were more bachelors, we could attract more women volunteers. A few years ago a girl would stay on a kibbutz for five years unmarried without being afraid of becoming an old maid. Now a girl seems terrified if she does not get married within one year. Fifteen or 20 young Israelis seemed more reluctant to join kibbutz life than in the past."

He said this could possibly result from the decline of fieldhand prestige in the face of Israel's industrial expansion.

"When Israel was growing and Jews settling the land, a kibbutznik was a much admired individual," said another Sede Boqer worker. "Today there is fear that technicians and engineers hold much higher prestige."

Ben-Gurion leaves the kibbutz now and then to go to Tel Aviv or Jerusalem where from time to time he is called upon to accept honors or bow before admiring members of Israel's Knesset, or parliament. But perhaps his most moving moments of all away from Sede Boqer come about when he goes by car to the rim of a silent and deep desert canyon just 3 miles south of the kibbutz. "There were three loves in his life," said a kibbutznik. "There is Israel and the Jewish people. Both are growing strong and enriched. But his heart lies with his third love on the edge of that arid canyon. When he goes there many of us are sad. It's the tomb of his wife, Paula, who died two years ago. Her influence will be with him until he joins her in his desert that he has never been able to forget."

VIRUS AND WATER QUALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 26, I inserted in the RECORD a statement of Charles C. Johnson, American Public Health Association, which listed categorically the variety of contaminants now present in our drinking water sources. In addition to the 500 new chemicals which enter our drinking water supply each year, there is growing concern with the problem of viral pollution. Because so little is known about the basic properties of virus, its effect upon our drinking water is insufficiently understood. There is, however, strong evidence that viruses which cause human infection and disease can be transmitted by water.

Mr. Speaker, the detection and treatment of viruses in our drinking water sources is yet another area which demands the full attention of our research capabilities. My purpose here is not to shock, but rather to bring to the attention of my colleagues the overwhelming weight of testimony which demands a greatly increased effort.

At the 13th Water Quality Conference in Urbana, Ill., on February 16, 1971, 13 scientific papers on the subject, "Virus and Water Quality: Occurrence and Control," were submitted and discussed. It was agreed in the general discussion of these papers that, because the basic properties of virus are poorly understood, their transmission by the water route has not been fully appreciated and that scientific evidence presented supports the thesis that viruses can be transmitted by water and result in human infection and disease. In addition, the speakers unanimously agreed that there is insufficient technical data now at hand to document conclusively that virus-free water can be attained with our present waste-water treatment and domestic water supply treatment processes and practices.

I include, for the information of my colleagues, a summary of these scientific papers:

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

For at least 4000 years man has recognized the need to treat water in order to assure its safety. For instance, in his book, *The Quest for Pure Water*, Baker (33) provides a quote from a Sanskrit source, 2000 B.C.: ". . . it is directed to heat foul water by boiling and exposing to sunlight and by dipping seven times into it a piece of hot copper, then to filter and cool in an earthen vessel. The direction is given by the god who is the incarnation of medical science."

In latter years, in an essay entitled "On Airs, Waters and Places," (see Ref. 1) Hippocrates advised that the source of supply should be considered in detail both with respect to quality and quantity: ". . . when one comes into a city to which he is a stranger . . . one should consider most attentively the water which the inhabitants use, whether they be marshy and soft, or

hard and running from elevated and rocky situations, and then if saltish and unfit for cooking; and one should consider the ground, whether it be naked and deficient in water or wooded and well watered . . ."

We now know that intelligent management of the natural aquatic environment and our municipal water supply and wastewater treatment and collection sub-systems requires an understanding of the basic properties, modes of transmission, persistence, and effects of pollutants. Basic knowledge is necessary if we are to assess the dangers associated with each contaminant as a prelude to the development and application of treatment and control procedures. It is particularly appropriate and timely in the era of environmental quality, that this Conference—Virus and Water Quality: Occurrence and Control—should focus on a group of pollutants which are as little understood in a scientific sense as they are minute in size, while at the same time being as ubiquitous in our natural environment as they are potentially catastrophic should they penetrate either natural or man-made defense mechanisms. Thus, this Conference provides an opportunity to define the current state-of-the-art and to identify vital areas of necessary research and development. To accomplish this dual purpose, papers were presented which, in addition to establishing an historical perspective, cover the following specific subject areas:

Properties of Virus Particles;
Detection;
Occurrence and Survival;
Viral Disease and Epidemiology; and
Removal by Water and Waste Treatment Processes.

Berg (26), who presented one of the six papers devoted to control mechanisms, provided the most succinct statement defining the current state-of-the-art:

"There is clearly more to do than has already been done."

Therefore, it makes little difference whether we approach the virus question from the standpoint of pollution control, which seeks to minimize the effects of man's activities upon our water resources, or from a health viewpoint which seeks to control the influence of water quality upon man's health and well-being. We have our work cut out for us if we are to provide appropriate water quality in our lakes and streams in support of recreational pursuits and food production, as well as to assure adequate quantities of safe drinking water to a growing population of over 200 million Americans.

BASIC PROPERTIES OF VIRUS

Metcalf (1) and Melnick (2) presented an excellent account of the biologic parameters concerning viruses in relation to their transmission by the water route. The salient features of these viruses are unique when compared with other biologic pollutants, and may be summarized as follows:

1. Strict parasitism in living cells and no replication or increase in the number in the aquatic environment.

2. Greater ability to survive in water and through water treatment processes than most vegetative bacterial pollutants.

3. Very few virus particles are required to initiate an infection in a susceptible host regardless of the route of transmission, e.g., water or water fauna such as shellfish.

4. Clinical illness is observed in only a small fraction of those who become infected, e.g., the ratio of one clinical case to 10–1000 sub-clinical infections, varying according to the species of virus.

5. One strain of virus may produce illnesses with widely variable incubation periods and clinical manifestations, e.g., a coxsackie virus may produce meningitis in one person, myocarditis in another, and diarrhea in a third, etc.

6. The basic component of viruses is nucleoprotein. A recent report (15) indicates that a supposedly dead virus can still be biologically active, e.g., UV or gamma-ray "killed" viruses may be oncogenic in animals.

Based on the features of viruses just described, there is little doubt that viral contaminants will continue to pose a public health hazard through polluted water. As a result of the population explosion and our increased per capita requirement for fresh water, an increasing strain is being made upon our already limited water resources. Direct reuse of water may become inevitable and of widespread practice in the future.

OCCURRENCE AND SURVIVAL OF VIRUS

Akin (16) in his presentation has reviewed this subject most effectively. Several points have been made quite clear from his report:

1. Human enteric viruses have been found in water throughout the world wherever we have looked, e.g., viruses have been isolated from an average of 36 per cent of the surface water samples examined; ample evidence was presented to indicate that ground waters can also transmit virus (17); Metcalf and Stile (18) found that 27–52 per cent of estuarine water samples contained viruses; McLean (19) showed that swimming pools were also polluted with viruses; to name just a few.

2. There is sufficient evidence to indicate that the several viruses tested were able to survive over long periods of time in the aquatic environment, i.e., 2–100 days at 20°–25° C. are required for these viruses to lose 99.9% of their original infectivity (20). Numerous other viruses have never been examined, thus their fate in the environment is unknown and there is no way of being able to predict it.

3. It is evident that little study has been made of the number of environmental factors that may affect the survival of viruses in water. Some work has been done on the evaluation of the effect of temperature. It is generally agreed that the higher the temperature, the shorter the time the virus survives in water. The purity of the water appears to play some role in their survival time, but this phenomenon is poorly understood. The influence of the numerous other factors is at present unknown. The numbers and combinations of these factors in nature are undoubtedly as numerous as the glittering gems of a morning dew. It is by no means an overstatement, therefore, when we say that we are far from being able to predict the fate of viruses in natural waters.

Sobsey and Cooper (21) reported the results of their studies on the survival of poliovirus in algal-bacterial wastewater treatment systems. Their data has certainly confirmed our lack of knowledge in the area of viral survival in the aquatic environment. Their work is not only of academic interest, but also of practical importance in guiding our thinking in designing future waste treatment and control facilities.

THE COLIFORM TEST

In their presentation, Geldreich and Clarke (24) have reviewed the adequacy of the current coliform test as an indication for the viral safety of water. The coliform bacterial methods have been used for nearly 70 years in the sanitary field. The use of a bacterial indicator system for monitoring virus in water is indeed a very complex problem, and many facets must be considered. These are:

1. The initial ratio of the coliform organism and enteric virus in feces, raw sewage, and water.

2. The relative survival time of bacteria and virus in the aquatic environment.

3. The relative resistance of bacteria and viruses to water and sewage treatment processes.

In raw sewage, there are on the average approximately 100,000 coliform bacteria compared to one virus. It is understandable that the great excess of coliform bacteria over viruses in water, and the ease of testing for coliform, make them a much more desirable indicator system for water contamination. The authors raised the point that if one assumes a water sample of 1000 liters is a realistic and reasonable size for viral testing, the volume required for the coliform test can also be increased accordingly, for example, let's say 20–400 liters per sample. Technically, the latter test can be accomplished easily for waters of finished drinking water quality by making use of the membrane filter technique.

It is their contention that water for potable use can be treated so as to be always free of biologic pollutants, including virus, by using the current treatment processes *provided they are adequately carried out.* Thus, where existing technology is applied, we should expect a minimal probability of viral infections. Unfortunately, adequate treatment is not being uniformly applied, as witnessed by the National Community Water Supply Study (25).

Geldreich and Clarke also agree with most experts in the field that the most critical safeguard against viral pollutants being found in treated water remains the application of a suitable disinfectant. In view of the new evidence presented at this Conference, they have recommended that additional study be made to further ascertain the relationship and dependability of the coliform test as an indicator of viral pollution.

REMOVAL OF VIRUS IN WATER AND WASTE TREATMENT PROCESSES

Obviously, the most crucial task in the area of water virology is the problem of removing these pollutants from wastewater prior to discharge into the aquatic environment and from drinking water prior to use in the home or by industry. The objective must be to find the vulnerable link and apply unit processes which, singularly and in combination, provide the highest possible removal efficiency and dependability.

Here we ask ourselves a hypothetical question: "Can available methods be completely relied upon to do the job?" Six speakers have presented papers in this subject area. The information presented is overwhelming. If reliability is defined as 100 percent removal even accepting the inadequacies in existing collection, identification, and enumeration procedures, the answer is "No, current methods cannot be relied upon."

Berg (26) has reviewed our current knowledge in virus removal from sewage and water by means of activated sludge, trickling filter, oxidation pond, coagulation, and sand filtration. Conventional treatment processes provide variable virus removal efficiencies ranging from 25 to 99 percent. Most of the experts at this Conference are in agreement that disinfection is the crucial process to eliminate or destroy viruses in water of any source. I would like to stress here that disinfection is an ancient art. Even chlorine was used as early as 1850 in England with the primary intent of deordorizing offensive sewage. It has been used in this country for the disinfection of water for over a half century. One might ask the embarrassing question: "Shouldn't we have been investigating the disinfection process more adequately, so as to have come up with a more effective system during this period of time?"

Berg (26) and Sproul (27) have reported that in the past two decades nearly all treatment processes have been evaluated for their efficacy in viral removal. Unfortunately, only a few representative viruses were used as working models in these studies.

In the most recent and detailed studies of 20 strains of human enteric viruses. Liu, *et al* (28) report that a wide range of resistance for viruses toward chlorine has been demon-

strated in the laboratory. The difference is indeed impressive, i.e., from 4 minutes to 40 minutes are required to kill 99.9% of different types of viruses even under exceptionally ideal conditions. A great deal, however, is still unknown concerning the performance of chlorination, as well as other processes, in the field. Several areas are in need of further documentation as to field efficacies and may be summarized as follows:

1. The number of viruses studied in the past has been insufficient to constitute a fair sampling. The response of those viruses not tested is unpredictable at this time, especially in regard to the hepatitis virus which, to date, cannot be handled experimentally, Thus, it is paramount that all known enteric viruses be investigated for their responses to treatment processes.

2. Most past studies were conducted in the laboratory with the exception of a few which were conducted on a pilot scale. It is inapt to extrapolate the results of these studies directly to field application. Therefore, pilot plant, as well as actual treatment plant studies, remain to be accomplished.

3. The viruses used in these previous investigations were all laboratory strains with the exception of the hepatitis virus (29). These viruses in many respects are known to be different from those occurring in the natural environment. Studies involving these "natural" viruses have not been carried out to determine what differences, if any, exist in their response to the various treatment processes.

4. Many environmental factors and their possible combinations have not been thoroughly explored and defined. Studies to determine the optimal conditions for each treatment process as regards the removal of viral pollutants remain to be carried out.

Thus, it is clear that considerable work remains to be accomplished in order to conclusively demonstrate the effect of each process on the removal or destruction of the whole spectrum of enteric viruses. At the moment, we are by no means sure that these processes are capable of achieving the desired objective. In addition, we are unsure as to the margin of safety provided by any combination on these processes.

New methods and improved procedures have been described by Cliver (30), Kruse (31), and others. Dr. Kruse's discussion on disinfection of water and wastewater was not only very informative, but of practical importance. It is generally agreed, and rightly so, that in the eradication of enteric virus diseases, the environmental approach would be more expenditious as well as economical, than would the biomedical approach, e.g., new vaccines, chemotherapeutic agents, etc. Given the *adequate* pretreatment referred to by Berg (26) and Geldreich and Clarke (24), this problem could well be expeditiously solved at a cost of 20 cents per person, $40,000,000) annually in this country (32). This would allow for sufficient chlorine to be used so as to disinfect all community water supply systems. Although this rather simplified solution remains to be epidemiologically documented by field studies, it does, however, definitely support the merit of using the environmental approach. As the old saying goes, the most efficient way to control an infectious disease is to break the weakest link in the chain of events.

REFERENCES

1. Melnick, J. L. Detection of virus spread by the water route. Proc. 13th Water Quality Conference (1971) p. ———.

2. Metcalf, T. G. Biologic parameters in water transmission of viruses. Ibid (1971) p. ———.

3. Zollner, N. and Lydtin, H. Increased incidence of abnormal cardiac findings in coxsackie infection of adults. Deutsch. Med. Wschr. *45* (1967) p. 2049–2055.

4. Monif, G. R. G., Lee, C. W. and Hsiung, G. D. Isolated myocarditis with recovery of echo type 9 virus from the myocardium. New Eng. J. Med. *277* (1967) p. 1353–1355.

5. Burch, G. E., Sun, S. C., Chu, K. C., Sohal, R. S., and Colcolough, H. L. Interstitial and coxsackie virus. B. Myocarditis in infants and children. J.A.M.A. *203* (1968) p. 55–62.

6. Brown, G. C. and Evans, T. N. Serologic evidence of coxsackie-virus etiology of congenital heart disease. J.A.M.A. *199* (1968) p. 151–155.

7. Gamble, D. R., Kingsley, M. L., Fitzgerald, M. G., Bolton, R. and Taylor, K. W. Viral antibodies in diabetes mellitus. B.M.J. *5671* (1969) p. 637–.

8. Carter, C. O. Section of epidemiology and preventive medicine: Congenital defects. Proc. Royal Soc. Med. *61* (1968) p. 991–1000.

9. Ray, G. C., Tucker, V. L., Harris, D. J., Cuppage, F. E., and Chin, T. D. Y. Enteroviruses associated with the hemolytic-uremic syndrome. Pediatrics *46* (1970) p. 378–388.

10. Mosley, J. M. Viral contamination of water: Epidemiologic evidence concerning its occurrence. Proc. 13th Water Quality Conference (1971) p. ———.

11. Rutledge, P., Skinner, H. G., and Jorris, E. D. Reports on three outbreaks. (b) Washington Island, Wisconsin. Hepatitis Surveillance (NCDC) Report No. 29 (1968) p. 16–18.

12. Morse, L. J., Gurwitz, A., Reilly, E. E., Jr., and Fiumara, N. Infectious hepatitis outbreak; College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass. Morbidity and Mortality *18* (1969), p. 357–358.

13. Harrel, J. A., Jr., Carpenter, R. L. and Austin, C. A. Infectious hepatitis—Hatfield, Arkansas. Ibid *19* (1970) p. 281–282.

14. Taylor, F., Eagen, J. H., Smith, H. F. D., Jr. and Coene, R. F. The case for waterborne infectious hepatitis. Amer. J. Publ. Hlth. *56* (1966) p. 2093–2105.

15. Defendi, V. and Jensen, F. Oncogenicity by DNA tumor viruses: enhancement after UV and cobalt-60 radiations. Science *157* (1967) p. 703–705.

16. Akin, E. W. Enteric viruses in ground and surface waters: A review of their occurrence and survival. Proc. 13th Water Quality Conference (1971) p. ———.

17. Coin, L., Menetrier, M.L., Lobonde, J., and Hannoun, M.C. 'Modern microbiological and virological aspects of water pollution' in Advanced Water Pollution Research, Proceedings 2nd International Conference, O. Jaag and J. K. Boors, eds. Oxford, Pergamon (1965).

18. Metcalf, T. G. and Stiles, W. C. Viral pollution of shellfish in estuary waters. J. Santitary Eng. Div. ASCE *94* (1968) p. 595.

19. McLean, D. M. Infection hazards in swimming pools. Pediatrics *22* (1963) p. 811–818.

20. Clarke, N. A., Berg, G., Kabler, P. W. and Chang, S. L. Human enteric viruses in water: source, survival and removability. International Conference on Water Pollution Research, London, 1962, N.Y., Pergamon.

21. Sobsey, M. D. and Cooper, R. C. Laboratory studies on the survival of poliovirus in algal-bacterial waste-water treatment systems. Proc. 13th Water Quality Conference (1971) p. ———.

22. Hill, W. F. Detection of viruses in water: A review of methods and application. Ibid (1971) p. ———.

23. Wallas, C. Development of an apparatus for concentration of viruses from large volumes of water. Ibid (1971) p. ———.

24. Geldreich, E. E. and Clarke, N. A. The coliform test: A criterion for the 'viral safety' of water. Ibid (1971) p. ———.

25. McCabe, L. J., Symons, J. M., Lee, R. D., and Robeck, G. G. Survey of Community Water Supply Systems. J.A.W.W.A. *62* (1970) p. 670–687.

26. Berg, G. Removal of virus by water and waste treatment processes. Ibid (1971) p. ———.

[Last reference.]

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

In 1889 Jane Addams brought Hull House, a large brick house in a poor neighborhood in Chicago, and began helping the poor. At this first settlement house in America the poor found food, medical care, warm friendliness, and classes in many subjects.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my distinguished colleagues, Congressmen FORD, ERLENBORN, DELLENBACK, and POFF, I am introducing on behalf of the administration a far-reaching proposal to establish a private legal services corporation.

From its inception in the Economic Opportunity Act, OEO was designed as the incubator of new programs, where ideas could be developed and programs could mature and grow. It was the intent of Congress that once a program was fully developed, it would be transferred to an ongoing agency where it would take its place with other programs. Today, through the introduction of this bill, this concept is being taken even a step further. Because of the success of the legal services program and because of its uniqueness, rather than transferring the authority to another Federal agency, we are seeking through this legislative proposal to establish an independent private corporation which, we feel, will be free from the political pressures we often find in old-line agencies.

The Legal Services Corporation is similar in design to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which is an independent, nonprofit corporation and not an agency or establishment of the U.S. Government. The Legal Services Corporation will also have a board of directors selected in the same manner as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, in that the board members will be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Because the design for public broadcasting has proven to be effective and free to a great extent from political pressures, we are confident that the same will be true with this new corporation.

Since legal services is a necessary and effective means for poor people to gain their rights working through the system, we feel that the proposed corporation's structure will substantially improve our ability to provide such programs. I recognize that during the developmental years, OEO's legal services program was not without problems as it was exposed to pressures from all levels of government. Many of the provisions in the bill we are

introducing today seek to correct those problems through some of the following features:

There is a politically independent structure.

There is no gubernatorial veto.

There is an 11-member bipartisan board of directors, a majority of whom must be lawyers.

A board member can only be removed by a bipartisan vote of seven board members and only for malfeasance, persistent neglect, or inability to perform duties.

The corporation shall have an advisory council appointed by the board which will include client population and representatives of the organized bar.

It is authorized for 3 years.

The corporation will have the power to make grants to or contracts with individuals, corporations, or other entities to provide legal assistance.

It will have the power to represent the collective interests of the poor before Federal agencies to resolve broad issues, thereby avoiding multiple litigation on some issues.

It will have the power to undertake research, training, and technical assistance and serve as a clearinghouse for information.

It will establish a graduated schedule of fees which would require only those clients who are financially able to pay a small portion of the cost of services.

The corporation will insure preservation of the attorney-client relationship and protect the integrity of the adversary process, guaranteeing independence for project attorneys to bring class actions or sue any agency or level of government.

In order to continue to concentrate the resources of the program on those areas of pressing legal need, project attorneys will be limited to handling civil cases as those practicing in the existing legal services program now do. Also, to guarantee that an individual attorney's time is not dissipated, all full-time project attorneys will be required to devote all of their professional activities to the legal service program in which they are employed.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal is the result of considerable study during the past year by OEO's National Advisory Legal Services Committee. This prestigious body studied the problem and their recommendations became the basis for this proposed legislation. Following is a list of the people on the committee:

LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Prof. Bamberger, Dean, Calif. Univ. Law School; Gary Bellow, Univ. of Southern Calif.; Mrs. Jean Cahn; Edward Carr, Director, NYC Legal Aid Society; Attorney General John Mitchell; Mary Ellen Hamilton, President, Nat'l Clients Council; John Cuminiskey; Jacob Fuchsberg; William Gossett, Esq; Prof. Horowitz, UCLA; Judge Edward Bell, President, Nat'l Bar Asso.; William Mahoney, Esq; James Lorenz, Jr., California Rural Legal Assistance; Thomal Gilhool; F. Wlm. McCalpin; Judge Theodore McMillen, Board Chairman, Human Development Corp., St. Louis; Judge Philip Newman, Municipal Court, Los Angeles; Revius Ortigue, Jr., Esq; John D. Robb, ABA; Jerome Sheftack, Esq; Maynard Poll; Theodore Voorhees; Miss Elizabeth Wickenden; Bernard Segal, ABA; Oliver Lofton, President, Priorities Investment Corp.; Earl Johnson, Jr., Univ. of Calif. Law School; Edward Right, President, ABA; John Douglas, President, NLDA; James Cobb, President-Elect, National Bar Asso.; Leon Jaworski, President-Elect, ABA; Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary, HEW; and Donald Lowitz, General Counsel, OEO.

On March 24, Mr. Barnard Segal, speaking as chairman of the executive committee, wrote the following letter and transmitted the National Advisory Committee's recommendation on the proposed transfer:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1971.

Hon. EGIL KROGH, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KROGH: I am sending this letter and enclosure to you in my capacity as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Advisory Committee on the Office of Economic Opportunity Legal Services Program.

As you know, the National Advisory Committee met in Washington on March 18 to consider various questions in connection with the proposed transfer to some other agency, of the Legal Services Program being currently administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Since recommendations on proposed legislation were under consideration, the Office of Economic Opportunity officials decided that the Acting-Director of Legal Services, who ordinarily presides at meetings of the National Advisory Committee, should not do so in this instance and that I should preside instead. No official or agent of the Office of Economic Opportunity was present during our deliberations.

I should like to make clear that the Committee's opinion concerning the best vehicle for the Legal Services Program if it is to be moved out of the Office of Economic Opportunity is not to be regarded as an expression on the wisdom of not retaining Legal Services in the Office of Economic Opportunity; the Committee did not address itself to this subject.

The enclosed memorandum reflects the recommendations, and in some cases, the underlying reasoning and philosophy, of the Committee. I am sure you will realize that because of limitations of time, and particularly the fact that the Committee had no specific legislative proposal or expression of viewpoint or preference of the Administration before it, the Committee did not discuss or vote upon every possible issue involved in the transfer. I hope, however, that the views of the Committee on the important issues which it debated and upon which it reached a consensus as expressed in the enclosed memorandum will prove of assistance in the drafting of the Administration's program. If, on the other hand, there is a desire to obtain the Committee's views on the Administration's program when formulated, we would, of course, have the National Advisory Committee convened as promptly as possible.

I should add that members of the Committee who represent government agencies or agencies funded by the government did not participate in the voting.

On behalf of the National Advisory Committee and myself personally, I express appreciation to you and your associates for having sought the Committee's views and for having afforded us this opportunity to share them with you on a matter of such great concern to the nation and especially to our poverty citizens.

Sincerely,

BERNARD G. SEGAL.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROPOSED TRANSFER OF OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

MARCH 24, 1971.

Before discussing the Committee's specific views concerning legislation providing a new home for the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, we shall consider the general principles which underlie the present Program and must form the basis for any new legislation.

The Legal Services Program is rooted in the concept of equal justice under law which is the cornerstone of our democratic society. In terms of the rendering of legal services, this means that the economically disadvantaged must have the same access to lawyers and legal institutions as their more affluent brothers. Lawyers hold the key to the court system and the enforcement of substantive rights. Such enforcement depends upon the availabilty of and equal access to the institutions which determine the rights of the individual in our society. Translated into practical terms, the goal of the Legal Services Program must continue to be making counsel available to those unable to afford legal representation, to the same extent that such representation is available to those financially able to employ their own counsel.

The Legal Services Program must continue to render high quality services in accordance with the professional standards and ethics embodied in the Code of Professional Responsibility of the American Bar Association. As a practical matter, this means that the Program must be set up and operated by lawyers at all levels of administration. New legislation must also assure a climate for attracting and retaining able lawyers. The competence of the advocates available to the poor has perhaps been one of the outstanding characteristics of the Program since its inception.

The integrity of the lawyer-client relationship must be preserved free of interference by outside sources. Particularly, this means freedom from political pressure and conflicting governmental policies which derogate from the lawyer's duty of absolute fidelity to his client. This can probably best be attained by establishing a structure independent of any federal, state, or local governmental department or agency.

The Legal Services Program must be structured so as to assure the continued support of the organized Bar and the legal education community whose assistance has been vital to the success of the Program up to now. Of paramount importance is the need for continued confidence in the Program by the clients its lawyers serve.

Removal of the Legal Services Program to an agency outside of any existing governmental department or agency should not obscure the fact that the federal government must continue to shoulder the responsibility for the support and maintenance of the Legal Services Program.

Although it is hoped that the proposed new home should encourage financial support by the private sector, the needs of the program preclude any withdrawal or reduction of government funds and support. At most, any new financial support from the private sector should be incremental, since best estimates are that the Office of Economic Opportunity Legal Services Program, and all quasi-public and private groups providing legal services to the poor, are scarcely meeting one-fifth of the need. Indeed, an assured source of government funding in amounts substantially higher than at present is essential to the proper functioning and continued growth of the Legal Services Program.

Annual appropriations have worked a particular hardship on this professional program because of uncertainties of employment prospects for its lawyers and concern that funds may not permit the completion of cases undertaken by its lawyers. Funding by substantial endowment, of course, is the preferable method. If this is not feasible, biennial appropriations should be provided with adequate reserve funds to insure the completion of matters undertaken by the program's lawyers.

The Program should continue to have well-defined accountability to the Congress, its clients, the Bar, and the public.

Non-profit corporation chartered by Congress

After considering various alternatives regarding a future home for the Office of Economic Opportunity's Legal Services Program other than OEO itself, the National Advisory Committee concluded and recommends that the Program be transferred to a District of Columbia non-profit corporation chartered by the Congress. This type of structure would appear to provide the greatest degree of inpendendence from political control, influence, supervision, and direction whether on federal, state, or local levels. In recommending this vehicle, the Committee assumes that all existing functions and programs administered by the Legal Services Division of the Office of Economic Opportunity, as well as programs related to Legal Services administered by other offices of the Agency, will be included in the transfer.

The Committee also wishes to express deep concern regarding the following statement from the report of the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization: "The corporate form would be a step toward the eventual reprivatization of this program while recognizing the need for the continued financial support and protection of the government for a still fledgling activity." This statement implies that the government-supported non-profit corporation status may be a transitory stage after which the Program will revert to private sponsorship and support. It would be an unthinkable disregard of government's obligation to its poverty citizens to contemplate any such move. In recommending the corporate structure, the Committee views it as a permanent structure for the Legal Services Program and anticipates the continued support of the federal government.

The necessity for insulation of the Legal Services Program from political pressures cannot be over emphasized. In this regard, the Committee noted with approval the general provisions on this subject in the legislation creating the Public Broadcasting Corporation[1] and would recommend that similar provisions be included in the charter of the Corporation.

In stressing the political independence of the Corporation and its lawyers, the Committee does not wish to imply that the Corporation, its directors, officers, and grantees should be insulated from the demands of the public interest and accountability to the Congress, the profession, and the clients to be served. All steps must be taken to insure the continued responsibility and responsiveness of the Corporation.

Scope of charter

The National Advisory Committee urges that the legislation, which will really constitute the charter, be as broad as possible and that the widest discretion be left to the Board in establishing and implementing policies. In this regard, all presumptions should be resolved against inclusion of specific subjects and in favor of leaving such matters to the Board of Directors of the Corporation as in the case of the Public Broadcasting Corporation.

A general statement of corporate purposes and activities of the Corporation should include:

Maintenance of the highest quality of service and professional standards in the operation of the Corporation;

Adherence to the preservation of attorney-client relationships and avoidance of conflict of interest as prescribed by the ethical mandates of the legal profession;

Visibility of program activities which contribute to the reduction of societal tensions;

Necessity for program attorneys to conduct themselves as officers of the court and to observe the highest standard of compliance with the Code of Professional Responsibility;

Protection of the integrity of the adversary process from any impairment;

Effective accountability to the client population;

Broad participation of the legal profession including the organized Bar, legal education, and the Judiciary; and

Efforts to improve institutions of Justice to make them more effective and efficient.

Restrictions on attorneys with respect to types of cases, clients, and activities should not be included in the corporate charter. Proscriptions on political activities might be included in the charter providing that such limitations relate only to partisan political activities.

The National Advisory Committee, unanimously and unalterably, is opposed to any restrictions on so-called class actions, law reform activities, or appropriate legislative reform, including suits against governmental agencies.

Poverty guidelines or indigency standards should not be established with specificity in the charter. Experience with the Legal Services Program leads to the conclusion that this matter would more appropriately be left to the discretion of the Board of Directors. Variances in client eligibility guidelines between geographical areas, urban and rural communities, and cost of living reinforce this conclusion; the Board will be in the best position to establish such guidelines and appropriate procedures for implementation as changes and differences in these elements occur and exist.

The Committee would also recommend that operating guidelines for projects to be undertaken be considered a policy-making function within the discretion of the Board rather than inflexibly stated in the charter.

The National Advisory Committee concluded that provisions for removal of directors and officers should be prescribed by the corporate by-laws rather than the charter. It is strongly recommended that directors not be subject to removal by any government official or agency. Such removal procedure would pose a serious threat to the political independence of the Corporation.

Board of Directors

The National Advisory Committee, after lengthy consideration, recommends that the Corporation be governed by a Board of Directors, composed of twenty-three members selected in accordance with the following formula:

Seven ex-officio directors consisting of the President and President-Elect of the American Bar Association; President and President-Elect of the National Bar Association; President of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association; President of the Association of American Law Schools; and President of American Trial Lawyers Association;

Eight directors appointed by the President, a significant number of whom shall be lawyers;

Four members selected by a Clients Advisory Council to be established by the Corporation, all of whom shall be lawyers; and

Three directors selected by project attorneys in accordance with democratic procedures to be determined by the incorporators.

The full-time executive officer of the Corporation shall also serve as a member of the Board of Directors.

Representation on the Board by the above-designated representatives of the organized Bar is suggested because active, assured service by such respected and responsible leaders of the profession will enhance prospects for the necessary continuing support of the organized Bar, add significantly to the respect and responsibility of the Board, and provide a constructive and moderating professional influence on the operations of the Corporation. Such representation has been one of the greatest strengths of the National Advisory Committee and has played a significant, indeed, an indispensible role in the success of the Office of Economic Opportunity Legal Services Program.

Similiarly, membership on the Board of Directors by representatives of the client community and project attorneys is considered important by the Committee. The mission of the Corporation, its credibility and viability, will be substantially enhanced by such representation. Here again, experience with the National Advisory Committee shows that other directors would profit greatly from exposure to the views of the clients' professional representatives as fellow directors.

Inclusion of other government legal services activities

The National Advisory Committee concluded that legal services activities sponsored or otherwise engaged in by government entities other than the Office of Economic Opportunity should not be transferred to the Corporation at this time. In addition to distinctions in the scope of services of other programs and complex issues of delegation and transfer, it was felt that the immediate objective was to accomplish the transfer of the Office of Economic Opportunity Legal Services Program and related research, development, and support activities. The Committee did not rule out expanding the Corporation at some later date to include legal service activities of other government agencies.

The Committee recommends that the Corporation be given authority to provide a degree of coordination to other legal services activities and to furnish technical assistance and evaluation services.

Criminal representation

The Committee concluded with reluctance that the Corporation should not seek to provide representation in "criminal proceedings". Experience with the Legal Services Program indicates that a severe overburdening of resources would result from extension of services into general criminal representation.

However, the Committee recommends that a restriction on criminal representation not be included as an inflexible charter provision. Difficulties in distinguishing between criminal and civil cases in some instances, variances in state legislative provisions and unavailability of competent defense services in some areas recommend that the formulation of guidelines in the criminal representation area be left to the discretion of the Board of Directors.

Establishment of clients advisory council

The National Advisory Committee recommends that a national clients advisory council be established and that the council be the existing National Clients Council, Inc.

Congressional authorization and appropriations process

The Committee recommends that legislation establishing the Corporation and authorizing its activities as well as appropriations legislation be considered by the Congressional Committees which have had authority over the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is further recommended that appropriations to the Corporation be handled

[1] 47 U.S.C.A. §§ 396(b), 396(e)(2), 396(f)(3), and 398.

through the budget of the Office of Economic Opportunity, or, if this should prove to be unfeasible for any reason, through the budget of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Restrictions on practice by attorneys

The Committee concluded that attorneys employed by local projects should not be allowed to practice law outside of the scope of their project employment. One area of difficulty called to the attention of the Committee related to isolated instances of part-time employment of attorneys by some projects. This would seem to recommend that the Board be allowed to develop guidelines in this area.

Local share contributions

Although contributions to local projects in cash and in services should be continued and encouraged, the Committee would recommend that rigid percentage local-share requirements not be required. Experience with the Legal Services Program and the difficulty in raising local share lead to the conclusion that this matter be left to the Board of Directors of the Corporation for determination.

Political activities—Lobbying

The Committee discussed restrictions on attorneys dealing with political activities and lobbying. While it was recognized that corporate resources should not be used for partisan political activities, it would appear that lobbying might be a permissible activity and even one to be encouraged when problems of poverty clients demand legislative solutions or the expertise of program lawyers would be of assistance in drafting legislation. This would appear to be an area where carefully drawn guidelines by the Corporation might be appropriate.

Other issues

Because of limitations of time and the necessity to explore fully the issues raised at its one-day meeting, the National Advisory Committee was not able to consider all of the important questions underlying the proposed transfer of the Legal Services Program. Issues not fully considered include the following:

Administrative Supervision of Activities of Project Attorneys: Formal Opinion No. 324, ABA Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, was noted with approval. This opinion considers the rights and obligations of project boards in establishing policies governing activities of project attorneys.

User Fees: The Committee recommends that the charging of user fees not be authorized in the charter.

Governor's Veto and Subsequent Procedure: not considered by National Advisory Committee due to lack of time.

Mr. Speaker, following is the proposed bill:

H.R. 8163

A bill to establish a Legal Services Corporation and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Legal Services Corporation Act."

SEC. 2. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, 78 Stat. 508, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2701, *et seq.*), is amended by adding after title 8 thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IX—LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

"ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 901. (a) There is authorized to be established in the District of Columbia a non-membership nonprofit corporation to be known as the "Legal Services Corporation" (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), for the purpose of providing legal services in non-criminal matters to persons financially unable to afford counsel as ascertained pursuant to guidelines established by the Corporation under Section 905(a)(2) (hereinafter referred to as "eligible clients"). The Corporation shall not be an agency or establishment of the United States. To the extent consistent with this Act, the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(b) The initial Board of Directors appointed pursuant to Section 902 of this Act shall take whatever actions are necessary and appropriate to establish the Corporation pursuant to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(c) The Corporation shall maintain its principal office in the District of Columbia and shall, at all times, maintain therein a designated agent to accept service of process for the Corporation. Notice to or service upon the agent shall be deemed notice of service upon the Corporation.

"GOVERNING BODY

"SEC. 902. (a) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") consisting of eleven members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, no more than six of whom shall be of the same political party. A majority shall be members of the bar of the highest court of a jurisdiction and none shall be a full-time employee of the United States.

"(b) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be three years or until his successor has been appointed and has qualified; except that of the members first appointed, five members designated by the President shall serve for a term of two years. For purposes of this subsection, the term of office of the initial members of the Board shall be computed from the date of incorporation. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of that term. The term of all members shall be computed from the date of termination of the preceding term. No member shall be reappointed to more than two consecutive terms immediately following his initial term.

"(c) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of such membership, be deemed officers or employees of the United States.

"(d) The Board shall select a Chairman from among its members who shall serve for a term of one year.

"(e) A member of the Board may be removed by a vote of seven members for malfeasance in office, persistent neglect of or inability to perform duties and for no other cause.

"(f) Within six months following the appointment of all members of the Board, the Board shall appoint an Advisory Council. The Advisory Council membership shall include persons who meet the client-eligibility standards described in section 905(a)(2) and representatives of the organized bar. The Council shall be convened by the President of the Corporation, at least twice annually, and shall render advice to the Corporation on matters pertaining to the Corporation's activities.

"OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 903. (a) The Board shall appoint the President of the Corporation, who must be a member of the bar of the highest court of a jurisdiction and shall be a non-voting, ex-officio member of the Board, and such other officers as may be necessary. No officer of the Corporation may receive any salary or other compensation for services from any source other than the Corporation during his period of employment by the Corporation. All officers shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

"(b) The President of the Corporation, subject to general policies established by the Board, may appoint and remove such employees as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the Corporation.

"POWERS, DUTIES AND LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 904. (a) To the extent consistent with this Act, the Corporation shall have the usual powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(b) In addition to the powers conferred by subsection (a), the Corporation shall have authority—

(1) To obtain grants from and to make contracts with individuals, and private and state and local government agencies, organizations and institutions;

(2) To contract with or make grants to individuals, partnerships, firms, organizations, corporations or other appropriate entities (hereinafter referred to as "recipient") for the purpose of providing legal assistance to eligible clients;

(3) To represent the collective interests of the eligible clients under this Act before Federal agencies with a view to identifying and resolving issues which might otherwise result in multiple litigation arising out of the administration of the agencies' programs;

(4) To accept gifts, devises and bequests not inconsistent with the purposes of the Corporation; and

(5) To undertake, either directly or by grant or contract:

(A) research;

(B) training and technical assistance;

(C) to serve as a clearinghouse for information;

relating to the delivery of legal services under this Act.

"(c)(1) The Corporation shall have authority to ensure the compliance of recipients and their attorneys with this Act, the corporate charter and bylaws and to terminate funding where a recipient fails to comply.

(2) If an attorney participating in a program funded by the Corporation violates the provisions of this Act or the charter, bylaws or guidelines of the Corporation, the recipient shall take appropriate disciplinary action.

(3) The Corporation shall not interfere with any attorney in carrying out his professional responsibility to his client or abrogate the authority of a particular jurisdiction to enforce the applicable standards of professional responsibility which apply to the attorney.

"(d) The Corporation shall have no power or authority—

(1) To initiate or defend litigation on behalf of clients other than the corporate entity itself;

(2) To undertake to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress or State or local legislative bodies by representations to such bodies, their members or their committees, unless such bodies, their members, or their committees, request that the Corporation make representations to them.

"(e)(1) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

(2) No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, or employee except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

(3) The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

"CORPORATE GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

"Section 905. (a) With respect to contracts or grants to provide legal assistance to eligible clients, the Corporation shall—

(1) Ensure the maintenance of the highest quality of service and professional standards, adherance to the preservation of attorney-client relationships, and the protection of the integrity of the adversary process from any impairment in furnishing legal services to eligible clients.

(2) Establish guidelines to ensure that eligibility of clients will be determined by recipients on the basis of factors which include:

(A) the assets and income level of the client;

(B) the fixed debts, medical expenses and other factors which affect the client's ability to pay;

(C) the size of the client's family;

(D) the cost of living in the locality; and

(E) such other factors as relate to financial inability to afford legal assistance;

and establish priorities to insure that those least able to afford legal services are given preference in the furnishing of such services.

(3) Establish a graduated schedule of fees which will require the client, if able, to pay at least a portion of the cost of legal services, based on the factors enumerated in Paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(4) Ensure that grants or contracts are made in such a way as to provide adequate legal representation to persons in both urban and rural areas.

(5) Ensure that attorneys employed full-time in legal services programs funded by the Corpration represents only eligible clients and refrain from any outside practice of law.

(6) Ensure that all attorneys refrain from undertaking to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress or State or local legislative bodies by representations to such bodies, their members or their committees, while engaged in activities carried on by legal services programs funded by the Corporation, unless such bodies, their members, or their committees request that the attorney makes representations to them; and that attorneys employed full-time by legal services programs funded by the Corporation refrain from such lobbying at any time, unless such bodies, their members, or their committees request that the attorney makes representations to them.

(7) Ensure that all attorneys, while engaged in activities carried on by legal services programs funded by the Corporation, refrain from:

(A) any partisan political activity associated with a candidate for a public or party office or an issue specifically identified with a national or state political party;

(B) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or provide similar assistance in connection with an election (other than legal representation in civil or administrative proceedings); or

(C) any voter registration activity (other than legal representation), and insure that attorneys employed full-time in legal services programs funded by the Corporation refrain from the above enumerated activities at any time.

(8) The Corporation shall establish guidelines for a system for review of appeals to be implemented by each recipient to insure the efficient utilization of resources and to prevent the taking of frivolous and duplicative appeals.

"(b) No funds made available by the Corporation pursuant to this Act, either by grant or contract, may be used—

(1) To provide legal services with respect to any criminal proceeding (including any extraordinary writ, such as habeas corpus and coram nobis, designed to challenge a criminal proceeding);

(2) For any of the political activities described in paragraph (7) of subsection (a) of this section; or

(3) To award grants or enter into contracts with so-called "public interest law firms which intend to expend at least 75 per centum of their resources and time litigating issues either in the broad interests of a majority of the public or in the collective interests of the poor, or both.

"(c) In making contracts or grants for legal assistance, the Corporation shall insure that any recipient organized solely for the purpose of providing legal services to eligible clients is governed by a body consisting af a majority of lawyers.

"(d) The Corporation shall monitor and evaluate recipient programs in order to insure that the purposes of this Act and the charter and bylaws of the Corporation are carried out.

"(e) Grants and contracts pursuant to this Act shall be made or refused by the President of the Corporation, but the Board shall have authority to establish, by rules, which classes of grants or contracts it wishes to review and approve prior to such action by the President.

"(f) At least thirty days prior to the Corporation's approval of any grant or contract application, the Corporation shall notify the Chief Executive Officer of the State, Commonwealth, District of Columbia, or possession in which the recipient will offer legal services. Notification shall include a reasonable description of the grant or contract application.

"RECORDS AND REPORTS

"SEC. 906. (a) The Corporation shall have authority to require such reports as it deems necessary from recipients with which it has made contracts or grants.

"(b) The Corporation shall have authority to prescribe the keeping of records with respect to funds provided by grant or contract and shall have access to such records at all reasonable times for the purpose of insuring compliance with the grant or contract.

"(c) The Corporation shall publish an annual report by April 15 of each year which shall be filed by the Corporation with the President, the Congress and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

"AUDITS

"SEC. 907. (a) The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited annually. Such audits shall be conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent Certified Public Accountants who are certified by a regulatory authority of a State; except that for the period ending December 31, 1975, such audits may also be conducted by:

(1) Independent public accountants who are not certified but who are licensed to practice by a regulatory authority of a State; or

(2) Independent public accountants who, although not so licensed or certified, meet, in the opinion of the Board, standards of education and experience representative of the highest prescribed by the licensing authorities of the several States which provide for the continuing licensing of public accountants and which are prescribed by the Board in appropriate regulations; provided that if the Board deems it necessary in the public interest, it may prescribe, by regulation, higher standards than those required for the practice of public accountancy by the regulatory authorities of the States.

"(b) The audits shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files and other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation and necessary to facilitate the audits shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audits; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons. The report of the annual audit shall be filed with the General Accounting Office and shall be available for public inspection during business hours at the principal office of the Corporation.

"(c) In addition to the annual audit, the financial transactions of the Corporation for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of its operations may be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. The representative of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers and property of the Corporation shall remain in the possession and custody of the Corporation. A report of any such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress and to the President, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he shall deem advisable.

"(d) The Corporation shall have a right to require an audit report from any recipient of a grant or contract with respect to funds received from the Corporation. The Comptroller General of the United States shall have access to such reports and may, in addition, inspect the books, accounts, records, files, and all other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by the recipient, which relate to the disposition or use of funds received from the Corporation. Notwithstanding this subsection, neither the Corporation nor the Comptroller General shall have access to individual case records subject to the attorney-client privilege.

"FINANCING

"SEC. 908. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the activities of the Corporation. The first such appropriation may be made available to the Board at any time after six or more members have been appointed and qualified, notwithstanding that incorporation may not yet have been accomplished. Subsequent appropriations shall be for 3-year periods or such other periods as appropriation acts may designate, and, if for more than 1 year, shall be paid to the Corporation in annual installments at the beginning of each fiscal year in such amounts as may be specified in the appropriation acts.

"RIGHT TO REPEAL, ALTER, OR AMEND

"SEC. 909. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this title at any time is expressly reserved.

"APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW

"SEC. 910. In the absence of specific reference to this title, the provisions of other titles of this Act (and references to this Act in other statutes) shall not be construed to affect the powers and activities of the Corporation or to have any applicability with respect to programs and activities assisted by the Corporation."

SEC. 3. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, 78 Stat. 508, is further amended (42 U.S.C. 2701, et seq.) by striking out paragraph (3) of section 222(a) thereof.

SEC. 4. (a) Title IX of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended by this Act, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Section 3 of this Act shall take effect on (1) the date of incorporation of the Legal Services Corporation, or (2) the date on which the first appropriation after incorporation becomes available to the Corporation, whichever is later.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 4, grants and contracts for the provision of legal services and related activities which are made by the Office of Economic Opportunity prior to the effective date of section 3 of this Act shall remain valid until their expiration date or their modification or termination as provided therein: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall succeed the Office of Economic Opportunity as a party thereto, and shall have the same supervisory authority and contractual relationship with respect thereto as the Office of Economic Opportunity had on the day prior to the effective date of section 3 of this Act. The Office of Economic Opportunity shall cause to be paid promptly to the Corporation the portion of its unexpended balances equal to the unpaid balance of such grants and contracts.

SEC. 6. In employing its personnel, the Corporation shall give due consideration to those persons employed in the Office of Legal Services of the Office of Economic Opportunity on the effective date of this Act.

REESTABLISHING OUR AUTHORITY OVER THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the United States balance of payments has been unsatisfactory for over a decade.

Shortly after his election to the Presidency, John F. Kennedy announced that the dollar would not be devalued. He did so in an effort to quiet a crisis that was depleting the U.S. gold stock. Since that time, we have witnessed the establishment and dissolution of the London gold pool, the objective of which was to intervene in the London gold market and eliminate any substantial differential between the official and private market price of gold. The gold pool was dissolved in 1968 when, under the threat of another crisis, official intervention in the private gold market was suspended. Since then, the private price of gold has been divorced from the official price.

To reduce capital outflows, investment abroad has been curtailed in a number of ways. A tax was first placed on Americans' purchases of foreign stock and bonds. Lending by banks to foreigners has come under the regulation of the Federal Reserve. At the beginning of 1968, existing voluntary controls over private direct investment abroad were made mandatory. Foreign aid has been tied. Defense procurement guidelines have been altered to give American suppliers a 50-percent preference over foreign competitors. Most recently, the Export-Import Bank and the Treasury have borrowed at high interest rates dollars from the foreign branches of U.S. banks in an effort to prevent even larger dollar accumulations by foreign central banks.

The United States ran a balance-of-payments deficit with official foreigners of $10.7 billion in 1970—the largest such deficit in our history. Although the apparent liquidity deficit shrank substantially from 1969, the Commerce Department estimates that apart from short-term capital flows, the underlying liquidity deficit in 1970 was about $4.8 billion, slightly larger than in the previous year. If we examine a measure of the U.S. basic balance-of-payments position, the sum of the current account and net direct investment abroad, a surplus of $3.6 billion in 1964 has deteriorated to become a deficit averaging about $3 billion in each of the last 3 years. This deficit, incidentally, is roughly equal to the foreign exchange cost of our military adventures in Vietnam and around the world.

Our interference with international business transactions in an attempt to bolster the U.S. balance of payment has proved futile.

PROBLEMS RESULTING FROM PERSISTENT U.S. PAYMENTS DEFICITS

European economic policymakers have long objected to the persistent structural element of U.S. payments deficits. The recent expansion of the Eurodollar market has brought the additional threat of huge tides of short-term capital sloshing across the Atlantic according to whether short-term interest rates are higher here or abroad. The ratio of U.S. reserves to foreign official claims on the United States is now more unfavorable than at any time since World War II. At the end of March 1971, total U.S. reserve assets amounted to $14.3 billion, of which gold reserves accounted for $11 billion. By contrast, liabilities to official foreigners—including recent dollar acquisitions by Germany—now total $25 to $30 billion.

As the events of the last few days have reemphasized, we live under the constant threat that at some point a massive short-term capital outflow imposed on top of the continuing structural deficit will precipitate an international monetary crisis. If a full-scale crisis got under way, foreign central banks would come galloping to the Treasury to demand gold in exchange for dollars. The outcome might well be the dissolution of the international monetary system into a number of currency areas. At the worst, it would lead to a cataclysmic collapse of international trade, finance, and investment.

In addition to the constant threat of a monetary crisis, the piecemeal, ad hoc methods that have been adopted in an unsuccessful attempt to reduce U.S. deficits are costly and promise to become even more expensive in the future. Favoritism given domestic suppliers in Government procurement has raised the costs of defense and other activities to taxpayers. Restrictions on the export of capital for direct investment abroad have raised borrowing costs to U.S. corporations, since they have been forced to seek funds in Europe. The tying of foreign aid has reduced the effectiveness of our development assistance efforts and generated animosity abroad. Ex-Im and Treasury short-term borrowing in Europe is more expensive than obtaining the same quantity of funds at home, and is proving counterproductive. Finally, as long as substantial U.S. payment deficits persist, the tendency always exists for the Federal Reserve to pursue a somewhat tighter domestic monetary policy than would otherwise be the case.

Recently a new threat has arisen that will be more difficult to avoid than a breakdown of the international monetary system, and that promises to be more costly than the ad hoc policies adopted in the unsuccessful effort to curtail U.S. deficits. The progressive erosion of the U.S. international competitive position—and particularly the decline in the U.S. trade surplus from the $7 billion level of 1964—is having the expected impact upon the workers and businessmen of this country. It has led to increasing concern among legislators about the international economic position of the United States. Organized labor now advocates legislation that would seriously restrict the entry of imports into the United States, and businessmen in a variety of industries are demanding protection from import competition.

Most available evidence suggests that the problem will not diminish, but instead will become more serious. While the U.S. trade surplus did swell to $2.2 billion in 1970 from $600 million the previous year, some deterioration is expected in 1971. Virtually the full amount of our current net export surplus can be explained by exports financed through the Foreign Assistance Act and Public Law 480. The U.S. trade surplus may resume a slow rate of growth in 1972 and thereafter, but a number of other aspects of our current-account position are not encouraging. Returns from overseas investments, net of similar payments to foreigners, have stabilized or even begun to decline slowly, net travel expenditures abroad are certain to grow, and so are private and official gifts to foreigners. There is virtually no prospect that the U.S. current-account figure—this includes some $3 billion of military foreign exchange expenditures—which was in deficit by $885 million in 1969 and in surplus by a modest $638 million last year—will grow into a surplus sufficient to cover what must be regarded as a normal level of U.S. net direct and portfolio investment abroad. Thus we must continue to face the prospect of a structural payments deficit of $3, $4, or $5 billion, depending upon what one considers basic to the underlying structure of the U.S. balance of payments.

If we want to keep importing from abroad, and traveling abroad, and investing abroad, and maintaining vast military operations abroad, at the present level, we are bound to continue the annual deficits which have brought the dollar to its sorry pass.

For the long term, what is needed to bring our payments more closely to balance is what is needed by this country anyway for a host of foreign and domestic reasons—to extricate ourselves from Vietnam, and to cut down on our foreign military adventures generally.

Since the reestablishment of convertibility for European currencies at the beginning of 1959, the net effect of changes in the par rates of other currencies has been to raise the effective foreign-exchange value of the dollar by nearly 5 percent. Given the organization of the in-

ternational monetary system, as spelled out in the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund and as new conventions have been established since World II, the United States has no practical ability to alter exchange rates between the dollar and other currencies. Because ours is a big country and the United States is second only to the Common Market in the volume of trade it conducts with the rest of the world, the United States would under no circumstances be able to unilaterally manipulate dollar exchange rates with no concern for the impact of our actions on other countries.

But the particular structure of the international monetary system as it has evolved makes any across-the-board modification of dollar exchange rates even more difficult. We have pledged to the International Monetary Fund that we will stabilize the value of the dollar in terms of gold. We have assumed the responsibilities that stem from the role of the dollar as the chief currency foreign monetary authorities hold as a reserve asset.

The dollar, in effect, has become the center of the international monetary system.

These developments would be all to the good were it not for the dangers that arise from persistent large U.S. payments deficits. The objective of the international monetary system is supposedly to foster full employment and the efficient global allocation of productive resources among competing industries. In idealized theoretical descriptions of the system, these objectives are to be achieved through multilateral freedom of trade and capital movements.

The impending crisis—now temporarily obscured by the froth of short-term capital flows—stems from a willingness to sacrifice the fruits of a stable, efficient, and flexible international monetary system in order to prop up the shaky and increasingly hollow edifice of that system. For a decade now distinguished academicians and perceptive civil servants of all colors have pointed to the danger of an international monetary collapse. They have scored the costly and self-defeating nature of capital export restrictions, Government procurement guidelines, export subsidies, and the sacrifice of domestic economic objectives for ill-defined international benefits. Now we are threatened with a 180° shift in the orientation of U.S. trade policy as a result of a structural payments deficit including a deterioration in our trade balance. Given a U.S. shift toward protectionism, we may be assured that other countries will follow our lead and retaliate as well.

The only way to insure that American workers have an effective remedy in maintaining their competitiveness vis-a-vis low wage but increasingly productive foreign labor, the only way to insure that inefficient and declining industries in the United States must indeed meet the rigors of international competition rather than hide behind newly erected trade barriers, the only way for the United States to reassert its leadership—since we are still the only conceivable leader—in the further elimination of trade restrictions and the freeing of capital movements, is for this country to reassert a measure of authority over dollar exchange rates and to topple the image that gold has become.

THE REUSS PROPOSAL

Earlier this week Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs Paul A. Volcker emphasized in a speech that the real problem of the U.S. balance of payments is our structural deficit, and that we should not be confused by the temporary disruptions caused by massive, but short-lived, capital flows.

I agree. Were the position of the U.S. balance of payments a fundamentally strong one, we would have nothing to fear from international capital flows induced by disparities in short-term interest rates. At the present time, it is entirely appropriate that the United States should have low interest rates to stimulate a domestic recovery, and that the Germans should simultaneously have high rates to fight their own inflation. If the U.S. balance of payments were strong, we could be confident that at some time in the future, perhaps when the U.S. recovery is well under way and inflationary pressures have been stifled abroad, the interest rate differential would reverse and short-term funds would flow back into the United States. In the interim, swaps by central banks or borrowing by U.S. authorities in Europe would be adequate to deal with the situation.

But the U.S. balance of payments is not healthy, and ad hoc expedients are inadequate. I note with sadness that my prediction of a few weeks ago regarding the success of U.S. Treasury's high-interest-rate borrowings in Europe has been fulfilled. Events have completely overwhelmed the Treasury's efforts. It is not so much flows of arbitrage capital seeking the highest net return that have swamped the Treasury's attempts, but speculation focused on the current misalinement of exchange rates—speculation founded upon the belief that the German mark is still undervalued relative to the dollar.

The latest crisis has forced the closing of foreign exchange markets in Germany and four smaller European countries. Undoubtedly the officials of these countries are now deliberating about what to do when sooner or later the exchange markets are reopened. This period of deliberation offers a great opportunity for the United States and for the long-run health of the international monetary system. But this opportunity will be seized and realized only if the actions of officials, when the markets are reopened, focus on the basis disequilibria of the system rather than just the apparent problem of short-term international capital flows.

In the international section of the 1971 Annual Report issued last month by the Joint Economic Committee, which received the bipartisan support of virtually all our members, we emphasized that the United States cannot expect other countries to be willing to finance our deficits indefinitely through the accumulation of ever larger stocks of dollars. Our committee suggested that the United States should cooperate in achieving multilateral agreement on a guideline that would impose "gradually increasing discipline on the financing of U.S. payments deficits. Under such a guideline, the proportion of annual deficits financed by dollar accumulation abroad would decline and the proportion financed by U.S. losses of gold, SDRs, or exchange reserves would increase over time."

Mr. Raymond Barre, the vice president of the Commission of the European Communities, recently cited the suggestions of the Joint Economic Committee in proposing an agreement on the orderly growth of the global stock of reserve assets. Mr. Barre said at Boca Raton last week that—

> It is very important to limit progressively the share and rate of increase of dollar balances in the international monetary system.

We should have no objection to a commitment that in the future no more than, say, half of U.S. deficits be financed through the accumulation of additional dollars if—at the same time—other countries agree to cooperate in substantially reducing or even eliminating the structural element of our payments deficits.

The current discussions among the monetary officials of the major industrial nations on what to do when exchange markets reopen offer the opportunity for introducing basic reforms. What other time is better than the present? We have been procrastinating and resorting to half measures for a decade, and the situation has only steadily worsened.

The monetary officials of the major industrial nations should convene under the aegis of the International Monetary Fund or any other suitable forum and agree to a realinement of exchange rates—including an increase in the value of the mark and the yen—calculated to bring the U.S. balance of payments closer to equilibrium. The U.S. structural payments deficit, once we have thrown off the burden of Vietnam, should be no more than a few hundred million annually, and we should be able to attain that position without the benefit of capital export controls, fat export subsidies, or other gimmicks. Nor should the list of candidates for exchange rate appreciation necessarily be restricted to the yen and the mark. The objective should be to develop, perhaps through an interim float, a new structure of exchange rates that will be tenable in the future and avoid the periodic bouts of speculation that are becoming so familiar.

Given a shift in the configuration of exchange rates sufficient to bring the U.S. balance of payments—freed of excessive military adventurism—into relative structural equilibrium, there would be no need for us to be covetous regarding our gold stock. Gold does not reproduce itself; hoarding it causes us to make unnecessary interest payments to foreign holders of dollars, and sales would help absorb some of the dollars that have been recently acquired by foreign monetary authorities.

Given a restructuring of exchange rates, we should lay aside de facto inconvertibility of gold into dollars—which has been the actual policy of this Gov-

ernment in recent years—and invite other countries to convert at least some of their dollars into gold to decrease somewhat our present $11 billion gold hoard for this purpose would be constructive, not hurtful. Of course, since at $35 per ounce our liabilities to official foreigners far exceed our gold stock, we would not be able to satisfy demands for conversion if all official foreigners chose to present their dollars. Because of this possibility, it would be only fair to give first priority to countries that had recently increased the dollar value of their currencies. Other nations would have experienced no change in the size of their reserves relative to the volume of their international transactions as measured in their own currencies.

If dollar conversion by other countries deprives the United States of a substantial part of our gold stock, we need not be troubled. The health of the U.S. international position, as events over the past decade have amply demonstrated, is dependent upon the productive and competitive abilities of the United States relative to other nations. Without the ability to compete, gold cannot save us, as it demonstrably has not. Under the Articles of Agreement of the IMF, we would be permitted, whenever we elect, to stabilize the value of the dollar, not in gold, but in terms of other currencies, as every other nation in the world now does.

SPECIAL PROBLEM OF SHORT-TERM CAPITAL FLOWS

A realinement of exchange rates, as I have suggested, would do little directly to counter the more specialized problem of massive international flows of short-term capital. Excluding flows resulting from anticipated exchange rate changes, this problem is largely one of differences in interest yields paid for dollar deposits in different parts of the world. Difficulties have arisen for European monetary authorities when the availability and cost of credit in the Eurodollar market have diverged substantially from the desired availability of funds and interest rates in the various money markets for individual European currencies.

A number of solutions have been proposed to deal with this problem, including closer cooperation among the monetary authorities of the United States and other countries, the recycling of short-term funds by officials to counter private movements, and the widening of the band within which exchange rates can fluctuate. At this time, any decision on the most desirable set of methods for managing short-term capital outflows might well be left to the analysts of the International Monetary Fund and various national monetary authorities. At some point legislatures will want to review the decisions made by these practicing experts.

CONCLUSION

Critics of the approach, I have suggested, will say that adoption of this proposal means enlarging, rather than containing an international monetary crisis. Looking beyond the immediate difficulties, in my judgment we are over the long run being forced to choose and, indeed, have been choosing, between a major shift in exchange rates and the spread of protectionism. If we always opt in favor of restrictions—whether over trade or capital movements—the end result will be the preservation of the present international monetary system, but that system will have become a shell. It will be an empty edifice that, instead of being an active flexible mechanism to promote economic growth and the efficient international allocation of resources, will become a monument to financial conservatism and economic timidity.

As the country with the highest per capita income in the world, with the largest unified monetary area, and with the capability to exercise initiative in trade policy, the United States should expand net exports of goods and services to all other areas of the world, should encourage freedom of capital movements in order that resources may be utilized wherever they are most productive, and should press for the further reduction of all types of barriers to international trade. But the United States will be able to fulfill its proper role in the international economy only if we can be assured of maintaining the competitiveness of U.S. labor and industry vis-a-vis foreigners and of an end to fundamental payments imbalances. The solution I have proposed may seem dramatic, but after over a decade of procrastination, half measures, excuses, and international bickering, the present is an excellent time to get to the crux of the issue.

Let the United States and its industrial partners accept the challenge embodied in today's crisis. Otherwise protectionism will gain in strength, and more crises will follow.

We need a four-part solution to the immediate crisis and to the basic structural disequilibrium affecting the international monetary system:

First. A U.S. retrenchment from its excessive military adventurism abroad, particularly in Vietnam.

Second. A realinement of exchange rates sufficient to substantially eliminate the structural elements of U.S. payments deficits that will remain after removing our present clogs on trade and investment.

Third. A limitation on the proportion of any future U.S. deficit that may be financed in dollars.

Fourth. A resumption of dollar-gold convertibility.

IMPACT OF EXCESSIVE FOREIGN IMPORTS ON DOMESTIC MARKET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, Mr. SIKES, and many others who have addressed themselves to the critical impact of excessive foreign imports upon our domestic market. The state of the economy of a substantial sector of my own congressional district is directly dependent upon the strength of our Nation's steel industry. Bethlehem Steel Corp. has its home plant, its enormous research center, and its corporate offices in Bethlehem, Pa., and tens of thousands of my constituents are totally dependent upon a strong domestic steel industry for gainful employment.

The amount of foreign steel coming into this country continues to be of serious concern, not only to Bethlehem Steel but to the entire American steel industry. In 1968 steel imports reached a record high of almost 18 million tons, equal to 16.7 percent of the steel delivered to customers in this country. To forestall possible legislative restrictions on steel imports, Japan and the countries of the European Common Market voluntarily agreed to limit their volume of steel exports to the United States for the 3-year period, 1969 through 1971. In addition, they agreed to maintain approximately the same product mix and geographical pattern of distribution for imported steel.

As a result of this voluntary arrangement and an unexpected boom in the worldwide demand for steel, steel exports dropped to 14 million tons in 1969 and 13.4 million tons in 1970. However, while Japan and the European Common Market have generally held to the tonnage pledged under their voluntary restraints, they have not fulfilled their other commitments. There has been a major shift from imports of ordinary steel to imports of higher priced specialty steel products such as tin plate and tool steel. The average value of a ton of imported steel jumped from $124 per ton in 1969 to $147 per ton in 1970. In 1970 the total value of the 13.4 million tons of foreign steel amounted to almost $2 billion. Although the distribution pattern was to remain the same, west coast steel producers were hit by a 50-percent increase in imported steel in that area in the past 2 years. In addition, the present limitations allow an excessive annual increase in foreign steel and do not apply to a number of important steel-producing countries.

The biggest jumps in imported steel have come in years of labor contract negotiations when steel customers build up their stockpiles against the possibility of a strike. In 1965 steel imports jumped to 10.4 million tons, up from 6.4 million tons imported in 1964. In 1968, the 18 million tons of foreign steel represented a jump of 57 percent over the record 11.5 million tons of the year before. The pressures created by stockpiling and a weakening of steel demand abroad will put the voluntary arrangements to a severe test in 1971.

Bethlehem and other domestic steel companies believe that voluntary limitations on exports by the principal foreign producers constitute a constructive approach provided that present deficiencies in the arrangement are overcome. The U.S. Government is presently negotiating

to have the voluntary arrangement extended through 1973 and modified to include stronger limitations on product mix, geographical distribution, and annual import growth rate. If these negotiations are not successful, the members of the domestic steel industry may renew their efforts to secure legislation to limit imports. If some broad and effective limitation on imports is not achieved, the profitability of domestic steel companies may be seriously impaired.

Private responses to import competition cannot prevent increased market penetration by low-cost imports. If this country is to have a strong steel industry on which it can rely for a major portion of its steel needs, Government action must be taken to insure orderly trade.

CONGRESSIONAL OPPOSITION TO SURRENDER AT PANAMA NO BLUFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a recent newsstory from the isthmus, Panamanian Foreign Minister Juan Antonio Tack stated that in the proposed Panama Canal treaty negotiations Panama will settle for nothing less than "full jurisdiction over all areas now known as the Canal Zone—and that means Panamanian law would apply there solely and exclusively." He also stressed that U.S. rule in the zone must end, and that Panama is not interested in "even talking" about a treaty for a new canal until after "reaching full agreement on jurisdiction over the present lock canal."

This statement by the anti-American and leftist Foreign Minister is precisely what I have predicted: that any sea level project in Panama hinges upon surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and canal.

The same newsstory asserts that certain Members of the Congress "headed by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, firmly opposes canal concessions" and that Panamanians "view talk about congressional resistance as a bluff." It is true that many Members of the Congress, both House and Senate, oppose any surrender at Panama but their stand is no bluff. If Foreign Minister Tack thinks that this resistance to surrender is a bluff, he can wait and see.

The United States has treaty based responsibilities and obligations at Panama in the interest of interoceanic commerce and hemispheric defense. The Congress is the agency of our Government vested with final authority as relates to the disposal of territory and other property of the United States and understands its obligations and responsibilities. The Congress is better informed on Isthmian Canal questions now than ever and will never permit the long planned giveaway of the Canal Zone territory and Canal to Panama or any international agency.

In an address before this body on May 3, 1971, I stressed that the transcendent issue over the Panama Canal is not U.S. sovereignty versus Panamanian but U.S. sovereignty versus U.S.S.R. control. The recent cabinet shakeup in the Torrijos regime featured by increased leftist penetration has caused thoughtful Panamanian and U.S. citizens to ponder its significance. Is it because the Torrijos regime has a secret alliance with the U.S.S.R. that would make Panama another Cuba and give the U.S.S.R. effective control of the isthmus? These are queries that must be answered.

Finally, I wish to assure Foreign Minister Tack that the Congress of the United States is not bluffing but will insist upon our Government fulfilling its obligations as regards the security of transit.

The previously indicated newsstory follows as part of my remarks:

PANAMA TO STAND FIRM ON CANAL

(By James R. Whelan)

PANAMA CITY.—Formal negotiations on a new Panama Canal treaty, a diplomatic timebomb that has been ticking for the past seven years, will open next month, it was learned here.

Foreign Minister Juan Antonio Tack, in an interview with Scripps-Howard Newspapers, said Panama will settle for nothing less than "full jurisdiction over all areas now known as the canal zone—and that means Panamanian law would apply there solely and exclusively."

He also said Panama is not interested in even talking about construction of a new sea-level canal until reaching full agreement on jurisdiction over the present lock canal. Panama also will insist on phasing out all military activities not strictly related to canal defense—which would mean sharp reduction of the 12,000-man U.S. force now here.

SOME FLEXIBILITY

On this point, however, Mr. Tack indicated some flexibility in Panama's position on just which forces are "essential" for canal defense, and on a withdrawal timetable, mostly to cushion the impact on the country's economy.

Panama, however, has left no doubt that U.S. nondefense military activities must end.

Key among these are the Army, Air Force and Naval schools which have trained 37,000 Latin Americans since 1946, including counter-insurgency units so successful in thwarting communist guerrilla movements in recent years in Bolivia, Venezuela, Colombia, Guatemala and other Latin countries.

Graduates also include most of Panama's 6,500-man national guard, now firmly in command of the country's political life, and strongman head of government Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera.

Mr. Tack emphasized that Panama has no objection to the United States running the canal itself, but that U.S. rule in the zone must end. The zone, roughly five miles on each side of the canal, has a population of 52,000, entirely American except for 1,300 Panamanian canal employes and their families.

CONTRAST BREEDS HOSTILITY

In his recent foreign policy review, Secretary of State William P. Rogers referred to Panamanian resentment of "the size and life style of the large community in the Canal Zone," a phrase singled out by Mr. Tack. More than any other issue, the contrast between the affluence of the zone and their own relative (tho rapidly diminishing) poverty has fueled Panamanian hostility.

"We cannot tolerate any longer," Mr. Tack said, "a government within a government. What we want is full jurisdiction in the zone—political, administrative, judicial, labor and all other."

Mr. Tack believes the trump card in Panama's hand is the creeping obsolescence of the present canal.

Under Mr. Tack's reasoning, the United States for strategic and commercial reasons needs a new canal more urgently than Panama, and so needs to wrap up negotiations in less than two years.

LONG RESENTMENT

Sovereignty in the zone—lately discussed more specifically as "jurisdiction"—has been a festering sore for Panamanians ever since the canal opened in 1914. Rioting resulted in 1964 when U.S. high school students refused to abide by an agreement to fly the Panamanian flag alongside the American flag. Panama broke relations with the United States and resumed them three months later only after agreement was reached binding both countries to seek "prompt elimination of the causes of the conflict."

In 1967, the United States proposed three draft treaties—one to govern the present canal, the second the building and operation of a new sea-level waterway, and the third covering defense.

The military government which seized power in 1968 shelved the canal question and only last August got around to rejecting the U.S. proposals as "not usable even as the basis for future negotiations."

NO SPECIFICS

Panama so far has put forward no concrete proposals of its own. In the view of U.S. observers, the 1967 treaties might have had a good chance of winning congressional approval and were more liberal than anything likely to clear the U.S. Congress now. A group headed by Rep. Daniel J. Flood, D-Penn., firmly opposes canal concessions. The 1967 package would have surrendered U.S. direct control of the zone to a bilateral commission dominated by the United States, sharply raised Panama's share of canal revenues, and made other concessions.

Panamanians, however, view talk of congressional resistance as a U.S. bluff.

LIGHTERAGE SERVICE IN THE PORT OF NEW YORK

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Interstate Commerce Commission is presently considering a proposal submitted by the B. & O. and CNJ Railroads for the discontinuance of lighterage service in the Port of New York. Today 22 members of the New York delegation are filing a formal statement with the Chairman of the ICC, George Stafford, opposing the discontinuance of this service.

The loss of lighterage service for the New York piers would have a grave economic impact on New York City and the region as a whole.

I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of our letter to Chairman Stafford, and note that New York City's Mayor, John V. Lindsay, has similarly filed with the ICC moving for the rejection of the proposed discontinuance of service.

Our statement follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1971.

Hon. GEORGE STAFFORD,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: A proposal now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission for the discontinuance of lighterage services by the B&O and CNJ Railroads in the Port of New York poses grave economic dangers to New York City and the region as a whole.

With the lighterage service presently provided by the railroads operating in the Port, less than one carload of break bulk freight is loaded or unloaded at the New Jersey railheads, transported on a barge or scow across the waters of the Harbor, and either shipped or received at a New York pier. The cost of this service is included in the tariff to the Port of New York. Lighterage provides an integral shipping link to the City, since the major railroad carrier lines terminate on the New Jersey side of the Hudson River, and there are no connecting freight tunnels to Manhattan and Brooklyn. Discontinuance of lighterage would necessitate alternative means of transporting small quantities of freight to and from the City, resulting in added shipping costs, and the possible diversion of some of the City's shipping trade to ports elsewhere.

The immediate issue before the Commission (I and S Docket No. 8593) involves the application of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad (B&O) and the Central Railroad of New Jersey (CNJ) to discontinue their lighterage services by an amendment to their tariffs. Together, the B&O and the CNJ Railroads account for 15% of the lighterage in the Port. We have reason to believe, however, that if this application succeeds, the Penn Central, which handles the vast bulk of the Port's lighterage, will soon follow suit, resulting in the complete elimination of these services. Total discontinuance of lighterage would result in tragic economic consequences to the City.

First, there would be an immediate loss of jobs, at a time when unemployment in the City is already staggeringly high. Abandoning lighterage services in the Port could eliminate over 4,000 waterfront jobs, plus more than 16,000 additional secondary jobs, directly or indirectly dependent upon waterfront commerce.

Second, this action would undermine current efforts to expand and enhance the activities of the New York City waterfront. The City is now engaged in an extensive program of pier and waterfront development, aimed at attracting industry and creating new jobs, thereby expanding the City's tax base and enhancing its economic viability. The City has invested millions of dollars in pier and terminal facilities in the hope of recapturing this investment through user charges and new revenues generated from waterfront commerce. This program is already yielding favorable results. Most of the investment, however, has been directed toward break bulk facilities—as opposed to container facilities that require more land than is presently available in the City. Since most NYC shippers now also depend upon break bulk facilities, the continuation of lighterage under present tariff conditions is absolutely essential to the very existence of the city waterfront, and to the continued success in revitalizing it.

Third, abandonment of these services would result in unreasonable economic discrimination against the City of New York, vis-a-vis shipping points on the New Jersey side of the port, and vis-a-vis other ports throughout the country. Lighterage, under present tariff rates, enables rail carriers to service all piers in the Port of New York at equal rates. In other words, freight charges to and from the Port are the same regardless of whether their origin or destination is on the New York or the New Jersey shippers from having an unfair economic advantage over their New York City competitors, who were not served by freight tunnels.

The Commission has long recognized the importance of this principle, by upholding lighterage in the Port of New York—along with equal rates for both sides of the harbor—in both rulings and case law. The Commission has considered lighterage services in New York, although water-borne, as "equivalent to necessary extensions of the railroad lines." Setting aside this established policy now would force New York City shippers to pay added costs, above existent rail rates, in trucking merchandise to and from New Jersey railheads.

We therefore oppose the discontinuance of lighterage in the Port of New York. The City has moved for the rejection of the proposed tariff provisions pending before the ICC, since they fail to comply with the established procedures in section 1(18) of the Interstate Commerce Act for abandonment of a portion of a railroad line.

We support the City's action concerning I & S Docket No. 8593, and urge the Commission to give the City's position every consideration in reviewing the proposed elimination of these services so vital to the City and the Port of New York.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, EDWARD I. KOCH, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, BELLA S. ABZUG, JOHN G. DOW, C. B. RANGEL.

BERT PODELL, PETER A. PEYSER, JOHN M. MURPHY, HUGH L. CAREY, JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, FRANK J. BRASCO, HERMAN BADILLO, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM.

JONATHAN BINGHAM, MARIO BIAGGI, LESTER L. WOLFF, SEYMOUR HALPERN, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, JAMES F. HASTINGS, FRANK HORTON.

ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATORS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for weeks we have read of a march on Washington by people who called themselves antiwar demonstrators but whose stated purpose would be to shut down the Government of the United States. Such an attempt would, in itself, be a conspiracy against the Government and people of America.

They have come by the thousands, they have made their effort and failed and now most of them have gone. While they were here most of them were nonviolent and they could have made themselves more objectionable. But the fact remains that they destroyed property and they sought to impose their will on the great majority, they interfered with the lives and natural pursuits of other people and they cost the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars. They were a smelly, unwashed, unattractive group. They did no credit to their objectives, whatever those objectives really were.

My point simply is this. I don't believe these people should be called antiwar demonstrators. Most of them, I am convinced, are being used by an unscrupulous crowd which seeks to overthrow America. Certainly some of those who have been identified as their leaders fit well into this category. Regardless of the true motives of the rank and file among the demonstrators, they are contributing to a very dangerous activity. By allowing themselves to be used against our own country's best interests, they are accessories to one of the worst of all crimes—the crime of treason. Consequently, I consider that a disservice is being done America by continuing to refer to these people and their leaders simply as antiwar demonstrators.

As a former newspaper publisher, I realize how handy it is to hang a label on groups such as now roam Washington's streets, but by what stretch of the imagination can the press continue to suggest this is an antiwar demonstration?

Just because those involved say so?

The press has done an admirable job in covering the events of the past weeks. No doubt many reporters were themselves in physical danger in pursuit of a story or picture.

Every reporter on the scene of the most recent disturbances has written or spoken of the damaging of automobiles, the throwing of rocks and bottles, the buildings defaced, the police injured, and the public utterances of the group leaders to shut down the Government by force.

Is it too much to ask, therefore, that the press abandon the comfort of the antiwar label and seek another umbrella under which to identify the burners and anarchists?

What must the people of other lands think as they read and see the reports flowing from Washington in recent hours?

Consider our own confusion when we read of similar outbreaks of violence abroad and as we attempt to sort out the exact meaning of the labels pinned on the various participants.

Even more confusing to our friends overseas—and of considerable comfort to our enemies—must be the present practice of calling these people antiwar demonstrators.

Who says that's what they are? Surely not the police who have been attempting to control the violence. Surely not the terrorized secretaries and Government workers who braved unknown dangers in order to go to their work in the Nation's Capital.

No, Mr. Speaker, these people are not simply antiwar or antiviolence. By their acts they are anti-American. Some of them are criminals. Most of them contribute to anarchy.

They are a great many things, but they are much more than antiwar, and it is time they were stripped—by the press and by all Americans—of this phony shield. Whether the rank and file know it or not, they were contributing to the overthrow of the United States. And they were being used for that purpose.

AN INTERVIEW WITH GEN. DANIEL C. JAMES

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Daniel C. James, a native of Pensacola, Fla., and my constituent, has distinguished himself in many ways. As a career Air Force officer, he has had an outstanding combat record. In his present assignment as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, he has taken a leading part in efforts by the Pentagon to secure the release of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia. Probably he is best known for the courageous manner in which he speaks out for America and for the institutions and traditions of our country. For all of these accomplishments America can be proud of him.

Recently he appeared on the Today Show, and I submit his interview for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The sentiments expressed by General James tell very clearly that our Government is pressing every lead which might result in the release of American POW's.

AN INTERVIEW WITH GEN. DANIEL C. JAMES

HUGH DOWNS. In our Washington studio this morning is Air Force Brigadier General Daniel Chaffee James. General James is also Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs and is responsible for Pentagon activities relating to the prisoners of war.

He's with NBC News correspondent Robert Goralski.

Gentlemen.

ROBERT GORALSKI. General James, I'd like to ask you, first of all, for clarification of what has been discussed in Paris on the POW's. It's my understanding that the communist delegations have said that they will release the POW's if we set a date for withdrawal.

Is this correct?

Gen. DANIEL JAMES. It's one of the most popular misquotes that is going around today that they have said that they will definitely release the prisoners of war as soon as we set a date. They haven't said that all. They have continually said that if we set a date that they will talk about it. And they said that again last week in the session—and after a wire service story had come out saying that one of the negotiators had said in a news conference—out of the talks themselves—that they would release the prisoners and that they would do this quickly after we had set a date.

When they got into the peace conference itself—and as the President says, it's the place to negotiate a peace; and a place for meaningful negotiations is at that peace table—they do not say that at the peace table.

GORALSKI. Well, what is our position? That we will not pull out our troops completely until the prisoners are released? Isn't that a summary of it?

JAMES. As you know, there have been quite a few people also who have said that there is no precedent for releasing prisoners prior to the end—the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of troops. And this isn't true either. In the Korean War when we had the first switch, the negotiations were still going on when the first switch was made. And then you have another thing here that has to be a big factor in this, Bob. These people have been imprisoned longer than any prisoners have ever been imprisoned in any other war. And it's a humane consideration that we try to get these people, the other side, to address and the people here at home to understand.

GORALSKI. What steps has the government taken then, General James, to get them released? What have we been talking about specifically at Paris?

JAMES. Well, we have been talking about—first of all, we have been trying to talk about meaningful negotiations, engage in meaningful negotiations. And there are a lot of people that are shouting at the government of our country about getting the war ended. The problem is getting the other side to engage in meaningful negotiations at the peace conference. And we have made propositions there. The President's made an unprecedented offer to return all thirty-eight thousand plus of theirs for whatever they hold of ours. We, of course, don't know the exact figure, because, contrary to what some of the people are saying here, they have never given us an accurate accounting.

The figures that Mrs. Weiss was addressing last week were—figures that she was talking about are mainly in North Vietnam. We have prisoners in South Vietnam. There's the Pathet Lao. We've never had any word from these people, one letter out of South Vietnam. We're talking about Laos; we're talking about Cambodia.

And so, you see, we don't know how many prisoners they hold. But the President has offered to release all of theirs in return for what they hold of ours and has asked for an accounting of the others. We have time and and time again tried to enter into meaningful negotiations to this end. And all we've gotten from the other side so far is just a bunch of name calling.

GORALSKI. How many prisoners actually do we know are being held by the North Vietnamese? You said there're thirty-eight thousand North Vietnamese and Viet Cong being held by our side . . .

JAMES. More than that.

GORALSKI. Now, how many are being held by them?

JAMES. Now, we're talking about a total figure of missing, captured—the whole works. We're talking about just over sixteen hundred; of about sixteen hundred—one thousand six hundred and fifty, we're talking about here.

GORALSKI. They're missing?

JAMES. They are missing. That includes the whole thing.

Now, of the ones that we have very good reason to believe—like photos, like information that we've gathered from their side, like radio-releases that we've broadcast that we've heard from them themselves, like other prisoners who have been released who roomed with some of these people—we have reason to believe that they hold just under five hundred in the North alone . . .

GORALSKI. Doesn't include Laos, Cambodia or South Vietnam . . .

JAMES. In the South, we don't know because this situation—we have had a hard time pinning down anything. However, we are carrying a figure, for instance, of three that we know at one point was in their hands. And we can't get them to account for them or to even admit or add these names to any list.

GORALSKI. General, there's an organization that calls itself a National Committee for Lasting Peace. And they've put out some material. One of the statements made by the San Diego based organization is that, and I quote: "Victory is the only way to get our prisoners of war back. Because we did not win in Korea, three hundred eighty-four Americans are still being held prisoner in North Korea."

Is that true?

JAMES. We don't have anything to support that argument. We've heard it several times.

A presumptive finding of death has been made in case of these people by the government. And the government doesn't just leap to those presumptive findings. They constantly reevaluate. They gather information as well as they possibly can. And they did this for a long time after the cessation of hostilities. And they have found no reason to support, no evidence to support this allegation that there are some prisoners still being held in North Korea or elsewhere.

One thing that argues loudest against it is there would be no reason. They would have nothing to gain. Certainly there's no shortage of manpower hardly anyplace in the Far East or in Southeast Asia. And if they had held them this long, it would be reasonable that they would have made some sort of use to try to gain some gain from this, some advantage from this, or tried to offer them as some sort of bargaining prop.

But we have found things to support our contention that there are no more. Now, it's very easy to come by this. There are a lot of men who are missing on our list here that we might not be able to get an accounting for. Because if you could see some of the terrain that we flew over—as you know, right down here in Louisiana we lost a fighter aircraft, and it took us almost a month to find it. Well, some of the terrain that we flew over in the North would make that look like downtown New York, you see.

And when you fall in that canopy of trees with a small fighter plane and the canopy closes back, well, then that's the end of it.

GORALSKI. You had a chance last week, General James, to talk to some of the veterans who were protesting the war. They demonstrated here in Washington. Did you get any feeling from these veterans who wanted to get out of Vietnam of what their attitude was toward the prisoner of war issue?

JAMES. Woefully little. And that was one of the things that distressed me. But then I didn't see any veterans down there that were following General Olds around the skies of Vietnam, or any of that type really.

The men were shouting about ending the war now and getting out of Vietnam right now. You know, on this point, I want to make it perfectly clear that the steps and the direction and the means to get out of Vietnam have already been set by the government of the United States. And I find it very hard to see how people can not believe a government and a President and a Secretary of Defense who have never gone back on any of the promises or commitments that they have made when they're pulling people out of Southeast Asia on a monthly basis. They're winding the war down. You can check the figures that are there now and the figures that were there twenty months ago. And it becomes very evident that the course of action has already been set in the war in Southeast Asia and to get our prisoners back.

The other side is the side that's holding up the progress now. . . .

GORALSKI. Well, do you feel the peace groups. . . .

JAMES. . . . And we have plans for that.

GORALSKI. . . . Are the peace groups then retarding progress at this time?

JAMES. I would have to question their judgment, if not their motives. Because, you see, the other side can't help but gain comfort and surcease from these sorts of action. It's very hard, as in the case of some of the people who had on this show or have been on the various shows before, who find it so easy to find everything wrong with our gov-

ernment and nothing wrong with the other side. Now, there has to be some very warped thinking here, because nothing in this world is that black or white—excuse the expression.

But we find if you look at the facts that our government and our President and our Secretary of Defense and our Secretary of State are doing everything they can to wind down the war and to effect the release of the prisoners.

There are other things that are involved here. You know, our country. . . .

GORALSKI. I'm afraid we're not going to have time to get into this, General James. Our time is just about up.

Thank you very much. General Daniel James, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense handling prisoner of war issues at the Pentagon.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in commemoration of the 1791 Polish Constitution.

This Constitution, adopted just 2 years after the signing of the American Constitution, stands as a cornerstone of democratic principles. As the Constitution itself proclaims:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It is indeed tragic that the freedom promised by the constitution was so short lived. Despite all of the historical adverses, however, the freedom-loving spirit of the Polish people has not been suppressed. At every possible opportunity they express their love of liberty. I hope and pray that this spirit can maintain them until the time their country is liberated.

The Polish people can look back with pride on their impressive history of great contributions to our civilization. It is entirely proper that Congress today salute the Polish people and join with our Polish citizens in anticipation of the day when Poland can again live under the principles of their original Constitution.

TURKEY MOVES FORWARD

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the May 1 announcement of Premier Nihat Erim of Turkey that his government plans to buy up the entire 1971 opium crop in an all-out effort to eliminate the illegal opium market in his country marks a significant advance in the international effort to cut off the supply of opium at its source.

Since Turkish opium, once it is converted into heroin, supplies 80 percent of the heroin that enters the United States, this step by the Turkish Government marks a turning point in what has been a long and frustrating war against heroin.

Under the government of the preceding leader, Premier Suleyman Demirel, Turkey had purchased approximately half of the poppy crop, but the proposal announced by the new Premier, after only 4 weeks in office, would actually cut off the American supply of illicit opium.

The money to finance this project, which will come largely from the American Government, will be well spent. For, even if we must compensate Turkish farmers who can no longer grow opium, the cost will be less to us than the cost of maintaining addicts within our own population, whose destruction of their own lives is made possible by the illegal importation of heroin.

This move on the part of the Turkish Government is very much in line with the sense of cooperation I felt when I attended the IPU meetings in Caracas, Venezuela, last month. The Turkish representatives at the meeting were most willing to cosponsor with me a resolution which the IPU adopted unanimously and which called for increased international cooperation on the part of member nations. I have confidence that the seriousness of the problem for other member countries impressed the representatives from opium producing countries and that the Turkish representatives, at least, have communicated the intense concern of the international community to their Premier.

The readiness of the Government of Turkey to cooperate with the United Nations and the United States and to bring their country into line with the provisions of the United Nations Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 also gives me encouragement. Certainly this forward movement and willingness to cooperate shall be considered in any discussion of terminating military or economic aid to countries whose people may be making illegal shipments of narcotics. The point is that we now seem to be making steady progress in what has been up until now a baffling and frustrating area. The Turkish Government deserves commendation for its latest cooperative action, which will not be without some adverse domestic reaction in Turkey.

I submit for the RECORD an important article on this subject recently printed in the New York Times:

TURKISH PREMIER VOWS TO HALT ILLICIT OPIUM TRAFFIC

(By Terence Smith)

ANKARA, May 1.—Premier Nihat Erim pledged today to remove Turkish opium from the illicit market by licensing poppy cultivation and buying the entire 1971 crop.

In future years, the premier said, substitute crops will be introduced.

"We have made a decision on humanitarian grounds," Dr. Erim said at a news conference here, "to do everything possible to stop the growth of this poison."

It was the first time a Turkish Premier had publicly committed his government to the elimination of the illicit opium traffic. Last year the government of Premier Suleyman Demirel purchased approximately half the poppy crop, but 60 tons of opium, the raw material for heroin, still went into the illicit market.

United States officials have estimated that Turkish opium accounts for up to 80 per cent of the heroin smuggled into the United States. For the last several years, Washington has been pressing Turkey to reduce its crop and eliminate the illegal traffic.

Dr. Erim said that the United States had agreed to pay the cost, estimated at $5-million, of purchasing the 1971 crop. He also indicated that the United States had agreed to compensate the 170,000 Turkish farmers who will be compelled to switch to a less lucrative substitute crop.

Later, United States officials said that no specific agreements had been reached yet, but that Washington had expressed its willingness to compensate Turkey. Last year the legal sales of Turkish opium amounted to $420,000, although illicit traffic earned many times that.

The earnings of the illicit traffic frequently returns to Turkey in the form of arms that are sold to leftist anti-Government forces, according to Turkish sources. By eliminating the illegal opium traffic, the government hopes to curtail this flow of arms.

Dr. Erim, who was installed as Premier by the military four weeks ago, received a group of about 20 foreign reporters this morning in the hilltop residence of the Foreign Minister. Most of the American reporters were here in connection with Secretary of State William P. Rogers' trip to the Middle East.

LICENSING LAW SOUGHT

The secretary spent two days in Ankara attending the 18th annual foreign ministers conference of the Central Treaty Organization.

Dr. Erim said his government was pressing for parliamentary approval of a bill that would require licensing of all opium cultivation and the policing of traffic in the drug.

In the meantime, he said, the Government plans to buy the entire 1971 crop to keep it off the illegal market.

In response to American pressure, Turkey has gradually reduced the number of provinces in which opium poppies may be grown, from 21 in 1967 to four for 1972.

The new bill, if approved, would bring Turkey into line with the provisions of the United Nations Convention on Narcotics Drugs of 1961, which Ankara signed but has not implemented.

CONTROL OF AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTS PESTS BY INTEGRATED BIOLOGICAL-CULTURAL METHODS

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that directs the Agriculture Department to conduct pilot projects in the integrated approach to the control of pests—that is, by such techniques as insect sterilization and specialized farming practices.

This bill authorizes the Agriculture Department to spend $2 million a year for 5 years for such pilot projects, and authorizes an equal amount for use by the National Science Foundation to expand its fundamental research on integrated biological-cultural principles and techniques to control agricultural and forest pests.

This bill to encourage full-spectrum pest control is a companion measure to one introduced in the Senate by Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Senator JAMES ALLEN, and Senator LAWTON CHILES.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that neither the environment nor farm economics can withstand continued reliance upon chemicals to control the spread of agricultural pests.

As more and more chemical pesticides now in use are found to be harmful or ineffective and fall into disrepute, there will be tremendous need for alternative means of controlling agricultural pests.

We can avoid that kind of crisis by acting now to increase the amount of research being done on nonchemical control of pests and to follow up that research with badly needed programs of field testing.

To protect the interests of the environment and of the people who produce the Nation's food and fiber, we must devise new methods for dealing with the troublesome and often very costly pests that destroy crops and damage produce.

This bill is an effort to stimulate the application of new-found techniques to control pest infestations with minimum damage to the environment and to nontarget species.

It is an effort to expand our array of defenses against pests in order to strengthen the agricultural community, provide relief for those who have suffered needlessly because of pesticides, and enhance the quantity and quality of our agricultural production.

Mr. Speaker, while there is much controversy over the use of pesticides, even among those of us who are sponsoring this legislation, there is no controversy about the need to develop more effective pest control methods. Whether a man is for or against the use of individual pesticides, I believe he can support this bill as an attempt to increase government pest control efforts in a comprehensive way. And such efforts will benefit the farmer.

The importance of this particular research can be seen when it is viewed in light of a report by the American Chemical Society last year which indicated that the eradication of just three pests—the boll weevil, the boll worm, and the codling moth—could reduce the amount of insecticides applied annually in the United States by 40 percent.

It is important to note that while some research is being carried out to control the cotton boll weevil with nonchemical means, other research to gain knowledge about the control of this pest with nonchemical means has been put off.

Without sufficient funds and public interest for the continuation of this project and other projects like it, we cannot look forward to any day soon when we will have at hand alternative means to control certain pests which we attempt to control today with thousands of pounds of chemicals. It is my deep concern that we will not have alternative means of pest control available for the time when our farmers are told they must stop using one or another pesticide.

It is my hope that Congress will act swiftly in this area to prevent further senseless destruction of our Nation's crops and environment.

The text of the bill follows, together with a list of the cosponsors—Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. EVANS if Colorado, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. SEBELIUS, and Mr. ZWACH:

A bill to authorize pilot field-research programs for the control of agricultural and forest pests by integrated biological-cultural methods

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to carry out, through the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, pilot field research programs for the purpose of (1) developing and testing the control of agricultural and forest pests by the employment of integrated biological-cultural methods, (2) determining the economic and environmental consequences of predicting and modifying agricultural and forest pest populations through utilization of multidisciplinary and integrated biological-cultural methods, and (3) developing methods of collecting, handling, and interpreting data obtained from such field research.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reimburse farmers and ranchers for any losses sustained by them as a result of any research authorized under this Act being conducted on their lands, crops, or livestock.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of $2,000,000, and such sum as may be necessary for each of the five succeeding fiscal years.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of $2,000,000, and such sum as may be necessary for each of the five succeeding fiscal years for the purpose of expanding its fundamental research on integrated biological-cultural principles and techniques to control agricultural and forest pests.

ASSISTANCE TO WORKERS LOSING JOBS BECAUSE OF ABOLITION OF COAL STRIP MINING

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide special assistance to workers who lose their jobs because of the abolition of coal strip mining.

This bill would add an amendment and new title to the bill authored by Congressman KEN HECHLER of West Virginia to abolish the strip mining of coal—a bill which 80 other Members of Congress, including myself, have cosponsored.

The movement to ban strip mining is, I am pleased to say, gaining momentum every day. The fact that more than one-sixth of the Members of this House have cosponsored Congressman HECHLER's bill is certainly significant.

Last weekend, the board of directors of the Sierra Club, meeting in San Francisco, went on record in favor of a "total and immediate ban on all surface mining of coal," and agreed to put the abolition of strip mining on the club's list of legislative priorities.

Other environmental organizations, including Friends of the Earth and Environmental Action, Inc., have announced that they will actively push for enactment of the Hechler bill.

A bill to abolish strip mining received the strong support of West Virginia's Secretary of State John D. Rockefeller IV as it moved through the State Legislature recently, and although it was defeated, Rockefeller has expresed confidence that such a bill will become law within the next several years.

I am certain that other States which have been subjected to the ravages of strip mining, including my own State of Ohio, will face similar legislative battles in the near future.

I feel strongly that while a State-by-State approach to the problems posed by strip mining is a useful stop-gap, in the end it will prove to be neither efficient nor practical.

Abolition at the Federal level is the most sensible approach to this problem, which poses grave dangers for practically every State in the Union.

But as the Congress considers the feasibility of abolishing the strip mining of coal for environmental and economic reasons, we must also consider the effects on those men and women who depend on strip mining for their livelihood.

According to the most recent statistics from the U.S. Bureau of Mines, nearly 25,000 people in this country are involved in strip mining, either as miners, or as supervisory or technical personnel. In Ohio, 3,201 people are employed in the strip mining industry.

The bill I am introducing today would provide special assistance to these workers when strip mining is abolished. That assistance would come in several forms:

Priority in employment on federally funded projects to reclaim strip mined lands, as authorized in the Hechler bill;

Cash payments, normally for a 52-week period with extensions in certain cases. The cash payment would amount to 85 percent of the worker's previous weekly wage, but could not exceed 85 percent of the national average weekly wage in manufacturing;

Testing, counseling, training and job placement services provided for under any Federal law; and

Cash relocation allowances for an unemployed worker who is head of a family and who has found a job in another location. The payment covers basic moving expenses for the family, as well as a lump sum payment equal to two and one-half times the average weekly manufacturing wage.

Most of these provisions are based on the workers assistance program provided for by Congress in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to aid workers who are injured by an increase in imports resulting from a tariff concession. President Nixon recently used this program to compensate, retrain and relocate unemployed shoe industry workers. And a similar program was initiated by Secretary of Labor James Hodgson when workers lost their jobs because of the shift to the Amtrak railroad system.

After viewing strip mining and so-called reclamation firsthand, talking with people whose property and lives have been disrupted by strip mining, and reading and studying about strip mining,

I am convinced that abolition is the only answer.

But we cannot make these environmental decisions in a vacuum. Abolition will create significant hardships for many people.

Congress must recognize, and the environmental movement must recognize, that we owe to those displaced from their jobs and their homes a responsibility to help them get back on their feet, to find new employment, and to relocate if necessary.

Nothing would make the environmental movement more vulnerable to charges of "elitism" than failure to consider the human impact of their decisions—in this case the impact of abolition on thousands of workers.

Fortunately, the problem of stripmining is not the usual case. Here we are talking about eliminating an entire industry because of environmental considerations. In most instances, industries can produce their product without fouling the environment, and they can afford to clean up their manufacturing process without going bankrupt.

The cry of some companies that compliance with environmental laws and regulations will cost workers their jobs is the same kind of blackmail we have heard before whenever a new effort has been made to bring industrial practices in line with the public interest—be it minimum wages, fair labor standards, occupational safety or pollution controls. The fact of the matter is that for most industries, the cost of cleaning up represents a very small fraction of their total costs.

In the long run, abolition of stripmining will provide more jobs and a better life for all those who live with it. The physical and economic effects of stripmining have been well documented. We know that the irreparable devastation which stripmining leaves behind far outweighs whatever short-term economic benefits it may bring.

We also know that even these benefits are offset by immediate losses in terms of homes and farms destroyed, polluted wells and streams, loss of tax revenues and blighted landscapes.

But for those people—fortunately relatively few in number—who make their living from stripmining, who know of the hardships in finding other employment and who have families to support, there is no time for such considerations. the bill I have introduced today is an effort to ease those hardships.

The bill can be perfected, I am certain. There are no doubt other means of assistance, and other areas of potential employment which should be considered. I am hopeful that the House Interior Committee will hold hearings on this bill, and all the other stripmining proposals before it, so that these questions can be explored.

THE DOLLAR CRISIS AND WEST GERMAN DEFENSE

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and chagrined to learn of the action of the Central Bank of West Germany which has precipitated an external devaluation of the American dollar.

It seems to me that this action has created the need for an immediate and massive withdrawal of American troops and dependents from defense installations in West Germany. The cost of "defending" West Germany has contributed to the inbalance of American dollars.

One of the most effective ways to bolster the dollar in Western Europe is to reduce the tremendous expenditure of American taxpayer dollars in providing 300,000 troops and 213,000 dependents to defend West Germany.

It is time that West Germany undertake a more substantial cost of its defense.

ELMO BURNS ROPER

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Elmo Burns Roper, the public opinion analyst who was among the first to develop modern political polls, died on April 30.

A student of public opinion since the 1920's, Mr. Roper spent more than 35 years as a full-time analyst of popular attitudes toward public issues, political candidates, and manufacturers' products.

Elmo Roper first came to national attention with his remarkably accurate prediction of the 1936 presidential election. While rival pollsters were forecasting a Landon victory, he predicted Franklin D. Roosevelt would win with 61.7 percent of the vote. When the ballots were finally tallied, Mr. Roper was off the mark by only 1 percent.

Mr. Roper continued his success in accurate predictions of presidential elections in 1940 and 1944, both within 1 percent of the actual outcome. In 1948, however, his streak was broken, as he, along with most of the pollsters in the Nation, forecast Thomas E. Dewey as the victor over President Harry Truman.

Despite his notoriety for predicting election results, Mr. Roper cared more about people and finding out ways to provide them with more information about subjects that affected them.

In addition to election polls, he did public opinion research for Fortune for 15 years and wrote a syndicated column. He was also an editor at large of the Saturday Review.

We all owe Elmo Roper a debt of gratitude for his contributions to our understanding of the thoughts and desires of the American people. We will sorely miss him. I extend to Mrs. Roper and his son, Burns Roper, my deepest sympathy.

At this point, I include an article by Martin Weil from the Washington Post of May 1, citing the life and accomplishments of Elmo Burns Roper, Jr. I am also including the obituary from the May 1 New York Times:

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1971]

ELMO ROPER, OPINION POLLSTER, DIES

(By Martin Weil)

Elmo Burns Roper, 70, one of the founders and leading practitioners of modern marketing research and public opinion polling, died yesterday in a Norwalk, Conn., hospital after a long illness.

A student of public preferences since his days as an Iowa jeweler in the 1920s, Mr. Roper spent more than 35 years as a full-time analyst of popular attitudes toward public issues, political candidates and manufacturers' products.

The writer for many years of a syndicated newspaper column and the Fortune Survey, which began in 1935 as the first published opinion poll, he surveyed voter preferences from the Roosevelt through the Nixon administrations.

In 1936, Mr. Roper came within 1 per cent; in 1940, within 0.5 per cent, and in 1944, within 0.2 per cent, of predicting Franklin D. Roosevelt's percentage of the popular vote. It made him a national oracle.

Mr. Roper and his friends and rivals, George Gallup of the Gallup Poll and Archibald Crossley of the Crossley rating, became the nation's best known pollsters of the time.

But the major polls foundered in 1948, when Harry S. Truman defeated the late Thomas E. Dewey in one of the most startling upsets in American political history.

In that year, Mr. Roper had stopped polling in September with the assertion that further polls were purposeless since it was clear that Mr. Dewey would win.

Polling techniques were changed after 1948 to take account of George Gallup's suggestion that failure to keep questioning voters up to election day made it difficult to detect shifts in voter attitudes.

A good humored Nebraska native, Mr. Roper was not reluctant to admit his errors.

In 1960, he wrote that he was "convinced that it was the Gallup Poll and ours that were more responsible than anything else for the do nothing campaign' that Dewey waged in 1948."

He added: "I also think the polls lulled many Dewey supporters into complacency and caused them to play golf on election day."

Mr. Roper noted that he had at times considered giving up pre-election polls, which he had once called "a socially useless function."

However, he explained, he continued political polling because "it gives us such a wonderful opportunity to calibrate the instrument we are trying to help perfect."

As did a number of others, his polling techniques depended essentially on attempts to gauge the attitudes of the public as a whole from interviews with a sample.

Mr. Roper expressed the belief that the polls' main purpose should be to educate, and to "point out areas of ignorance . . ."

Although some have sought to elevate the status of opinion surveying to that of a science, Mr. Roper maintained that there is a considerable amount of art involved.

"Predictive polls," he maintained in 1957, require too many "judgmental decisions" in addition to a certain amount of "political sagacity" to be accorded scientific status.

In the area of marketing research, Mr. Roper showed skepticism toward the theory of "motivational research" that sought to link acceptance or rejection of a product with deep-seated psychological drives.

He appeared at a debate on the subject before the American Association of Public Opinion Research in 1955 wearing a medical gown and calling for the creation of a square egg.

Parodying the theories of motivational research, he asserted that square eggs are needed because while normal eggs look and taste good, they are prone to roll, thereby creating deep-seated feelings of insecurity.

In his prime, Mr. Roper was described as a lean, quiet six-footer, with curly brown hair parted in the middle, brown-eyed and bespectacled, with a pleasant thin-lipped face.

A Democrat, he raised funds for candidates of both parties, and applied to them "Roper's Law."

According to the law, if an officeholder agreed with him 60 percent of the time he was pleased, 75 per cent delighted and 90 per cent concerned.

He asserted that he did not believe that thinking men could agree so often.

Born July 31, 1900, in Hebron, Neb., he attended the University of Minnesota for one year and then studied moral philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, in Scotland, but never obtained a degree.

In 1921, he returned to the U.S. to open a jewelry store in Creston, Iowa.

Although the store did well, he set out to learn why it did not do even better, and concluded that he was trying to sell what he liked, not what his customers did.

Studying their preferences, he decided he did not want to sell "the kind of jewelry the Iowa farmers liked," and so gave up the store in 1928 to begin selling clocks.

After five years of sales success in which he carefully queried his customers as to their likes and dislikes, he gave up selling and entered marketing research full time.

According to a close associate, Mr. Roper, who conducted many surveys in recent years for major corporations, always regarded himself as half marketing consultant and half public opinion analyst.

Although the newspaper column was discontinued, Mr. Roper conducted and published a number of studies of public attitudes in recent years, through Elmer Roper and Associates and Roper Research Associates.

A major study of opinion leaders, made in 1966, showed a growing concern with environmental issues, considerably before the question of ecology had aroused wide public interest.

Another recent survey sought to determine the social responsibilities of business, a topic of major interest to Mr. Roper, who sat on the board of directors of a wide variety of corporations and foundations.

He maintained offices in New York and lived in West Redding, Conn. Survivors include his wife, Dorothy; a son, Burns W., four grandchildren and a great-grandson.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1971]

ELMO ROPER, POLLSTER, IS DEAD; PREDICTED 1936 ROOSEVELT VICTORY

WEST READING, CONN., April 30.—Elmo Roper, the public opinion analyst who was among the first to develop modern political polls, died today in Norwalk Hospital at the age of 70.

IMPORTANT IN POLITICS

Elmo Burns Roper Jr. acquired national fame in 1936 for creating what was to become a 20th-century phenomenon in political forecasting—the scientific poll. Adapting the sampling techniques he had developed as a marketing consultant, he predicted with remarkable accuracy the re-election of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Along with his rivals, George Gallup and Archibald Crossley, Mr. Roper became an increasingly important figure in the world of politics. As polling became a staple of campaigns, pollsters, as they came to be known, proliferated. Louis Harris, currently one of the leading practitioners, got his start in the Roper organization.

Mr. Roper's technique consisted of using a cross-section of the public that was comparatively small but carefully picked to be as representative as possible.

The 1936 Presidential election was his most sensational triumph. He predicted the Roosevelt victory with 61.7 per cent of the popular vote. When the vote was tallied, Mr. Roosevelt had received 60.7 per cent.

Meanwhile, the rival Gallup and Crossley polls found themselves embarrassed by their predictions that Alf M. Landon, the Republican, would be the winner.

Again in 1940 and 1944 Mr. Roper predicted within 1 per cent Mr. Roosevelt's margin of victory. But the streak was spoiled in 1948 when, along with almost all the other pollsters, he forecast Thomas E. Dewey as the victor over President Harry S. Truman.

He was wrong again in 1960, but not by much. With John F. Kennedy defeating Richard M. Nixon by one of the closest margins in history, Mr. Roper's margin of error in picking a Nixon victory was only slightly in excess of 1 per cent.

However, even before the Truman upset, Mr. Roper had come to consider simple predictions as "socially useless."

He was more interested in his finding that the "average" citizen was often uninformed on vital matters of public policy. He argued that opinion polls could explore those areas of public ignorance to see where more information was needed.

When the public had sufficient facts, he said, "it is likely to steer just as wise and fair a course as that plotted by any of its leaders."

Mr. Roper was born July 31, 1900, in Hebron, Neb. After graduating from high school there, he attended the University of Minnesota and the University of Edinburgh.

He started his business career by opening a jewelry store in Creston, Iowa, in 1921. Seven years later, he gave up the store to become a clock salesman. He said later that one of the reasons he was able to make a good living at that job during the Depression was his technique of polling his customers on their likes and dislikes in clock styles.

Mr. Roper came to New York in 1933 and became a partner in a market research firm that did polls for various products. The firm, which eventually became Roper Research Associates, Inc., was engaged by Fortune magazine in 1935 to survey public opinion on broader issues and Mr. Roper was on his way.

SYNDICATED A COLUMN

In addition to election polls, Mr. Roper did public opinion research for Fortune for 15 years. He also wrote a syndicated column and was an editor at large of The Saturday Review. During World War II he served as a deputy director of the Office of Strategic Services.

Mr. Roper retired from his firm in 1966 although he retained the title of senior consultant. In recent years he had lived in his big Colonial home in West Redding.

Last February, in one of his last interviews, Mr. Roper spoke with a visitor about the swamp, once owned by the photographer Edward Steichen, outside his home. Mr. Roper was among the residents who contributed to an investment group that purchased some of the Steichen land for use as a community recreational area.

Looking wan and tired but still mentally alert, Mr. Roper noted that the neighborhood might become a little noisier when the recreation area opened. "But the swamp will be good for kids," he said. "And I'd rather have people than housing developers."

His widow, Dorothy, and a son, Burns, survive.

A funeral service will be held at Mr. Roper's home Monday at 2:30 P.M. A spokesman for his organization said the eulogy would be delivered by Senator Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho.

THE CONSTITUTION SCORNED

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 weeks, thousands—hundreds of thousands—of men and women have come to Washington. They shared a common purpose. To bring home—again—their determination that the immoral, misguided war in Southeast Asia end.

They have been hardened and saddened by the harsh realities of the death and destruction which continue in Southeast Asia. They understand, and seek to correct, the injustices which distort this Nation—the endemic racism which perpetuates unequal education, unequal jobs, unequal opportunity; the continuing failure of governmental institutions—both executive and the legislative—to address the needs of the people by providing an end to the war, decent housing, adequate income, quality education, and sufficient food; and the repressive streak of those in power, who view dissent as a challenge, not as an expression of the constitutional freedoms which they so cavalierly respect.

This week in Washington thousands have had demonstrated to them, first hand, the very failures which they have deplored. I certainly do not condone violence or the destruction of property. Those who violate the law accept the consequences the law prescribes. However, the law does not prescribe dragnet arrests and illegal detentions.

This week in Washington witnessed a breakdown in the legal process. More than 10,000 people have been arrested. That is indeed a staggering number; I have heard some refer to it as some sort of historic watershed of police enforcement. I find it historic, but not as a mark of the legitimate workings of the legal process. Rather it constitutes a wholesale violation of constitutional guarantees.

Dragnet arrests were employed to sweep clean areas of the city. I spent a number of hours this week at the Washington Coliseum, where several hundred prisoners were being detained. Many of them told me that they had been entirely innocent of wrongdoing. One law student was taken into custody while walking to class. A Presbyterian minister was taken into custody while walking down the street. A young man and woman were taken into custody while walking together. A reporter from the Washington Post was detained, as was a reporter from the Washington Evening Star. An employee of the House of Representatives, sitting on the Capitol Grounds yesterday, was detained. Two young people who questioned why they could not cross a street were detained.

I do not want to make any untoward comparisons. But, as an attorney, as a former assistant district attorney, and as a citizen, I can only say, this is not American justice.

For most of the thousands detained, there were not even any charges against them. For many, the police have been unable to produce specific evidence of criminal behavior—in many instances because, in fact, there was no such behavior.

Many citizens against whom no formal charges have been lodged nevertheless have been photographed and fingerprinted, imprisoned for hours and even days. Last night my legislative assist-

ant, an attorney, went to the Coliseum. Hundreds of people were being denied the right to speak to an attorney, or to even make a telephone call, until they acceded to being fingerprinted and photographed.

I think the American Civil Liberties Union well hit the mark by terming the police procedures adopted "martial law characterized by the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus."

The abuse of the court system similarly is reprehensible. On Tuesday evening Chief Judge Harold Greene of the superior court ordered the release of those who had been detained in custody whom the police could not link directly to specific offenses. And yet his order was delayed until yesterday morning pending an appeal, when the police themselves have privately admitted to me and to others that most of the cases could not stand up in court.

What this all amounts to is the suspension of constitutional liberties. It cannot be condoned; it cannot be justified—and that includes the praise which the President has so generously bestowed upon the District of Columbia police. The Constitution protects the people; it is not a piece of paper to be tossed aside for the sake of police expediency.

Some pose the issue as a conflict between individual rights and society's rights. This misses the mark. When the rights of the citizens are violated or sacrificed, it follows that the rights of society fall.

This week in Washington we have seen the Constitution undermined by the forces of legal authority. Next week, unless the people of this Nation fully realize what has happened here, it could happen in another city. And the week after, in another. And what is the result? Increased alienation; increased division.

Those in power continue the war—the underlying immorality which has, as evidenced this week, tainted so much of this Nation's life and attitudes. They continue their disdain for constitutional liberties. And America continues to bleed—through the veins of her young men in Asia, through the veins of their brothers and sisters at home, and through the veins of our brothers and sisters in Asia.

This is a sad time for America.

At this point, I am including an article which appeared in the May 5 edition of the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Mass Arrests Tarnish Public Image of Policy," and written by William Basham; an article which appeared in the May 6 edition of the Washington Post entitled "Protests Point Up Conflict of Rights," and written by Haynes Johnson; an article from the Washington Post of May 5, entitled "Mass Arrests Directed by Justice Department," by Sanford J. Ungar; a news story from the May 5 edition of the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Appeals Panel Upholds Prisoner Release Order," and an article from the Washington Post of May 6, entitled "Controversy Mounts Over Arrests Here," by Sanford J. Ungar:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 5, 1971]

MASS ARRESTS TARNISH PUBLIC IMAGE OF POLICE

(By William Basham)

For the first time in recent years, the arrest tactics of the Metropolitan Police Department during a massive protest have brought serious criticism.

In the past, the department has enjoyed a national reputation for fairness in handling large numbers of demonstrators. But this week the comments are not laudatory.

The primary criticism is over the department's decision to drop its procedure of making out arrest forms and photographing arrested persons at the scene of an offense Police claimed that they had to dispense with normal procedures because of the vast number of anti-war demonstrators arrested within short periods of time.

METHODS ARE ATTACKED

Also under attack are the department's methods of carrying out arrests. Police were observed at Dupont Circle yesterday threading their way through persons dressed in business suits and systematically arresting youthful pedestrians who had long hair and wore odd clothing.

In the past, demonstrators usually have commended Chief Jerry V. Wilson for his men's performance. It was generally observed that Wilson gave the youths a fair shake when he could. But this week, few demonstrators know exactly what kind of nonviolence activity will set off arrests.

An affidavit filed yesterday by the police in Superior Court said more than 400 field arrest forms were filled out by officers Monday during the disruptions of rush-hour traffic. But 6,580 arrests actually were made that day.

GOAL ACHIEVED

To police and the Justice Department, the tactics were successful. They got thousands of trouble-makers off the streets. Moreover, they were locked up for lengthy periods of time because they were not permitted to post collateral for the relatively minor offenses.

But to several judges and civil libertarians, the mass roundup of American citizens on the streets of the Nation's Capital was an outrage. Demonstrators were not being told why they were arrested, learning only that charges would be made out at a later time, they charged.

Professor Roger R. Kuhn, who teaches a course in "current problems in civil rights" at George Washington University, was standing near the school's student center on Monday as police began an arrest sweep through the campus.

Kuhn, in sworn testimony at Superior Court, said he wore a legal observer armband and was taking notes when an officer bumped him.

"He accused me of bumping him," Kuhn said, "and I was arrested." He said the badgeless and nameless officer gave no reason for the arrest, filled out no form and herded him with the others to the lockup.

Many other officers without badges and nameplates were observed on Monday by Star reporters.

Aside from their argument that a citizen is placed in jeopardy merely by being out on the street during demonstrations, civil rights lawyers have pointed out that "arrests of convenience" are quite likely to be thrown out of court because defendants who ask for trials know that there is literally no information linking them with arresting officers or a specific offense.

Attorneys with the Public Defender Agency and the American Civil Liberties Union have demanded the immediate release of the roughly 3,000 persons remaining in the various city lockups this morning. They maintain that emergency situations, particularly when the demonstrators were not attacking police or civilians, do not excuse the government from following the law.

EATON CRITICAL

The legalities of this week's police actions are still being argued in court today, but President Nixon already has personally commended the city for its handling of demonstrators. The District City Council praised the police force for its role in keeping the government running.

The President's thanks were delivered by telephone to Mayor Walter E. Washington. But the Rev. David Eaton, chairman of the D.C. Human Relations Commission, bitterly criticized the arrest procedures, then said the mayor was left out of the decisions on how police would proceed.

The handling of demonstrators at one point yesterday caused a police lieutenant to admit that "these arrests are shaky," but he hastened to add that they served their purpose by defusing a potentially explosive situation.

Presumably the arrest tactics have the blessings of Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell. "We want to make these cases stick," Wilson said yesterday.

But a great many people are waiting to see how that statement and the action of his men can be made compatible in the eyes of the law.

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1971]

PROTESTS POINT UP CONFLICT OF RIGHTS

(By Haynes Johnson)

Abraham Lincoln: "It has long been a grave question whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of its citizens, can be strong enough to maintain its existence in great emergencies."

That old American dilemma has never been more clearly in focus than this spring week in Washington. The demonstrators have made their protests, the government has survived, but citizens everywhere are wrestling with disturbing questions in the latest aftermath of massive acts of civil disobedience.

"At 8:30 the other morning I was radicalized and deradicalized and then confused about what I thought," said one Georgetown woman, recalling her reaction at witnessing clashes between police and protesters and then the destruction of her own property—first her trash cans and then her car.

The basic question involves probably the most delicate, complex and central theme of American life—rights. Citizens' rights and society's rights. The right to assemble peacefully and petition the government for redress of grievances, and the right to move freely without impairment. The rights of a majority—and a minority. The right to due process of law, and the right to be free from excessive bail or be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment.

All of those came into direct conflict this week in the streets and prison compounds and courtrooms of Washington. They have left Washington a troubled city.

Over lunch and in offices, citizens can be heard discussing a number of aspects growing out of the demonstrations. Citizens at home are calling newspapers to report, often emotionally, one horror story after another—about a protester or a passerby or a prisoner. They have been telling about people manhandled, detained, their personal property taken and not returned.

The past few days have seen two distinct sides to those reactions.

Monday's shut-down-the-government demonstration brought a strong reaction

from citizens whose rights to go to work or to a hospital or a bank or a store—and the right to have their property secure—were affected.

It also brought an equally strong reaction from citizens and protesters alike who were caught in the massive-arrest tactics employed by police.

Citizens have been arrested on unspecified charges. For many, the government has been unable to produce specific evidence of criminal behavior. Many citizens against whom no formal charges have been lodged nevertheless have been photographed and fingerprinted, imprisoned for as long as 18 hours without being allowed to contact their families, and then freed after posting collateral. Their police records may follow them through life.

Those tactics have led the American Civil Liberties Union to charge that the police procedures adopted amount to "martial law characterized by the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus."

Other tactics—those employed by the demonstrators—have come under sharp criticism, and often from demonstrators themselves. It has been common this week to encounter groups of protesters debating quietly among themselves about the methods and strategy of their movement.

Often, the end result has led to only more confusion over the question of rights, both theirs and society's. Sometimes, they came down to a kind of us-against-them thinking. A college student demonstrating outside the Justice Department on Tuesday had said it was all right to take illegal actions because he felt it was, after all, "their law," not his.

Then he went on to ask a different kind of question. "Do you think," he asked, "that the American general in Vietnam was right when he said, 'To save the city we had to destroy it'?"

What has been clearly emerging amid all the anger and confusion is a sense of the continuing deep division among Americans. This week, some of the worst fears of both poles—those who fear lawlessness and those who fear police-state-type oppression—have come close to being realized. The events in the streets and the police precincts and detention centers appear to have driven the two farther apart.

"I think they ought to give it to them," said a Washington merchant. "There's no excuse for this kind of lawlessness. These are kids that, well, that don't know the seriousness of what they're doing. It all goes back to what a lot of psychologists told their parents: 'don't interfere with the children.' These kids need discipline. They need law and order."

A protester, trying to thumb a ride to New Jersey, gave another side. "I was clubbed twice, gassed, and thrown into that concentration camp," he said heatedly, "and I would like the country to know that I came here nonviolently and that we have a police state here in America."

Then there are those citizens in the center who say what happened to them has brought about a dramatic change in their own attitudes.

"I used to be a Republican until yesterday, and now I'm an anarchist," said the assistant personnel manager of a downtown department store as he was released from the makeshift detention center at the Washington Coliseum.

He said he had left his home near George Washington University about 8:30 a.m. Monday and was arrested 20 minutes later. He had gone inside the student union there to escape tear gas exploding around him, he said, and was swept up in the police dragnet outside as he stepped out the door.

"I was not told I was under arrest," he said, "and I have not been advised of my rights whatsoever. I haven't been able to sleep here. I didn't think this could happen to a D.C. citizen. I just can't let this go. They've deprived me of my personal liberty."

He added, by way of personal qualification, that he is a four-year veteran of the Marine Corps. He voted for Richard Nixon twice.

One citizen, interviewed Monday in Georgetown during the disturbances, expressed a less emotional opinion, but from a larger perspective.

"It's producing so much more frustration," he said. "I don't think it's going to produce anything positive for either side. This is not going to end the war, and it's probably going to harden positions on both sides. You get increasingly extreme positions from both sides on something like this."

[From the Washington Post, May 5, 1971]

MASS ARRESTS DIRECTED BY JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

(By Sanford J. Ungar)

The Justice Department decided early in this week's antiwar protests to employ mass arrests to insure public safety and protect "the lives and property of law-abiding citizens," even if the arrests were of questionable legality, a high Justice official said yesterday.

The official said that standard arrest procedures that "would result in solid court cases" were abandoned after the weekend when it "became apparent that the process was taking too long."

Out of that policy have grown a record number of arrests on unspecific charges and a heated controversy over their validity and effect.

The American Civil Liberties Union charged yesterday that police had "made indiscriminate sweep arrests, catching up in the dragnet many persons not engaged in violating the law and others whom they could have no possible way of prosecuting and convicting."

Confronted with such accusations, the Justice Department official, who asked not to be identified, said that "when you arrest 7,000 people you're bound to get a few who shouldn't be there."

Shortly before midnight, Chief Judge Harold H. Greene, of the D.C. Superior Court, ordered the immediate release without collateral of all demonstrators still in custody for whom the government could not produce specific evidence of criminal behavior.

However, early this morning three members of the D.C. Court of Appeals agreed by telephone to stay that ruling until 7:30 a.m.

They will then hear an appeal from the corporation counsel's office.

C. Francis Murphy, corporation counsel, appealed Greene's ruling by contacting Alexander Stevas, clerk of the Court of Appeals, who, in turn, reached the appellate judges by telephone. Lawyers for the D.C. Public Defenders service who sought the hearing before Greene, were not involved in the telephone communications.

In his decision ordering release of the demonstrators, Greene ruled that they still would have to submit to fingerprinting and photographing but that any information gathered could not be used "to constitute an arrest record" and "shall not be disseminated to the FBI unless there is an actual conviction.

He ordered the information turned over to the Superior Court and said it would be destroyed after 90 days if there is no conviction.

He also ordered that demonstrators who refuse to submit to the fingerprinting and photographing be brought before the Superior Court between noon and 5 p.m. today for arraignment.

Ruling on another issue, Greene enjoined Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson from imposing a collateral schedule and said that all defendants would be brought before his court instead for bond hearings. That ruling was also stayed.

The major problem continued to be the several hundred persons held at the Washington Coliseum who refused to pay collateral as permitted by the police, on the grounds that they were illegally arrested.

The Justice Department, in close communication with the White House, has kept a watchful eye on police, who changed policy yesterday and reinstituted special field arrests techniques developed after the 1968 civil disorders.

To insure compliance of the metropolitan police department with strategy developed under the leadership of Attorney General John N. Mitchell, sources said, a deputy assistant attorney general from the Tax Division of the Justice Department has been the constant companion of Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson.

In addition, high-ranking court sources confirmed yesterday, a Justice Department aide concerned with District of Columbia affairs, Donald E. Santarelli, has served as a liaison with the city's courts.

Superior Court itself operated with almost unprecedented slowness yesterday in handling those who had not gone free on collateral after Monday's arrests or who were among the estimated 2,000 arrested yesterday.

By 2:30 p.m., only 60 persons arrested Monday had been brought before judges sitting yesterday. It took until 5 p.m. for the city's corporation counsel to charge 89 arrested yesterday morning with disorderly conduct.

Of one group of 150 brought to the court lockup in the morning, seven were charged, and the other 143 were released for lack of evidence.

There was a flood of protests, to the courts, other city officials and reporters, about continued irregularities in police procedure despite a 5:30 a.m. order by Wilson to use field arrest forms and instant photographs in all arrests.

Some of those set free on collateral contended that information was included in their record that did not reflect accurately the conditions of their arrest.

In some station houses, the line for "arresting officer" on the field arrest forms, filled out belatedly during detention, was crossed out and replaced by "court officer." A single policeman would then sign a batch of forms, including many for people whom he did not arrest.

At the show-cause hearing before Judge Greene, three Justice Department lawyers, testifying under subpoena, said they had gone to the coliseum Monday night to aid in processing the persons held there.

The names of seven policemen were placed on field arrest forms in simple rotation, they said, and the spaces for time and place of arrest were left blank.

Norman Lefstein of the Public Defender Service argued that the government had decided to round up thousands, place them in confinement and say, "If we take our time, perhaps we'll come up with something on which to charge them."

A controversy was also brewing over the police decision to photograph and fingerprint many persons against whom no formal charges were lodged or who went free on collateral.

Under standard District police procedure, as elsewhere, such fingerprints are routinely submitted to the FBI's identification files and never removed unless the arresting police specifically ask that they be sent back.

Among those freed on bail were Rennie Davis, leader of the Mayday group that planned this week's protest, and John Froines, a codefendant with Davis in the Chicago Seven conspiracy trial.

Davis was arrested Monday and Froines

yesterday on federal charges of conspiring to violate the civil rights of citizens and to interfere with federal employees.

U.S. Magistrate Arthur L. Burnett set bail for Davis at $25,000 and for Froines at $10,000. Each was released after posting 10 per cent of that amount.

Sources said that the case against them and unspecified others were developed under the direction of Robert Mardian, assistant attorney general in charge of the Justice Department's Internal Security Division.

Although preliminary matters are being handled by the U.S. attorney's office, Mardian apparently plans to have his own assistants prosecute the case.

Two other representatives of Justice's Internal Security Division were observed at Superior Court yesterday. Court sources said they were combing lists of those processed for hearings to determine whether more serious charges might be filed.

Sources at the Justice Department said that all the major decisions on handling the crisis of the past several days were made during long strategy sessions held at department headquarters on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Most of the sessions were attended by Mitchell; Deputy Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst; Santarelli; L. Patrick Gray III of the department's Civil Division; John Dean, counsel to President Nixon; either Chief Wilson or the general counsel, Gerald Caplan, of the police department, and either Deputy Mayor Graham Watt or Corporation Counsel Francis Murphy.

At an initial meeting Monday, a basic decision was made to try to "keep those arrested out of circulation" for at least 12 hours after their arrest, sources said.

For this reason, the sources added, no attempt was made to streamline the presentation of cases in court, although Judge Greene had at first established round-the-clock sittings of Superior Court judges.

The desire to keep people "out of circulation" was also offered as the basis for the delay in a police decision to revert late Monday to the system of freeing some of those arrested after they posted $10 collateral.

Several local officials insisted that the city government had nothing to do with arrrest policy.

The Rev. David H. Eaton, chairman of Washington's human relations commission, said at a press conference that "every source I've been able to check shows (the mass arrest decision was) made by the President of the United States, passed on to Attorney General Mitchell to Kleindienst to Chief Wilson. The mayor was not consulted in any way whatsoever."

The ACLU charged that the procedures followed amounted to "martial law, characterized by the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus."

However, Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D-N.C.), chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, praised the police for "a rather fine job."

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 5, 1971]

APPEAL PANEL UPHOLDS PRISONER RELEASE ORDER

The D.C. Court of Appeals today upheld an order by the Superior Court chief judge compelling city police to release anti-war demonstrators they have had in custody since Monday but whom they cannot link directly to specific offenses.

At midnight, Judge Harold H. Greene ordered that anyone whom the police were holding without a field arrest form drawn up at the scene of the alleged offenses should be released immediately. A three-judge appellate panel had held up the ruling pending a hearing this morning.

Only about 200 of 6,580 demonstrators arrested Monday on disorderly conduct charges remained in custody at the Washington Coliseum by the time of the decision.

Those for whom police do not have field forms—which include photographs and fingerprints—must be released immediately if these demonstrators consent to being photographed and fingerprinted, and supply their names and addresses.

Those who do have field forms must be sent to Superior Court for arraignment by 5 p.m. today, according to the court order.

After Greene's midnight ruling, police released about 650 demonstrators. However, a panel of the appellate judges suspended the order about 1 a.m., for the hearing this morning.

They upheld Greene's position at 10:45 a.m., but overturned a related ruling that the arrest records must be destroyed for those whom the government cannot convict.

The order does not mean that charges are dropped.

Police yesterday arrested 2,680 demonstrators—about 2,000 outside the Justice Department. Chief Jerry Wilson ordered them held without collateral, and most of them this morning were in lockup cells at courts and police precinct houses.

During the arrests, police were seen methodically making out field arrest forms, as ordered earlier in the day.

Three Democratic members of the House, including District Del. Walter E. Fauntroy, accused the Nixon administration of permitting a massive breakdown of the legal process in Washington by ordering mass arrests in order to break up the demonstrations.

Democratic Reps. Robert F. Drinan of Massachusetts and William F. Ryan of New York, along with Fauntroy, said today it is not necessary to sacrifice constitutional rights of individuals, even to stop disorders.

Fauntroy said neither he nor the city government had been consulted by the Justice Department in making a decision to make mass arrests. This conflicted with a statement by Police Chief Jerry Wilson accepting responsibility for the decision.

The three also blamed the administration for failing to make provision for adequate detention facilities for those arrested, and each said he knew of many cases of innocent persons being arrested.

"This simply is not American justice," said Ryan, while Drinan, a former dean of the Boston College law school, asked the administration whether it will apologize to the innocent persons arrested and expunge their arrest records.

The question of whether demonstrators can post collateral had put the superior court's chief judge and the police chief at loggerheads. At issue is whether Wilson had overstepped his powers by ordering his clerks not to accept collateral. Greene had, in effect, ruled that Wilson did so, because he did not consult with the judges beforehand.

The legal skirmishes generated mass confusion at the Coliseum early today.

After Greene's order to free demonstrators not specifically charged, a young man in blue denims said:

"They just told us to get out—they just rushed us out. And they said if we didn't move out, we had better watch out or we would be arrested for failing to move on."

John Mathews, a Star reporter, spent 7½ hours at the U.S. District Court cellblock in a small detention cell which held 106 persons. Just before 9 p.m., the prisoners were served two bologna sandwiches. The cell had a drinking fountain and a toilet.

At about midnight Mathews and the others in the cell were fingerprinted and processed, then channeled to smaller cells. For another 6½ hours Mathews and 65 others were in another tiny cell.

The young demonstrators worked out a sleeping arrangement in which they lay head to toe, in sardine-like fashion. Because of the lack of space, about a dozen had to stand up, while the others slept. Communal living dominated the prison life with everybody sharing puffs on cigarettes, water and sandwiches.

The prison personnel were praised by the demonstrators. The officers, who have been working long shifts for two weeks, were friendly and cooperative and tried to ease the discomforts of the overcrowded cellblock, which contained an estimated 900 demonstrators, probably three times its capacity.

The first prisoners boarded buses to go to court arraignments at about 8:30 a.m., some 16 to 17 hours after their arrests. Mathews was released at about 11 a.m., almost 20 hours after his arrest. Most of the demonstrators, however, faced many more hours of processing through the courts before their release. Those without bail money also faced the possibility of added time in jail.

Some of the protesters in the cellblock had head wounds, which they said were inflicted by riot police who waded into their sit-down protest at the north end of 10th Street near Pennsylvania Avenue. One demonstrator said that for a few minutes the front line of the riot police "seemed to lose control" and attacked the unresisting demonstrators with their heavy oak riot sticks.

Cellblock personnel arranged as quickly as they could for the injured protesters to be treated by doctors at the cellblock or at D.C. General Hospital. One demonstrator, however, said that it took about five hours for him to be treated for a gash on the scalp. Since the wound had clotted without treatment, the doctor told the demonstrator that he would not stitch the cut, and gave him a tetanus shot to prevent disease.

The arrested young protesters were particularly annoyed that for up to 20 or more hours they were unable to get to a telephone to inform relatives or friends of their whereabouts.

One youth said that some of those released had mixed up the photographs and fingerprints to foil police efforts to track them down later.

Before the appeals court today, Barbara Bowman, director of the Public Defenders Service, sharply criticied the act of holding those still in the Coliseum.

"These 200 are people against whom the government has no case," she said. "This is not a small deprivation of liberty. Conditions are terrible. People are being kept in conditions that animals in slaughterhouses aren't kept in."

Legal aid attorneys have complained that toilet facilities were stopped up and that there was not enough food.

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1971]

CONTROVERSY MOUNTS OVER ARRESTS HERE

(By Sanford J. Ungar)

Washington Post Staff Writer

Controversy mounted in Washington's legal community yesterday over procedures used by police and other local and federal officials in arresting, detaining and processing persons during the militant antiwar demonstrations of this week.

A bitter feud developed between the city's courts and the police about who was responsible for setting policy in resolving thousands of arrest cases.

Joined by the American Civil Liberties Union, a former federal prosecutor called for empaneling of a special jury to consider whether the constitutional rights of those arrested had been violated.

Chief Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals, acting as chairman of the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia, named a former White House aide to hear a study of whether a three-year-old pro-

gram for mass arrests during civil disturbances had been followed.

After permitting hundreds arrested Monday to post $10 collateral that night, under a court order police again stopped accepting collateral Tuesday morning and said all arrested persons would be taken to court.

At 7 last night, more than 1,000 people arrested Tuesday still were being held awaiting court action.

The last 250 prisoners arrested Monday were removed from the Washington Coliseum at 3 p.m. yesterday and were sent to court.

Some had spent as much as 55 hours in custody. New prisoners were sent to the coliseum on Tuesday and yesterday.

Complaints about court congestion and delays, as well as sanitary and health conditions in emergency detention facilities, continued to pour in.

Meantime, a three-judge panel of the D.C. Court of Appeals ruled that fingerprints and other identifying information concerning everyone arrested here this week—including those held without field arrests forms—must be submitted to the FBI.

Lawyers protesting that decision bounced back and forth between the city's local and federal courts, and U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard A. Gesell announced a hearing for this afternoon on whether the FBI should be banned from disseminating such information to employers.

PETITION DISMISSED

At midnight last night, Superior Court Judge Alfred Burka dismissed a habeas corpus petition filed at 10:30 p.m. by the D.C. Public Health Association charging that an epidemic threatened the prisoners. This came after Dr. Albert Braverman of D.C. General Hospital told a press conference sponsored yesterday by the health association that "there is the potential of a scarlet fever epidemic."

Burka's dimissal came after he received assurances that the number of prisoners in the District Court cellblock—the origin of the complaint—was being reduced and that medical aid was available.

At 1:15 this morning, Judge Burka dismissed a petition filed by the American Civil Liberties Union that contested the arrests at the Capitol on the grounds that the crowd assembled there had a constitutional right to do so. Burka said in his dismissal that, if he heard the ACLU arguments, he would be trying the cases of those arrested in advance; he said the lawfulness of the arrests should be argued in trials.

Two other habeas corpus petitions before Judge Burka early today became moot when the prisoners they concerned were delivered to Superior Court for bond hearings.

In the Nixon administration's first formal response to criticism of the mass arrest procedure, an assistant attorney general told a North Carolina audience that "the circumstances were extraordinary" Monday, justifying suspension of normal law enforcement standards.

William H. Rehnquist, of the Department's office of legal counsel, said that the procedures developed out of a balance between "the needed authority of society to protect itself against crime and prevent violence" and "the right of the individual . . . to a speedy hearing in which he will be advised of the charges against him."

White House Press Secretary Ron Ziegler said at an afternoon briefing that President Nixon feels "the D.C. police force dealt with a very difficult situation in a very competent and appropriate way."

Pressed by reporters, Ziegler added that "the President feels strongly that the Constitution should be followed" in controlling civil disturbances.

In letters to Bazelon, Chief Judge Harold H. Greene of D.C. Superior Court, and Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.), Washington attorney Robert Robert L. Ackerly contended that the orderly functioning of government without disruption "was accomplished by a suspension of constitutional guarantees and civil rights by the chief of police."

A former Assistant U.S. Attorney here, Ackerly said he was "shocked and sorely distressed that the police can with impunity, sweep the streets and then receive the support of the courts, which not only set high bonds but practically eliminated the effectiveness of habeas corpus."

Ackerly suggested that a special grand jury be established, on the model of one in Chicago that investigated the deaths of two Black Panthers during a police raid in late 1969. He suggested that it be led by a specially named prosecutor.

Ralph Temple, of the ACLU Fund, concurred in Ackerly's proposal.

But Thomas A. Flannery, U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, said that "I see no basis for such an investigation."

Bazelon had no comment on Ackerly's letter, but it was learned that on Tuesday he had named Stephen J. Pollak, formerly President Johnson's adviser on D.C. affairs, to head a Judicial Conference Committee on "justice under emergency conditions."

Other members have not yet been named to the committee, but it was understood that Washington attorney Lloyd N. Cutler, chairman of the original group, would serve with Pollak.

The Cutler committee originally recommended the field arrest procedure for civil disturbances, which was abandoned by the metropolitan police during the unprecedented arrests of Monday. It since has been reinstituted.

Police and courts exchanged charges yesterday over who should be held responsible for the extreme delays in processing arrested persons.

In a sharply worded opinion, Judge Greene criticized the police for vacillating earlier in the week on whether to permit collateral to be posted by those arrested.

No sooner had Superior Court judges begun setting $250 bond in demonstration cases (as requested by police), Greene said, then the police switched and reinstituted collateral instead of bringing people to court.

"The court was placed in an untenable position," Greene said, "of either setting bonds that were meaningless—since no one would agree to court processing if he could be released at the precinct for a nominal amount—or of having constantly to adjust its bond policies to follow the everchanging tactical line of the police department."

Police department general counsel Gerald M. Caplain, on the other hand, denied that police had taken cases to court slowly, blaming delays on defense lawyers for allegedly advising their clients not to cooperate.

Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson was critical of local judges for leniency in dealing with protesters previously. "I suspect some of the problems this week might have been averted," he said, "by some jail terms last week."

Assistant Attorney General Will Wilson, chief of the Justice Department's criminal division, appeared personally in Superior Court yesterday to argue against release of persons who had been held in the Washington Coliseum.

Two judges dismissed all charges against that group.

Early yesterday, a three-judge panel of the D.C. Court of Appeals upheld Judge Greene's ruling at midnight Tuesday that persons held at the Washington Coliseum without specific details of their offenses must be released.

They struck Greene's provision, however, that fingerprints and other identifying information could not be sent to the FBI's files and should be destroyed unless charges were developed within 90 days.

Later in the day, the Appeals Court refused to grant a stay of its decision regarding the arrest records.

The Public Defender Service then brought its case before Judge Gesell, who has been sitting on similar matters related to the FBI's policy of distributing such material.

Denying a request for a temporary court order, Gesell said, "the court must take into account that this community is in a near state of siege, and I do not think it would be appropriate . . . to take steps to impede the chief of police."

He scheduled a further hearing for today, however on whether records should go to employers.

THE STRIP MINING BILL

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, an unsually perceptive analysis of the vital issue of the strip mining of coal, and proposed legislation dealing with the practice and effects of strip mining, is contained in the April 16–30, 1971, issue of Coal Patrol written by the distinguished Kentucky correspondent Thomas N. Bethel:

STRIP NO MORE?

A major confrontation is slowly shaping up in Washington between the strip-mining industry and conservationists who want it abolished. Congressman Ken Hechler's abolition bill (H.R. 4556), which would require a complete phase-out of all stripping within 6 months after passage, now has nearly 80 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives, and an identical bill (S. 1498) is being pushed in the Senate by Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin and George McGovern of South Dakota.

Growing numbers of conservationists in major coal-mining states are pulling together their limited resources to support Hechler's proposal (formally titled the Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act of 1971). Growing national awareness of ecological problems has given the abolition effort a thrust it couldn't have achieved four or five years ago, and chronic optimists in Washington are talking about it as an idea whose time has come.

If so, however, coal industry spokesmen haven't gotten the word. The industry is cranking up an unprecedented publicity/advertising/lobbying/pressure campaign, aimed straight at key Congressmen and Senators and at a general public which knows relatively little first-hand about stripping.

Stripping is booming for 3 basic reasons. First, the country's skyrocketing energy needs have given coal production of all kinds a new lease on life (coal is the basis of more than half the nation's electrical output, and about half of all production goes to power plants); second, it's cheaper to strip coal than to deep-mine it, and the techniques, skills, and engineering involved are much simpler; third, the passage of the 1969 Coal Mine Health & Safety law, with its relatively tough safety regulations for deep mines, made strippers out of many deep-mine operators who couldn't or wouldn't pay the increased costs of safety. Strippers escape any kind of federal regulation, since previous efforts to enact federal legislation have failed and reclamation is the exclusive concern of the states.

Conservationists claim that, by and large, state regulation of stripping has been a joke, thanks to the normal tendency of coal-state legislatures to succumb to the highest bidder. The coal industry bids high—lobbying with great skill and inexhaustible funds when the occasion demands—and the result, according to abolitionists, are a string

of state laws which have done nothing to protect the land from destruction. Examples:

Kentucky: Pressured by conservationists, the state passed a supposedly tough strip-mine law in 1966; controversies have raged ever since over its enforcement. Meanwhile strippers tore up nearly twice as much land in 1970 as in 1969 (23,000 acres for 1970, 13,000 in 1969), and early figures for 1971 show the trend continuing; in the first 3 months of the year, 29 new operators applied for permits, according to state reclamation director Elmore Grim. Grim's field inspectors (12 new ones have just been hired in an effort to keep up with the strippers) are reporting major problems with mudslides on "reclaimed" mountain slopes, and Grim complains that permit applications coming in now are in areas "where the coal is not very good, where the coal is located in critical areas, where it's difficult to mine safely." Nevertheless the state rarely denies a permit, and anyone with the money for reclamation bonds—generally, $200 per acre—can get into the business.

West Virginia: The state's 1967 stripping law was hailed as a triumph for conservationists. It wasn't partly because enforcement was left to the pro-industry state department of natural resources. Supported by secretary of state Jay Rockefeller, conservationists fought for outright abolition in this year's legislative session. Despite broad public support, they were beaten by the industry's massive propaganda campaign, which tended to ignore ecological arguments and concentrated instead on the jobs that would be lost in poverty-stricken West Virginia if the industry were banned. A compromise law, passed in the last few moments of the session, banned stripping in 22 counties where it has not yet begun (12 have no strippable coal, however, and 6 have deposits considered uneconomical to mine, so the law really restricts mining in only 4 counties—not much of a compromise, seen in that light). Strip operations are under way in 28 counties and damage, according to state foresters and others, is overwhelming. State resources director Ira Latimer admits that "we've committed some terrible acts to this state and its resources" but invariably defends the strippers and believes some regulations are too tough—in some areas he would favor allowing stripping on slopes steeper than 33°, the present limit, even though his opposite number in Kentucky, Elmore Grim, says that would mean uncontrollable slides and destruction of watersheds. "Each application should be judged on its merits," Latimer says, arguing that since coal is the state's key industry, he has an obligation to assist its development wherever he can. Faced with this kind of attitude, conservationists have vowed to fight for abolition again in 1972.

Ohio: Reporting to its members on stripping in Eastern and Southeastern Ohio, the state AFL–CIO newspaper reports that "from the roadside it looks like the remains of a terribly devastating nuclear war, and from the air it resembles the barren surface of the moon—desolate, lifeless, and miles of nothing but deep trenches and mountains of rubble and rock." Led by the giants of the coal industry, Peabody and Consolidation, at least 150 companies are currently ripping up 27 counties. The result, according to a recent *New York Times* report: "an upheaval of terrain unmatched since the glaciers of the last ice age." The state's strip-mine law, written by the industry in the 1940's and updated in 1965, is considered hopelessly vague by conservationists. Pennsylvania's reclamation director, William Guckert, describes it as "a phony, an insult to the people of Ohio." The strippers invest heavily in brochures full of color pictures demonstrating their rare instances of successful reclamation, but occasionally they reveal their true feelings—as when Consol vice president J. D. Reilly described conservationists as "stupid idiots, socialists, and Commies." (He has since been quietly retired.) Consol's reclamation director for Ohio, Arthur Wallace, is less prone to Red-baiting, but equally adamant; "There's no question that we're upsetting the earth," he told the Akron *Beacon-Journal*, "but this was never good agricultural country." So much for God and Nature.

Strippers have a whole batch of arguments assembled and ready for use when the going gets hot. Some of their big guns:

1. "If you do away with stripping you'll put thousands of men out of work." Since the coal industry has killed more men than any other, its rare statements of concern for workers' welfare should always be approached with caution. All the same, Congressmen and state legislators listen closely to any argument that suggests disgruntled men might be going to vote against them. However, even by the industry's own estimates there aren't more than 25,000 men working for strippers nationwide. Most of these men aren't miners at all in the strict sense of the word; they're heavy-equipment operators, with skills that could be shifted to highway, construction, and public-works projects (when and if the U.S. drops war-making long enough to get around to such items). Further, if strip-mines were replaced by properly operated deep mines there would be more than enough new jobs to go around, since deep mines require greater numbers of men for the same tonnage of coal. (Job stability would almost certainly be higher, too, since most major new deep mines have 15–30 year life expectancies, vs. 3–5 years for the average stripping job.) In any event next week Rep. John Seiberling (D., Ohio), a co-sponsor of Hechler's abolition bill, will introduce legislation designed to assist any workers who might be thrown out of work if the abolition bill becomes law. According to the Congressman, his bill will include "cash payments, retraining, relocation allowances, and special consideration in obtaining jobs for strip miners in areas for which they are particularly well trained, such as reclamation of strip mined land, and heavy construction."

2. "A ban on stripping would mean the lights would go out all over the country." Coal industry spokesmen are fond of talking up the nation's alleged "energy crisis," citing last year's widespread brownouts and blackouts as evidence that the U.S. is barely keeping up with its fuel requirements. According to Carl Bagge, president of the National Coal Association, "to prohibit strip mining in 6 months would be to guarantee widespread blackouts of electric power in less than a year." Coal, in his view, is "too important to the nation's future to be hamstrung by its more extreme critics" (an attitude with a parallel in White House attitudes toward war protests). As Baggs knows, however, the energy crisis is at least partly the industry's own invention. If domestic consumers were really faced with an emergency situation, the coal industry wouldn't be exporting nearly 60 million tons every year, as it is now. (That's enough coal to supply New York City for the next 7 years.

(On a nationwide basis, its' enough to stockpile all the coal-burning plants for 2–3 months.) In fact, coal production is running more than a million tons per week ahead of last year, stockpiles are building up, and shortages are less likely than they were a year ago. Nevertheless, if the utilities are seriously troubled about upcoming power demands, they could begin to remedy the situation by doing less advertising. New York's Consolidated Edison announced this week that it would cut out all advertising designed to promote consumption, and henceforth would stress power conservation. The other utilities show no signs of following suit.

According to the Federal Trade Commission, they did more than $304,000,000 of promotional advertising last year and will, if anything, increase that figure in 1971. (During the same period, they put into effect rate increases of more than $360,000,000, while spending less than one-fourth of one per cent of their profits on research. This is a crisis?) Fear-generating statements like Bagge's neglect not only facts such as these, but also ignore the fact that the coal industry is developing major new deep mines at an unprecedented rate and would be developing even more if it anticipated a stripping ban; nothing holds back the development of such mines except the industry's dogged refusal to accept, voluntarily, limits on destruction of the environment.

From 1910, when the Bureau of Mines was created, until 1969, when the new Coal Mine Health & Safety law was enacted, the industry successfully resisted 20th-century safety practices in its deep mines; the signs are that it expects the same half-century-plus period of grace with its stripping operations. Anything less than that produces dire threats of a national power crisis.

3. What are you so upset about? We already do a good job of reclamation." This is a claim that the industry is well-equipped to push—not because it's true, but because all you need to push it is a large supply of cash and a stack of carefully composed full-color photographs. With those in hand, you can bury the abolitionists in a sea of advertising, and that's what several energetic companies have been doing. United States Steel, which devastated Big Black Mountain in Kentucky and never reclaimed an inch of it, puts a couple of employees in hunting outfits, complete with shotguns at the ready, and photographs them knee-deep in weeds on an old strip job; the caption, carefully written, stresses "potential hunting areas" on reclaimed land, without actually suggesting that any game exist there. The photograph runs on a magazine cover. . . . Another company stocks a well-silted pond with fish and photographs two intrepid anglers catching them. The photograph runs in dozens of pro-industry weekly newspapers. . . . Probably the most energetic company in the propaganda sweepstakes is Bethlehem Steel.

Faced with a rising chorus of opposition to its current stripping operations in West Virginia and Kentucky, the company has been running full-page color ads in *Time, Newsweek,* and other magazines touting its reclamation at Fishpond Lake—a small body of water created *by* an earlier strip job. "The ad made strip-mining seem such a public spirited and beautifying enterprise," wrote columnist Pat Furgurson in the Baltimore *Sun,* "that I just had to come down to have a look at Fishpond Lake." Furgurson found evidence that the ad was deliberately misleading; you had to work for the proper camera angle, and "don't look left or right . . . coal slides into the water, scars in the mountainside . . . beer cans and gritty dust blowing from the irreparable gash in the slope opposite." He also pointed out that Bethlehem contributed only the land; the state of Kentucky paid for the dam and the lake. Elsewhere, he looked at another "model" Bethlehem reclamation project: "Little grows there but weeds."

Even where reclamation looks reasonably good, that's only part of the story. The tearing up of the earth leaves internal injuries that may not be visible, but the patient still dies. On April 10 the U.S. Geological Survey released the results of an 11-year project in which the agency studied a 25-square-mile section of Kentucky in which a relatively small-scale stripping job had been carried out.

Despite a superficial re-growth of greenery in the affected area, the agency found that apparently permanent damage had been done to streams, fish, animal life, and the area's tree-growing capacity. The report carefully refrains from passing judgment on

stripping, but the evidence is overwhelming, and, as one of the report's editors told the New York Times, "this is a study of a disaster." He could have added that it is a disaster much of which would be missed by the casual observer: bushes and grasses grow (enough to serve the purposes of an industry publicist), but no animals run among them, no birds nest in them, and in the streams that flow past, filled with silt, no fish swim.

Acid mine drainage still befouls the water more than a decade after the last ton of coal was pulled out, and the destruction of the topsoil (already largely destroyed by decades of unrestricted lumbering practices) has been so complete that no forests will grow there again in our time—if ever. As many foresters and professional conservationists have testified, this is the pattern of stripping wherever it goes on. Bethlehem's cheerful response, straight from the advertising copywriter: "We need lots of coal, and we must mine it where it is . . ."

Faced with this kind of attitude, strip-mine abolitionists are digging in for a hard fight. They are learning through bitter experience that the coal industry has limitless financial resources available for propaganda, and powerful connections in Washington. Bagge, the National Coal Association's new president, got himself appointed to the Federal Power Commission by Lyndon Johnson and served a stretch there before becoming chief lobbyist and spokesman for the industry.

Not long ago, making preparations for NCA's annual convention this June, he lined up such speakers as Sen. Henry Jackson, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, who can—if he wants—block hearings on the strip-mine abolition bill; Rogers Morton, Secretary of the Interior, who will be the administration's spokesman on how much regulating it wants to do; Elburt Osborn, director of the Bureau of Mines, who is on record as opposed to federal control of stripping; Sen. Robert Byrd, Democratic whip, who has never been known to vote against the coal industry; and Ed Edmondson, Democrat from Oklahoma whose House Interior Subcommittee on Mines and Mining will be holding hearings on federal regulation of stripping.

The assorted speakers will address themselves to the common theme of the convention: "Out of the Past Comes the Future." Hard to argue with that—but it's a message that abolitionists, recuperating from previous defeats in various state legislatures, will do well to ponder, long and hard.

THE HECHLER BILL

Congressman Ken Hechler's Abolition Bill is the strongest of more than a dozen surface-mining regulation measures that have been introduced thus far in the 92nd Congress. "A halt to strip mining," he argues, "will be a valuable investment in the future productivity of the soil, protection of our water supply, the saving of forests and streams, prevention of floods, the saving of the property of home-owners and, above all, the preservation of the total environment."

Unlike regulatory measures introduced by other Congressmen and Senators, the Hechler bill affects only coal. It prohibits the development of any new strip mines after the date of enactment and requires all mines then in operation to close down within 6 months. Enforcement responsibility is given to the new Environmental Protection Agency rather than to the Department of Interior (which has regulatory control over deep mines). Operators of active strip jobs at the time of enactment must submit comprehensive reclamation plans within 60 days. States are required to submit, within one year, environmental control plans for underground mines. The federal government is authorized to pay up to 90% of the cost of reclaiming abandoned strip mines; citizens are authorized to file class suits if necessary to force the states or the federal government to carry out their various responsibilities under the law. The act is applicable nationwide, including all federal and Indian lands.

The administration's proposed regulatory bill, introduced in the Senate by Sen. Byrd of West Virginia with the support of Sen. Henry Jackson, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, is a much weaker measure, drafted with the active assistance of lobbyists at the National Coal Association. The bill (H.R. 4704 in the House, S. 993 in the Senate) allows states two years to submit plans for environmental control, and the federal government would keep hands off unless the states missed their deadlines. It does not require regulation of stripping on federal or Indian lands, and there is no provision for reclamation of abandoned stripping sites. The states could ban stripping in areas where "adequate" reclamation is impossible, but since the states already have this authority, and since the definition of "adequate" is left up in the air, the chances of abolition would be nil.

Without exception, other bills introduced in both houses of Congress go no further than current state regulations, which are considered inadequate by most conservationists even when strenuously enforced. Most of the bills were drafted with the aid of industry lobbyists in Washington, and reflect the National Coal Association view that regulation is best left to the states, with the federal government in a supporting role—paying the costs of research and experimental reclamation techniques, for example. The NCA's spokesman, Carl Bagge, in conversations with Sen. Jackson and others has called the Hechler bill "drastic and irresponsible"—a view echoed by Jackson when he attacked "environmental extremists" determined, so he said, to sacrifice economic growth to ecology.

The Hechler bill is likely to receive serious consideration in Congress only if it receives widespread support from citizens in stripped areas of the U.S. They have been flooding Hechler's office with letters of support, but it may be that some of their letters should he directed to the Congressional committees which, so far, have been reluctant to hold hearings on abolition. On the Senate side, Sen. Henry Jackson, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, is the key man to reach; on the House side, his opposite number is Rep. Wayne Aspinall.

A 100TH BIRTHDAY SALUTE TO HUNTINGTON

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward with a great deal of pride and anticipation this weekend of participating in one of a series of year-long festivities marking the 100th birthday of my hometown, Huntington—the largest city in West Virginia.

This will truly be a great weekend with scores of bands, a huge parade and ceremonies for our guest of honor—Gen. Chuck Yeager of the Air Force, an old friend from Hamlin, W. Va., the first man to fly faster than sound, and who is flying to Huntington for the weekend celebration.

An excellent article describing the growth and progress of Huntington since its founding in 1871 appeared in a recent edition of International Nickel magazine. It was written by Robert Hinerman, who wears two hats. He is mayor of Huntington and is also a top employee of International Nickel Co. which is observing its 50th anniversary in Huntington and which has contributed so much to the city's growth and progress.

The article, which follows, also includes a foreword by a distinguished West Virginia colleague in the Senate, the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD:

SHARING AN ANNIVERSARY OF PROGRESS

(By Robert E. Hinerman)

FOREWORD

(The City of Huntington is rich in history and bright in promise. For the veterans of the French and Indian War who first settled in the area, the accessibility to waterways and lush green hills and valleys meant a good life of hunting and fishing. Today, this same terrain provides pleasant surroundings for the city's nearly 75,000 residents—and the waterways have made Huntington one of the busiest river ports in the United States.

The 100-year-old city's potential for further growth is characterized in far-reaching concepts such as the urban renewal program now in motion. With 60 per cent of America's markets located within a 500-mile radius, the geographic location of Huntington has proved valuable to companies like International Nickel. For these firms, as for the city itself, the second 100 years seem to hold as much potential as did the first century.—Robert C. Byrd, United States Senator, West Virginia.)

In the Ohio River Valley of West Virginia is the stately city of Huntington. A stranger passing through the city is quickly struck by an almost unique sense of urban spaciousness. The handsome parks, the wide streets, the plentitude of greenery, the overall neatness that meets the eye, reflect a strong and long-lived sense of community.

This year, Huntington is celebrating its centennial. Sharing the anniversary and celebrating one of its own is International Nickel's Huntington Alloy Products Division, a citizen industry that for fifty years has been an integral part of the life and growth of Huntington.

A CITY IS BORN

Veterans of the French and Indian War first settled in this area about 1775. In the earliest years, pioneers gathered timber booms in great rafts about the mouth of the Guyandotte River, and for a time the region yielded thousands of animal skins. Nearly a hundred years later, the city itself came into being under the auspices of the man for whom it is named: Collis P. Huntington. His Central Pacific Railroad had barely been linked with the Union Pacific when Huntington turned his attention eastward to the Chesapeake & Ohio, a railway system being constructed between the Atlantic Ocean and the Ohio River.

Under Huntington's direction, the C&O was reorganized in 1869. By 1870 he had selected a site for the western terminus of the railroad, and work began at both ends of the track. That winter the railroad magnate commissioned Rufus Cook to design and lay out the new city. Cook, a famous engineer from Boston, laid out some 5,000 acres nestled in the westward nook of the Guyandotte and Ohio Rivers. The carefully constructed grid pattern, with its many broad streets and wide avenues, was duly recorded and on February 27, 1871, the City of Huntington was granted her charter by the West Virginia Legislature.

AN ABUNDANCE OF RESOURCES

Today Huntington is a city mature in accomplishment but young in promise. At age 100, it can look back with satisfaction—

with a sense of community achievement, and forward—with a sense of purpose, and the knowledge that today is the sum of what it has been, and the firm foundation for what it will become.

Much of Huntington's promise for the future remains her legacy from the past. These include the invisible but abundant underlying resources of the region: oil, salt, stone, sand, coal, clay, and gas, along with abundant water, timber, and transportation. Resources that are not tangible include a resilient spirit and unending resourcefulness.

The city has much. It is, for instance, a regional medical center, with eight hospitals and nearly 3,000 beds. Marshall University provides a steady flow of young ideas and a host of highly specialized skills. Huntington also has a marvelous cultural center in the Huntington Galleries, and it is well on its way to becoming the convention center of a considerable transmountain region. Whether on the hills or in the valley, this is also a city of homes, and of more than 1,000 acres of city parks and recreation areas. It is a city that gives one a sense of spaciousness and calm amid much purposeful activity. Huntington is a city of churches—nearly a hundred of them—and of countless civic, cultural, and charitable organizations.

CONTINUING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Construction activity in Huntington has been spectacular, with building permits doubling, tripling, and quadrupling in a three-year period. Huntington's trade area includes some 600,000 people, and retail sales are well over the two-thirds-billion-dollar mark in the area. Wholesaling has been established since pioneer days, and the city has been a financial center since its founding. Some 75 per cent of the industrial firms in Huntington sell nationwide and 22 companies have international sales departments.

Local government in Huntington has provided the climate for continuing economic development in the area. The city operates under a city manager and mayor-council form of government, with joint city-county civic boards for recreation and health.

AN INCOMPARABLE SITE

Fifty brief years ago, when Huntington Alloys came to the city, Huntington was able to offer itself as an almost incomparable industrial site. A moderate climate and a touch of Southern serenity at first belie the fact that this city near the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains is also a key to the geographic reality of the Ohio River Valley. The city is closer to Chicago than to Atlanta, and no farther from New York than from Savannah. In a radius of 500 miles is contained 60 per cent of the nation's markets and over 50 per cent of its population.

As Inco engineer W. L. Wotherspoon wrote in the 1920s soon after the new plant was built: "This territory covers the intensive manufacturing districts of the United States, with Chicago and St. Louis in the West, and New York and Philadelphia in the East. Huntington occupies a central geographic position in the territory and is also close to extensive natural resources, especially coal and natural gas."

Thirteen important railroads were connected within 175 miles of Huntington. And the Ohio River provided additional easy accessibility to extensive markets. Excellent labor, plentiful fuels, adequate power, first-rate transportation, equable climate, plentiful water and all needed supplies, a strategic location, and pleasant living conditions: Huntington offered them all, and in 1920 Inco found and purchased a 76-acre industrial site.

IN A DUSTY CORN PATCH

With the end of World War I in 1918, Inco had launched a project to establish new markets for nickel and began searching for the best possible site for an anticipated refinery and rolling mill. The company set up a rigorous schedule of economic and environmental factors and spent two years conducting an intensive survey. Its search established Huntington as the clear choice. The new site, where a bumper crop of corn then grew, was bounded by the Guyandotte River within a mile of its junction with the Ohio, and was directly accessible to the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad.

The following year, in March 1921, as the city celebrated its Golden Anniversary, ground was broken for the Huntington Works. A great productive plant rapidly took the place of a dusty corn patch. The new works started operations in May 1922, and by the end of the year production had reached 3,850,000 pounds. In 1923, the first full year of operation, production was up to 16,000,000 pounds. The new plant had cost $3.5 million, and the entire production during the first year was devoted to two products, Nickel 200 and MONEL alloy 400, which remain today important members of the Division's product line.

As the city surged confidently into its second half century, the infant industry at first took hesitant steps as new men learned the intricacies of operating new machinery. But soon the people of Huntington found that the new industry was right in step with them.

A MAJOR INDUSTRIAL CITIZEN

Over the years, the product line has grown from two to more than fifty different nickel and high-nickel alloys produced in the largest mill complex in the world devoted exclusively to the production of such alloys. These products set the standard in industries that depend on them, and the world has watched Huntington products in action during such dramatic and historic happenings as Apollo 11's trip to the moon.

During this time, too, employment has grown from a few hundred to some 3,000. Huntington Alloy Products Division has earned its place as a major industrial citizen of Huntington. Today, 50 years removed from the dusty corn patch where it began, the Huntington Division pours about $40 million a year into the economic mainstream of the area, including nearly $30 million paid to employees in wages and salaries.

A 50th Anniversary is, after all, a special thing. And Huntington Alloy Products Division can take special pride in noting their growth and accomplishments during these years, a time of challenges met that holds forth promise of a bright future.

A SELF-RENEWING SOCIETY

For Huntington, this centennial year is also a time for taking stock. The men and women of the city are eager to preserve the machinery of their society that works so well here, a "family feeling" for one's own neighbors, neighborhood, city, and region. Their values have been well tested. Yet theirs is a self-renewing society, ready to change where change is for the better.

The core area is ready for a change of that sort. A cleaning out and tearing down. A rebuilding. Private investors and the city plan just that, with renewal activity already underway. There is an expressed determination to create a city that continues to grow with the sort of planning that will make it an ever better place for people to live.

It has been in this city that Huntington Alloys has grown from a fledgling, experimental plant to become the major producer of specialized high-nickel alloys in the Free World. The Division has grown in an atmosphere of steadily developing and continuing accomplishment in Huntington, a city whose next hundred years are likely to be as bright as the Division's most highly polished product. As a corporate citizen, the Division is especially proud to carry the name of Huntington.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MOORHEAD, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POWELL) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ESCH, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBISON of New York, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEGICH) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina to extend his remarks following special order today of Mr. BETTS.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POWELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURKE of Florida in two instances.

Mr. WARE.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia.

Mr. BIESTER.

Mr. MYERS.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.

Mr. REID of New York in three instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in three instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. RUPPE.

Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in four instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. ROUSSELOT.
Mr. KEATING.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEGICH) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. ASPIN in two instances.
Mr. DENT.
Mr. RANGEL in two instances.
Mr. BEGICH in three instances.
Mr. KARTH in two instances.
Mr. ALBERT in two instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.
Mr. REUSS in six instances.
Mr. RYAN in five instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON.
Mr. RARICK in five instances.
Mr. SCHEUER in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. PODELL.
Mr. FISHER in three instances.
Mr. BOLLING.
The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOORHEAD) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. GARMATZ in two instances.
Mr. HAGAN in two instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.
Mr. CAFFERY.
Mr. ASHLEY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1204. An act to amend section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, to allow certain service to be credited for purposes of civil service retirement; to the committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4246. An act to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits and economic stabilization, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1260. An act to amend the Small Business Act.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 5, 1971 present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5674. An act to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to provide an increase in the appropriations authorization for the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 10, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

685. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

686. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

687. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting copies of the determination of the President No. 71–12, waiving the $75 million ceiling on the aggregate of the total amount of military assistance, cash and credit sales, credit guarantees and loans, excluding training, to Latin America, pursuant to section 33(c) of the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

688. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

689. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contains in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

690. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the improper use of enlisted personnel, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on improved manpower management in the Federal Government; (Rept. No. 92–184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 8190. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 92–187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7616. A bill to amend section 715 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of contributory negligence on claims involving members of the National Guard; (Rept. No. 92–186). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Stephen C. Yednock; (Rept. No. 92–185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. PELLY):

H.R. 8140. A bill to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 8141. A bill to provide Federal revenues to State and local governments and afford them broad discretion in furnishing training and employment opportunities needed by individuals to qualify for satisfying and self-supporting employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABOUREZK (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. GRAY):

H.R. 8142. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to completely exempt certain farm vehicles and farm vehicle drivers from the provisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABOUREZK (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LINK, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 8143. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to completely exempt certain farm vehicles and farm vehicle drivers from the provisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABOUREZK (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SLACK, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 8144. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to completely exempt certain farm vehicles and farm vehicle drivers from the provisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 8145. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to extend its coverage to certain additional counties; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 8146. A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, to provide for the removal of names from mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 8147. A bill to prohibit display of the flags of the Vietcong and the Government of North Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRON (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DORN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KING, Mr. LENT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. NEDZI):

H.R. 8148. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Antietam National Battlefield in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRON (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. DANIELSON):

H.R. 8149. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Antietam National Battlefield in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 8150. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, section 204; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 8151. A bill to establish a national system of solid waste management; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 8152. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require recipients of grants for regional medical health programs to provide for reasonable public access to information concerning such programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DANIELSON, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 8153. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 8154. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 8155. A bill limiting the use of publicly owned or controlled property in the District of Columbia, requiring the posting of a bond for the use of such property, and setting penalties for the violation of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 8156. A bill to establish an executive department to be known as the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 8157. A bill to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injury from hazardous products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 8158. A bill to require the protection, management, and control of wild free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. SEBELIUS):

H.R. 8159. A bill to authorize pilot field-research programs for the control of agricultural and forest pests by integrated biological-cultural methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 8160. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the purpose of developing and improving communication procedures and facilities with respect to the prompt and efficient dispatch of police, fire, rescue, and other emergency services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 8161. A bill to provide a program for honoring industry and other private efforts to contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 8162. A bill; National Public Employee Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. POFF):

H.R. 8163. A bill to establish a Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 8164. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8165. A bill to provide that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 8166. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with States, local agencies, and individuals in the planning and carrying out of practices for water yield improvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8167. A bill to assure an opportunity for occupational education (other than that resulting in a baccalaureate or advanced degree) to every American who needs and desires such education by providing financial assistance for postsecondary occupational education programs, and to strengthen the concept of occupational preparation, counseling, and placement in elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8168. A bill to establish an executive department to be known as the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 8169. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for severely handicapped persons and persons in attendance, when the severely handicapped person is traveling with such an attendant; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 8170. A bill to provide increased unemployment compensation benefits for Vietnam era veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 8171. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for international drug control assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8172. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 8173. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal employees health benefits program to unmarried children who are dependent, full-time students; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 8174. A bill to provide for the control of surface and underground coal mining operations which adversely affect the quality of our environment, to provide readjustment assistance if workers are adversely affected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STOKES:

H.R. 8175. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for a pension of $100 per month for unremarried widows of men awarded a Medal of Honor posthumously; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 8176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in communications with legislative bodies, and committees and members thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request) (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. SATTERFIELD, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 8177. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 8178. A bill to amend titles 39 and 18, United States Code, to prevent a seller or publisher from mailing goods, materials, or publications (or a bill therefor) to any individual pursuant to a purchase order or subscription bearing such individual's name without first confirming that such individual in fact sent the order or subscription; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8179. A bill to transfer to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs the administration of the United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act and other laws which were transferred to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (Department of the Interior) by Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 8180. A bill to extend the Export Administration Act of 1969, to encourage diplomatic efforts to improve international monetary mechanisms, to eliminate certain foreign investment controls, to establish a Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8181. A bill to require Federal Reserve banks to discount certain commercial paper

used to finance the export of U.S. commodities, to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to eliminate certain export credit controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 8182. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to public and nonprofit private hospitals for the acquisition of renal dialysis equipment and grants for training of persons to operate and maintain such equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 8183. A bill to protect ocean mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 8190. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.J. Res. 616. Joint resolution to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of the hostilities of the Second World War, to provide for the payment of noncombat claims occurring prior to July 1, 1951, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 618. Joint resolution instructing the Secretary of the Interior to call for an international meeting on the preservation, conservation, and protection of endangered species of fish and wildlife; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 619. Joint resolution to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of the hostilities of the Second World War, to provide for the payment of noncombat claims occurring prior to July 1, 1951, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LENT:

H.J. Res. 620. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to neighborhood schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 621. Joint resolution to instruct the President of the United States to release certain appropriated funds; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.J. Res. 622. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 292. Concurrent resolution calling for suspension of military assistance to Pakistan until the present conflict in the country is resolved; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution calling for the immediate recision by the President of any orders withholding certain Federal funds meant to assist local communities in constructing housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself and Mr. GIAIMO):

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States should not undertake to guarantee any loan to the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. or any of its creditors with respect to the production of the L–1011 airbase unless assurances are given that the L–1011 airbase will utilize engines manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. Res. 431. Resolution designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 432. Resolution expressing the commendation and appreciation of the House of Representatives to the U.S. Capitol Police force for its loyalty, dedication, vigilance, and efficiency in responding to emergency conditions and situations at the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WINN:

H. Res. 433. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the problems of urban areas; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 8184. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 8185. A bill for the relief of Francesco Castelli and Giuseppa Castelli (also known as Giuseppina Castelli); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8186. A bill for the relief of Francisco and Mario Chirino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8187. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Namio and his wife, Anna Namio, and their child, Josefina Namio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8188. A bill for the relief of Antonino Taourmina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 8189. A bill for the relief of Sammy Morris Gully; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Thursday, May 6, 1971*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, help us now to put aside for one brief moment all that obstructs Thy presence and to be deaf to all earthly sounds that we may hear again "Thy still small voice of calm" which comes from above and beyond to the deep and unfathomable world within us. Invest our finite and temporal existence with a sense of the infinite and eternal. Keep ever before us the distant vision of the coming of Thy perfect kingdom, and give us the wisdom and courage to do those things we can do now to advance Thy kingdom of justice and righteousness—and to Thee shall be the thanksgiving and praise, now and evermore. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today appear at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 5, 1971, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 70. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes; and

S. 531. An act to authorize the United States Postal Service to receive the fee of $2 for execution of an application for a passport.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, with an amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22), designating "Human Development Month" and "Voluntary Overseas Aid Week," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1260), to amend the Small Business Act.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 583. A joint resolution designating the last full week in July of 1971 as "National Star Route Mail Carriers Week"; and

H.J. Res. 602. A joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period from May 22, 1971, through May 28, 1971, as "National Rescue Mission Week."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1260. An act to amend the Small Business Act; and