

all possible pollution involved in our environment.

The different world governments have sent their top representatives. Top scientists from all over the world will participate in this symposium.

Senators, are, of course, interested, as well as Members of the House of Representatives and others. I hope that they will come and participate.

We will not resolve anything with any definitiveness except that the people will go back to their countries with a feeling that we are all concerned about world environment.

As I at one time said, the pollution of the Yangtze and Yellow Rivers are just as important to this planet as the pollution of the Mississippi or the Yukon.

These men are meeting together preliminary to a world symposium which will meet in Sweden early next year and set up the guidelines for participation by all governments involved. They are the very best scientists in the countries that are going to be represented.

I hope that the Senate will participate as much as possible.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as far as I am able to determine, this will be the final quorum call today.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 9:30 a.m. Following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there will be a period, not to extend beyond 10 a.m., for the transaction of routine morning business, with a limitation of 3 minutes therein on speeches.

At 10 a.m., the Senate will proceed to debate the amendment by the junior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) with reference to no draftees in Vietnam after December 31, 1971. Time will be controlled and a vote will occur on the amendment at 1 p.m., tomorrow.

Immediately following the vote on the Nelson amendment, the Senate will proceed to debate the amendment by the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) with respect to the pay bonus for combat infantrymen. Time will be controlled, and a vote will occur on the Kennedy amendment at 4 p.m., tomorrow.

Time on any amendments to the amendments is limited to 1 hour coming within the periods allotted.

Senators are on notice, therefore, that at least two votes are scheduled for tomorrow and, undoubtedly, they will be rollcall votes.

There is little on the calendar other than the unfinished business, the bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act.

When the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it will stand in adjournment, according to the order previously entered, until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday. At least two important votes are scheduled for Wednesday, and undoubtedly they will be rollcalls.

Rollcall votes in addition to those I have enumerated may, of course, occur on tomorrow and Wednesday.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9:30 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order and as a further mark of respect to the memory of our late, departed colleague, Thomas J. Dodd, a former Senator from the State of Connecticut, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 25, 1971, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24, 1971:

U.S. NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Frank H. Price, Jr.	Marmaduke G. Bayne
Arthur G. Esch	Robert L. J. Long
Robert L. Baughan, Jr.	Thomas J. Christman
James B. Hildreth	Clarence A. Hill, Jr.
Mayo A. Hadden, Jr.	William R. Flanagan
Henry Suerstedt, Jr.	David H. Bagley
Edwin M. Rosenberg	Kent L. Lee
Philip P. Cole	Frederick C. Turner
Daniel E. Bergin, Jr.	Robert B. Baldwin
George L. Cassell	Julien J. LeBourgeois
Howard S. Moore	George P. Steele, II
Philip S. McManus	Narvin O. Wittmann
Lawrence Heyworth, Jr.	Robert C. Gooding
William T. Rapp	Charles N. Payne, Jr.
John M. Barrett	John L. Marocchi
	Clarence R. Bryan

MEDICAL CORPS

Harry P. Mahin
David P. Osborne
Herbert G. Stoeckel

SUPPLY CORPS

Douglas H. Lyness
Wallace R. Dowd, Jr.
John A. Scott

DENTAL CORPS

Vernon L. Anderson

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TELEVISION AND THE PRESENTATION OF NEWS

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Roger Le Grand, president of the Wisconsin Association of Broadcasters has brought to my attention the meaningful remarks of Elton H. Rule, president of the American Broadcasting Co. at a network luncheon in Los Angeles on May 3, 1971.

In renewing the pledge of the utmost to present fair, objective, but uncompromising reportage, Mr. Rule justifies the freedom from censorship pressures which are inherent in our constitutional democracy. In linking freedom with responsibility, Mr. Rule has reiterated the highest standards of the fourth estate. Mr. Rule's remarks, with some deletion in the interest of space, follow:

CXVII—1046—Part 13

TELEVISION AND THE PRESENTATION OF NEWS—NO ROOM FOR THE ELECTRONIC OSTRICH

(By Elton H. Rule)

My friends, let me say simply and sincerely that it's fine to be back. And thank you for your good wishes. They meant more to me than I can easily express.

The last time we talked in Chicago, I was on film. One friend commented that the film was all right, but my color looked a little strange. A little strange? It was. We shot the film in full-living yellow.

In Chicago, I said that, at times during this past, traumatic year, there seemed to be a divergence of goals between the ABC Network and its affiliates. I said that recent events have proved that there is no divergence.

Our theme is unity. Our aim is unity. Our byword is unity. We're moving ahead together.

It has always been vitally important that we stand together. Perhaps it is more important now than ever before in the history of our ABC organization, and in the history of the medium we proudly represent.

Now, I know that the after-luncheon speaker often performs the function of a glass of brandy. He reminds the assemblage that all's right with the world. Allow me to depart from that tradition.

Today, I'd like to talk about a subject as vital as our heartbeat.

A recent issue of Variety carried an editorial entitled *An Unholy Silence*. The point of the editorial was that at a time when the television industry was under threat of censorship in the crucial area of news reporting, few voices have spoken out against this threat. It was a point well taken.

While some industry voices have indeed spoken out—perhaps we have not made enough of a noise on the side of freedom for electronic journalism.

One reason is that we do not seek to make noise for its own sake. We want to make sense.

There is so much shouting going on that American ears have begun to develop immunities. Passion can give wings to reason. But passion without reason is a vapid as reason with passion.

We must examine the events of the present, we must determine our relationship to those events, and we must emerge with a sense of identity—with a knowledge of where we stand. Then we must be passionate in the defense of that stand.

What are the events of the present?

Is television different when it comes to news? How is it different?

One way television is different is in the size of the audience it serves.

Another way it is different is in the way it presents the news—with sight, sound and motion.

In scope and in impact television is different.

When it comes to the need for journalistic freedom—responsible freedom of expression—it is no different.

Year after year Americans vote television the most credible medium and the medium that supplies the nation with most of its information in the area of news. We are all familiar with these careful studies and we are all aware of the vote of confidence they represent.

In a direct sense, the entire credibility of the television medium is dependent on keeping the faith of our audience in the news we present.

News is the foundation of television's credibility, and that credibility extends to areas of entertainment, to the commercials we show, to every conceivable nuance in the relationship between ourselves and our audience.

If we lose that trust, if a credibility wedge is driven between ourselves and the people we are pledged to serve, then we have not only lost face, we've lost the ballgame.

For that reason, among so many others, we must be zealous in our right to gather and present the news in a climate of responsible freedom.

If we disagree on this particular story, or that particular subject—even if we are sharply divided on key political issues—we have to realize that we agree on the basic right of freedom to know.

Earlier I said that we must fight for our right to gather and present the news in a climate of responsible freedom.

Freedom has very special responsibilities. Credibility must be earned day-to-day, year after year. It must be capable of standing up to every challenge and test. This credibility comes from responsibility. It comes from responsible reporting and responsible analysis.

That is true for our Network newsmen, and for the local newsmen. It is as true for the man who speaks of global events as it is true for the sportscaster. And it is equally true for newsmen in every media—a journalistic common denominator that often calls for uncommon professional skills and dedications.

In the vast majority of cases television newsmen, local and network, have been true to that responsibility. They have been their own devil's advocates, their own severest critics.

If there are exceptions, they should surely be exposed. Self-regulation is an inevitable part of maturity.

Today the film editor's scissor wields enormous power.

That scissor can be a deadly weapon used to sell a point of view or a constructive tool used to tell a story clearly and well.

It is certainly a News Department's job to see that the editor's scissor does not leave truth among the out-takes.

We cannot be accountable for what happens in history, but we are surely responsible for how it is presented over the airwaves.

We are vigilant just as you are vigilant at your stations. What we do is seen and judged by millions. We know our responsibility in the climate of freedom. And we try hard to live up to it.

Because of its size and power, television journalists and the material they show have always been a source of controversy. Today, more than ever, the controversy rages. The reason is simple. There is much bad news. Television shows reality in a vivid, uncompromising way.

Lately, there has been discrepancy between what viewers see and hear and what they are

told by official spokesmen. A credibility gap has opened like a fissure in the American bedrock.

The minds of sensible and sensitive Americans are in a state of confusion. Many people just don't know what to believe anymore. We rail against the cynicism of youth, and we fuel that cynicism by the most cynical actions day to day.

Now we are faced with a direct, untenable attempt at the worst kind of censorship. One cannot help suspecting, without sharing the eternal paranoia of the radicals of the right and left, that there is an attempt, conscious or unconscious to drive a credibility wedge between television and its audience.

In a way, recent actions seem aimed at giving viewers the feeling that what they see is not what they see. If they can be made to feel manipulated, they will doubt. When they see horror, they will feel that what they are seeing is not horror in Indo-China but some kind of dramatic overstatement of a bizarre charade.

There are many dangers in this kind of response. Not the least is the very fact that people don't like bad news. They don't want to believe it.

In other days, the messenger who brought bad news to the king had his head chopped off. Maybe messenger services haven't changed all that much.

Television, the electronic messenger, has been bringing much bad news. Instead of focusing their concern on the events, many focus rage at television itself.

It doesn't make rational sense, but it makes psychological sense. Television is too often the scapegoat when the images it shows are less than the image of Snow White. Many would rather their mirror on the world was a mirror that said "You are the fairest of them all" no matter what it reflected.

Intended or not, one result of the current climate is the feeling that somewhere, under pressure, an egg is about to hatch. Out will come a television set that resembles an Electronic Ostrich.

This Electronic Ostrich would keep its head in the sand and its tail in the blue sky. What it showed its viewers would be carefully pre-screened and pre-controlled by some pre-selected censor. It would drug the brain and dull the senses.

Of course, it would not change reality. It would not alter truth.

We have the right to credibility. We have a duty to our viewers. We have the responsibility to enlist their help in resisting any incursion on their right to know the truth.

We will rally to grind down any attempt at censorship or inhibition of our freedom and we will win.

The right of free speech and free press have been part of the fabric of our lives. It is a free press that is the most vital check and balance in our society.

The television industry cannot stand by and watch a credibility wedge be thrust between itself and its viewers. We cannot surrender, under threat of regulation, or any other threat, our right to free speech and free journalistic pursuit.

We must make our viewers aware of the threat posed to this medium, and to their source of truth. We must make them aware that perhaps there are those who would convert their window on the world into a Berlin Wall of the mind.

If there cannot be a credibility gap between our television industry and the viewers we serve in the presentation of news, there must certainly be no credibility gap between our network and you, our affiliates. In the presentation of news there cannot be two credibilities.

From our side, ABC News pledges its utmost to present fair, objective, but uncompromising reportage, and I support that pledge.

Our News Department attempts to be

strictly objective. This has resulted in our being called right-wing by some, and left-wing by others. We know one thing—it takes two wings to get off the ground, to achieve balance. And we believe we have achieved that balance.

Today, the newsmen seeking a course of objectivity often resembles a tightrope walker keeping his balance in an earthquake.

He is subjected to pressure by government officials, self-serving political groups and even from within the television industry itself.

The same Variety that carried the editorial on "An Unholy Silence" calling for vocal defense of the newsmen's basic rights, only last Wednesday published an article headlined "ABC Edited D.C. Peace Speech The White House Way." In that article, it is stated that ABC "seemed clearly to be deferring to the Nixon Administration in its editing of the eloquent speech which electrified the Capitol made by Vietnam Veterans against the War leader John Kerry."

The facts are these. All three networks edited the Kerry talk. The editing done by ABC News reflected the judgment of ABC News as to what was most meaningful and pertinent in the speech. The script and film clips of ABC News' presentation tell their own story.

What Variety's anonymous reporter is criticizing is our editorial judgment. He is not expressing news in his article, but opinion.

He is surely entitled to his opinion, but his article was not labeled as such. The implication that ABC News deferred to the Nixon Administration is not only insupportable, it is ridiculous.

What we have is clearly another example of the kind of pressure that has reached danger levels.

For the information of Variety, and everyone else, ABC's News Department maintains an attitude of fierce autonomy and independence. ABC newsmen serve no master but history itself.

Harry Reasoner recently went on-air with a commentary that summed up our feelings.

"I keep reading in the New York Times," Harry said, "that there is some kind of scheme in White House circles to make ABC News sort of a teacher's pet of the administration . . . if there is a White House scheme, which I doubt, it puts us in the position of a Mark Twain hero . . . the man who was being tarred and feathered and said that if it weren't for the honor of the thing he would just as soon have missed it. There is only one proper place for journalism in relation to government—or for that matter to any special group. That is arm's length or maybe a few inches longer."

Harry, I'll second that.

At ABC we know that our medium is not only aimed at the people—it is involved with them.

We know that television is of the people, for the people and by the people like you who are responsible and responsive to our mandate as broadcasters.

We know that we must make certain that our audiences realize that television is theirs, and that we are worthy as its administrators. We can do this only by positive, effective action and articulate presentation of our case.

On April 28, in a Wall Street Journal article entitled "Many In Broadcasting Fear The Rising Attack From The Government" there is the phrase "at any rate, the nation's broadcasters are running scared." This is no time to run and no time to run scared. And we're not about to do either.

The symbol of this country is not an Electronic Ostrich—and it never will be.

Our symbol is the eagle. The eagle makes a loud sound when it has something to say.

This is a time for us to make a very loud sound.

This is a time for eagles.

I thank you all.

**WANTED: A SMALL PLANT TO
SAVE A CITY**

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from Robert R. Burns, the mayor of the city of Evanston, Wyo., county seat of Uinta County, nestled in the lovely foothills of southwestern Wyoming, a few miles from the Idaho and Utah lines.

Here is a community that could make an idyllic and profitable home for 200 or 300 families and a way of life for their children which is unexcelled anywhere in the Nation. Evanston is but a half an hour's drive into some of the loveliest mountains and lakes in the West—fishing, hunting, skiing, recreation abound. Evanston is less than a 2-hour drive to Salt Lake City with its cultural, municipal, and historic attractions. It is but a few hours to Yellowstone Park, to the Tetons, and the great western mountain country. Yet, Evanston is dying.

Bob Burns' letter follows, and I hope that some industry, somewhere looking for a way to avoid the tribulations of an overcrowded locale, might read it and get in touch with the good mayor. His phone number is (307) 789-3890. I am sure that Gov. Stan Hathaway, the facilities of the State administration, the offices of both Senators of Wyoming, GALE MCGEE and CLIFF HANSEN, would expedite facilities for plant construction, for land acquisition for the facilities necessary to move an AAA industry plant into this area.

The letter follows:

EVANSTON, WYO., May 11, 1971.

Rep. TENO RONCALIO,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TENO: We here in Evanston are becoming very alarmed about the decaying economy of our city and county.

During the past few years, our economy has been declining, and the future shows more of the same unless we get some help.

As you know, our economy had for its base the Union Pacific Railroad, and it is no secret that great changes have been, and are being made in this industry.

During the last census, Evanston lost 400 in population—nearly 10 per cent. This was caused by a combination of things. The railroad has been reducing forces for 20 years, but in recent months has made drastic changes. Evanston was the terminal for engine crews, firemen and engineers; now, trains do not stop at Evanston, and crews run from Ogden, Utah, to Green River. This will affect over 100 families here. The reclamation plant will be phased out in just a couple of years, affecting about 80 families. This plant has dropped from 300 employees to 80 in about 15 years. The Interstate 80 by-pass has caused great hardships to downtown business.

We have eight or nine empty buildings in our downtown area. Service stations, grocery stores, hardware, lumber yards—everyone has felt the pinch.

The unfortunate thing is that there does not seem to be anything on the horizon for us. We have not been fortunate enough to have booms in mineral development as our neighboring counties have had. In fact, the two or three coal mines in our county are now closed, and what oil we had is not being developed at all now.

Both Evanston and Uinta County are at their legal limit as far as bonding capacity,

yet we are in need of many things. With the continued policy of the railroad to remove as much as possible from the tax roles, the people who are left here will find it impossible to carry the burden.

I am sending a similar letter to Senators McGee and Hansen, and hope you will all pull together to help us out of our plight.

It is hard to explain all our trouble in a letter. I would like to plan a trip to Washington to discuss in more detail our problems here in Evanston. If such a meeting of the minds would be of help, please let me know.

Hope you can help us out.

Sincerely,

ROBERT R. BURNS,
Mayor,
City of Evanston.

BRINGING SPAIN INTO NATO

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the May 19 edition of the Roanoke, Va., Times included an excellent editorial on the subject of inviting Spain to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I have urged that Spain, which is a member of the European family of nations, be asked to join NATO, which is the principle means of defense of Western Europe. The editorial supports the position which I have taken.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "Bringing Spain Into NATO," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

BRINGING SPAIN INTO NATO

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. made a telling point or two on the Senate floor the other day in favor of inviting Spain into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Spain is and was of strategic importance in the European and Mediterranean picture; the U.S. has maintained bases there for almost 20 years, and at a time when the NATO position and our own position have deteriorated in that area, it makes sense to shore it up by bringing Spain in. Unlike some other European countries, she would not likely balk at making the kind of military commitment asked of her in NATO.

Granted, there are arguments against giving such recognition to Spain, still tightly controlled by Franco. But the generalissimo is on the way out; he is aging and has already designated an heir, Prince Juan Carlos. Franco's own regime seems to be loosening up a bit, changing with the times. If the U.S. really would like to influence Spain's outlook in the future, making a NATO ally of her would offer one opening for this. As for spurning Spain due to repressiveness and militarism, NATO could not do this and be ideologically consistent unless it also turned Greece out of membership.

We agree with Sen. Byrd that Spain has been a pariah long enough. But rapprochement ought not to stress simply military considerations. Through political and cultural groups such as the Council of Europe, Western nations ought also to invite Spain into a broader kind of partnership. It is basically unfair to a country so old and rich in history and traditions to pigeonhole her among the boondock countries run by generals. She has more than that to offer.

**THE REVERSION OF OKINAWA TO
JAPANESE ADMINISTRATIVE CON-
TROL**

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the April 30 edition of the Hartford Courant included an excellent editorial on the subject of the reversion of Okinawa to Japanese administrative control.

It has been contended that this reversion should take place by Executive action, but I have argued that the matter should be brought before the Senate, because it involves a change in a treaty ratified by the Senate. The editorial supports my position, and the administration has indicated that this question will be referred to the Senate for action.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "The Senate's Role in the Okinawa Issue," be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

**THE SENATE'S ROLE IN THE
OKINAWA ISSUE**

The subject of the reversion of Okinawa to the administrative control of Japan has frequently and rightly been of great concern to Senator Byrd of Virginia. And he returned to it again last week in Congress.

Ever since the matter came prominently to the fore, Senator Byrd has held that it would be foolhardy to commit the United States to defend most of the Far East—as indeed it is committed to do—and at the same time to give away this country's unrestricted rights to use its great military complex on Okinawa. This, of course, is what the Japanese government is asking, largely out of political motives.

And as things are now progressing, the reversion of Okinawa can be expected sometime in 1972. What Senator Byrd said last week is that while there may be room for debate whether it is wise to give up unrestricted use of Okinawa at this time, there is no room for debate on how the decision should be arrived at.

In some quarters outside of Congress it is being argued that the reversion should come through Executive order of the President, rather than by submitting the matter to the Senate. The Senator is on completely solid ground when he contends the matter should have the advice and consent of the Senate, either for approval or rejection. The United States obtained Okinawa as a result of the peace treaty with Japan, which required Senate ratification. It seems entirely logical if a section of that treaty is now to be altered in regard to Okinawa, that the Senate again should pass upon it. It would be paradoxical to give away without Senate approval what was obtained only with Senate approval.

Senator Byrd rightly points to an ironical facet in the argument by those who would transfer the administration of Okinawa back to Japan by Executive order, thus bypassing the Senate. An enormous hue and cry was raised in this country when American forces went into Cambodia and supported the South Vietnamese incursion into Laos. The President was accused of usurping the constitutional role of the Senate in foreign policy when, as Commander in Chief, he approved those two military actions without consulting the Congressional chamber. But now, argument is being made the other way around. Let Executive order suffice to return Okinawa

to Japanese administration. Let the Senate be damned. This is the stance of those who ostensibly are afraid the Senate might not okay reversion at this time. It shows all over again how debate depends not alone on logic, but on whose bull might be gored.

PUBLIC HOUSING IN JEOPARDY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision that allows local communities the right to veto public housing projects may eliminate many projects for low-income families. In a 5-to-3 decision, with Justice William Douglas ruling himself out of the case, the Court upheld a 1950 amendment to the California constitution that requires endorsement by a majority of the voters before housing projects need be constructed.

The housing authority commissioners of Contra Costa County have issued a brief report on the impact of the recent Supreme Court decision that overrules the local Federal courts.

The report follows:

Anyone that has been involved in a referendum at the local level on this issue will certainly take issue with Justice Black's statement that "provisions for referendums demonstrate devotion to democracy." It has been demonstrated over and over that all organized opposition needs to do is resort to bias and discrimination to effectively throttle the attempts of the poor and minorities to better their housing conditions through the election process.

The box score in California in the last 10 years has been about half of the referendums won and half lost, just depending entirely upon whether there was organized opposition. However, the past is no prologue to the future since certain elected high State and National officials have in the past six months deliberately created in the public mind a feeling that the primary reason for the highest taxes in history is the demands of the "undeserving poor" who are somehow lumped into the welfare mess.

In today's political climate there wouldn't be the slightest chance of winning an election for non-elderly housing in this county. There might be a slight chance of winning one exclusively for the elderly but this does us no good. By administrative fiat HUD has given elderly housing a bottom priority and mandated the most minimum of construction standards which require 60% of the elderly units to be one room studios. The City of Richmond Housing Authority won an election for 200 elderly over two years ago and are still waiting for a contract from HUD. They apparently are lost somewhere among the unapproved applications for 435,000 units that Secretary Romney refers to as his "balanced program" in justifying his failure to release funds appropriated by Congress.

The effect of this ruling upon this authority simply means that we may as well forget trying to do anything for the roughly 4,000 eligible low-income families on our waiting list except through the device of Section 23 leased housing. The direct effect of this ruling is to:

1. Completely preclude any possibility of new Authority construction.

2. Makes a farce out of requiring a housing element in every master plan insofar as requiring communities to provide housing for a cross section of income levels.

3. Makes it virtually impossible for us to exercise our option to ever acquire any of the Section 23 leased elderly projects. This was probably dubious at best because of the necessity of taking the properties off the tax rolls, but the election requirement is a real clincher.

The national administration must be very elated over the cooperation of the Supreme Court in their continuing efforts to frustrate the intent of Congress and local concern over the unmet needs of its poor, elderly, and handicapped.

PRESIDENTIAL POWERS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on May 18, the editorial page of the Norfolk Ledger-Star published a column on Presidential powers by James Reston and an editorial on the same subject.

Mr. Reston opposes restriction of the President's war powers by congressional action. The editorial takes exception to Mr. Reston's arguments.

In the course of making its point, the editorial refers to the Senate's approval of my resolution calling for the issue of reversion of Okinawa to be sent for ratification to the Senate. The editorial sees this vote as an important one in the assertion by the Senate of its constitutional role.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "The struggle for powers," and Mr. Reston's column, "Balancing Power, Reality," be included in the Extensions of Remarks. The editor of the Ledger-Star is William H. Fitzpatrick.

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

THE STRUGGLE FOR POWERS

James Reston asks an important question elsewhere on this page today concerning the relationship of the Legislative and the Executive branches in the conduct of foreign policy.

Mr. Reston wants to know how the dilemma can be resolved and suggests that the attempts by Senators Mansfield, Javits, Fulbright, Stennis and others to contain the Presidential power won't do much good; Mr. Reston prefers the philosophy of Walter Lippmann that only by the display of "self-restraint, objectivity of mind, and magnanimity" can an orderly sense of teamwork supplant the natural rivalries built—and built with a purpose, remember, please—into our system. The purpose being that one outlined by Mr. Jefferson when he said place no confidence in man in matters of power.

But Mr. Lippmann was writing thus in 1941, before the Second World War broke upon us, let alone the Korean and Indochina adventures. In those days Mr. Lippmann was an out-and-out interventionist. He's more restrained now, but his logic is sound, and

we'd like to observe that that is the way things were meant to be by the Founders. Only when the Executive and the Legislative branches saw matters exactly the same was the country likely to steer wrongly, and most likely to get itself into trouble.

Even this diffusion of power by no means guarantees security; all one has to do is to recall the Tonkin Gulf Resolution to see the folly of that thinking. Nonetheless, the way to a little clearer view of the problem Mr. Reston poses—How do you separate the nuclear danger from a continuous war involvement such as Vietnam?—can be seen in the resolutions that strengthen the power the President already has to respond to immediate attack or threats, while making him come back within a specified time to Congress for authority to continue any armed conflict that may have arisen. This makes sense, and we hope something like it passes.

It makes sense, just as Senate adoption of Senator Byrd's Resolution by vote of 63 to 14 some 18 months ago told the White House that the Senate believed any reversion of Okinawa to Japan must take place by treaty, since Okinawa came under our jurisdiction by treaty. There was talk at the time, and as late as last month, that the President ought to bypass the Senate and come to agreement with the Sato government by executive agreement. Perhaps it was not Mr. Nixon's intention to bypass, as President Johnson did when he handed the Bonin Islands and the Northern Ryukyus back by the executive agreement route; but the Senate action raised a warning flag which Mr. Nixon seems determined to keep in view.

He seems so determined, in spite of the advice of *The New York Times* that he ought to go ahead and ignore the Senate and just write a little note handing back Okinawa. The *Times*, on April 19, deplored the decision by Mr. Nixon to use the treaty route, advice that would do more to exacerbate the present difficulties between the White House and Capitol Hill than anything we can at the moment think of, short of opening another Indochinese front. So if Mr. Reston really wishes something might be done to help matters along in the governance of this country, we'd like to suggest that the advice given by Dr. Lippmann to pursue "common council and continuing accountability" has not yet reached the *Times* editorial pages.

As for us, we support the general idea of limited powers for the Presidency; we believe in binding down the man with the chains of the Constitution. Few ambitious men are to be trusted with power, and if it comes to the clutch we'd put ours in the diverse ambitions of the 100 Senators plus the President far sooner than we would any President acting alone.

BALANCING POWER, REALITY

(By James Reston)

The ancient dilemmas of American politics are back in the headlines again: How to give the President the powers necessary to defend the nation in a time of nuclear weapons and international ballistic missiles, and still maintain control of the Congress? How to keep him strong enough to govern the nation without allowing him to impose his will on the people and their representatives in the Congress?

There is another question which is central to the present debate: How to keep the President from using the authority he clearly must have in a major nuclear crisis—when the nation could be devastated before the Congress could even be assembled—in more limited emergencies like the Vietnam war.

This is the new element in the old strug-

gle between the executive and legislative branches. The invention of nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles has clearly destroyed the old concept of an "equal balance" between the President and the Congress, and another invention—national television—has added to the President's advantage in the ancient struggle.

But the struggle goes on because President Johnson and President Nixon have been assuming that the new presidential powers of the nuclear missile age, which are almost unlimited, may be applied to limited wars and limited emergencies.

This is the assumption that is now being challenged by Sens. Mike Mansfield, William Fulbright, Jacob Javits, and others. They are trying to draw a distinction between presidential power in major emergencies and presidential power in lesser emergencies. They recognize that the balance of power between the executive and the legislature has moved to the White House, and must do so in a nuclear crisis, but they don't want to lose all legislative control to the President in the usual non-nuclear crises of foreign and defense policy.

Unfortunately, Mansfield and Fulbright have not done much better than Presidents Johnson and Nixon in clarifying this distinction between presidential power in primary emergencies and presidential power in secondary emergencies.

In the conduct of the Vietnam war, for example, Nixon has asserted his right, as he sees it, to invade Cambodia and Laos even without prior consultation with the Congress and Mansfield and Fulbright, among others fearing that the Congress may be losing all effective control over presidential power, are now trying to compel him to get all American troops out of Vietnam by the end of this year, and cut the American forces in Europe in half in the coming fiscal year.

So there is a new and more subtle aspect now to the old struggle of executive versus legislative power. It is not merely who rules—the President or the Congress—but when and under what circumstances.

The controversy in the Capital goes on and will continue to do so, for the founding fathers, when they were allocating power at Philadelphia, were consciously and purposely ambiguous.

They knew conditions would change. They wanted the executive and the Congress to struggle for power and to clarify the problem in the struggle.

Passing bills to give the Congress more power to restrain the President is not likely to be more effective than the power the Congress already has over money, and refuses to use.

So, though candid and trustful consultation between the White House and Congress is, and always has been, hard to come by, there is really no more effective compromise, particularly after the inventions of the atomic bomb and the long-range missile.

Since then, the President cannot be deprived of decisive power. As Walter Lippmann said back in 1941, even before the use of the atomic bomb, "this difficulty can be resolved, but only by the display of self-restraint, objectivity of mind, and magnanimity which are rare indeed in public life. The difficulty will be restored by those who, if they like the President, are for him regardless; who if they do not like him, incite Congress to resist him. . . It is no good depriving him of necessary power. It is no good arguing that mechanical provisos and limitations are a real substitute for consultation, common council, and continuing accountability."

That is a fairly good description of where the President and the Congress are in May of 1971.

SOME CONCLUSIONS ON VIETNAM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the editorial page of the Washington Post contained an article by the former Ambassador to the United Nations, Charles Yost.

He places Vietnam in the kind of perspective badly needed today. His analysis of the situation demonstrates his tremendous grasp and understanding of the Vietnam War and its meaning.

We, in the Congress, would do well to take seriously Mr. Yost's point of view. It seems to me we would do even better by taking his advice.

I commend this article to the attention of the House.

[From the Washington Post, May 23, 1971]

LOSING AND WINNING THE WAR—SOME CONCLUSIONS ON VIETNAM

(By Charles W. Yost)

(NOTE.—Mr. Yost was charge d'affaires at Bangkok in 1945–6, ambassador to Laos in 1954–6 and served two years in the Nixon Administration as ambassador to the U.N. Since February, he has been associated with the Columbia School of International Affairs.)

One of the most compelling factors causing successive U.S. administrations to escalate our participation in the Vietnam war and to move very slowly in our withdrawals from it has been the fear of domestic backlash if the area were "lost." It has been argued, partly by analogy from the domestic consequences of the "loss" of China in the late 1940s, that any U.S. administration which failed at least to hold South Vietnam would be condemned both immediately at the polls and subsequently in history as the first to "lose a war."

The most painful and traumatic aspect of our massive involvement since 1965 has of course been the loss of more than 40,000 American lives. It is now argued that, if the Communists should clearly and rapidly win the war after our withdrawal, the thought that these men had died in vain would produce a revulsion not only against the administration in power but also against any further U.S. military involvement overseas. This could, it is feared, lead to a new mood of isolationism in the country, comparable to that in the 1920s and 1930s, which could undermine NATO and all our foreign commitments and could open the way for easy Communist expansion elsewhere.

Whatever may be the substance of these fears, a few words of caution about the rhetoric of both Right and Left on the issue might first be relevant.

As to the rhetoric of the Right, it would appear that extravagant talk about the anticipated backlash tends not to dispel but to foster and feed it. To suggest, for example, that the U.S. might be "a pitiful helpless giant," if it does not at this stage respond to force with still more force in Vietnam, builds up in the country the very psychosis that is feared. After all, every great power, Britain, Russia, France, not to mention Germany and Japan, has from time to time suffered defeat when it overestimated its capabilities, but has usually been praised for prudence rather than condemned for retreat when it accepted and adjusted itself to realities.

As to the rhetoric of the Left, it is equally counterproductive to indulge in extravagant

self-flagellation and to talk as though we were a nation of war criminals. There can be no question that the North Vietnamese began this "dirty" war in South Vietnam and Laos, without any provocation from our side, extended it later to Cambodia and carried it on from the beginning with the utmost ruthlessness and atrociousness. We have erred in misjudging our capability and that of our allies to carry on such a war successfully and to do so without being drawn involuntarily into other kinds of atrociousness. Our intentions were, however, of the most honorable—to support the principle of self-determination and to help small countries resist aggression as we had rightly and successfully done in Korea. To draw another parallel, it is easy to imagine with what violence the Soviet Union would have reacted if the West Germans had tried to take over East Germany in the same manner the North Vietnamese have tried to take over South Vietnam.

The wise course at present is not to berate ourselves either for having "lost" a war, which was our war only to the extent we made it so, nor for having fought it on a scale disproportionate to our interests and those of the people concerned. Rather, as therapy for our national traumas, both Right and Left can and should take comfort from the fact that our intervention, misguided as it may have been in scope and scale, has not been entirely in vain. The passage of six years has measurably eased some of the pressures with which our intervention was originally designed to cope.

First, the danger of widespread resort to "wars of national liberation" as a technique for expanding Communist domination, which we feared in 1965, has at least abated. The Communist great powers have seen that such wars, whatever their final outcome, involve great hazards and great burdens. We hear much less talk about them than we did in 1965 and, while they have certainly not been wholly abandoned, they are likely to be exploited in the future with considerably more caution and restraint.

Second, Communist China, which appeared in 1965 to be in a belligerent even if not in an expansionist mood, now seems interested in improving, at least to some degree, its relations with the rest of the world. It is probable that, whatever the reasons may be, it would at present prefer tranquility rather than turbulence among its near neighbors.

Third, while we have repeatedly underestimated both the ambitions and the determination of the North Vietnamese, there can be no doubt that they have suffered very heavily over the past six years. It does not seem too sanguine to suggest that, after a settlement in South Vietnam and Laos acceptable to them, whatever that may prove to be, they will hereafter concentrate primarily on their own reconstruction and cease for a time at least to be major troublemaker in Southeast Asia.

Fourth, time has been provided by the war in Vietnam for other nations in the area—Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia—to strengthen their own internal security and to move toward modernization in some respects. They are better prepared to resist subversion and insurgency than they might have been had Vietnam collapsed in 1965.

Fifth, as to the U.S. domestic scene, while the duration of our involvement and the scale of our losses have increased our trauma, they have also moved us much closer to a national consensus that the time has come to pull out. In 1968 there was quite probably a majority of Americans who would have opposed and been deeply embittered by withdrawal without "victory." Now disgust and disillusionment with the whole enterprise is

so widespread that withdrawal would very probably be greeted by an enormous sigh of relief, not of course a unanimous sigh of relief, not of course a unanimous but a predominant one. While withdrawal in 1968 might not have "brought us together," it very probably would do so now.

Finally, the U.S. has through this experience, tragic and divisive as it was, learned a very valuable lesson. It has learned the limitations of its power. It has learned that, despite its great military and economic strength, it cannot control events in distant parts of the world. And it has fortunately learned his lesson in a place and time when failure, while of course painful, was by no means fatal, indeed has not, I would argue, seriously damaged our essential interests or those of any of our allies except those in the immediate theater of war. It seems now a costly lesson, but it may come in the perspective of history to seem a remarkably cheap one.

Whether it will prove to be true depends of course on how we react. If we should be carried away by poisonous mutual recriminations, or if we should simplistically conclude that, because we wasted 40,000 lives and 32 billion dollars in Vietnam, no other overseas involvement or investment is in our national interest, then indeed we would have lost far more than the area and the war. But this would be quite irrational folly—like concluding that, because there are 56,000 deaths on our highways each year, we should scrap the automobile.

Let us rather, soberly and maturely, treat the Indo-China war as part of the painful experience of growing up as a great power. Let us concentrate on meeting the pressing needs of the future at home and abroad, which we have neglected while we fought the war. Let us help bind up the wounds we and our adversaries have inflicted on Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, to the extent and in the way the peoples of those nations may want our help. Let us, once again soberly and maturely, reassess our commitments, our interests and our forces abroad, to determine in the light of experience which may be less, or indeed which might be more, compelling and necessary than they were a decade or two ago.

If we behave in this way we shall in fact, despite our grievous losses and mistakes, have "won" the war, and our dead shall not have died in vain.

CIA OPERATIONS IN LAOS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator CLIFFORD CASE in a Senate speech accused the CIA of violating a congressional ban by secretly financing mercenary soldiers in Laos. He is right. I have written him of further areas of CIA involvement in foreign policy in Laos that demand clarification. I enclose a copy of that letter for the benefit of the appropriate committees in the House of Representatives, whoever they are—and, if they exist—that have the responsibility of oversight of the CIA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., May 21, 1971.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I noted your charges concerning the CIA financing Thai troops in

Laos. Not only is that accurate, but Congressman McCloskey and I were told in the presence of Ambassador Godley by Suvanna Phouma, while in Vietnam, that those troops aren't Thais—they are really Laotians living in Thailand. And he told us this with a straight face!

Furthermore, General Veng Pao's Army of MEO's is financed by the CIA and answerable only to them. "We fire and hire their generals and pay their survivors a widows mite", so we were told by Ambassador Godley.

No one can convince me this policy need be concealed from the American public. If it is a worthy policy its disclosure and Congressional examination would be consistent. If it is not worthy, we should desist from it.

I hope you will insist on further revelations in this murky and disturbing area of American involvement. I am unable to do so given my lowly status. You can and should do so and I would be pleased to assist.

Sincerely yours,

JEROME R. WALDIE,
Member of Congress.

MR. JAMES R. KING ADDRESSES THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANNING OFFICIALS

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the urban crisis now affects towns and cities in every region of our country. Its symptoms are blight, decay, and flight from the inner city. Reversing this process of deterioration will require bold, imaginative programs by Government and private organizations. It will also require a comprehensive national urban policy.

Mr. James R. King, director of the City Demonstration Agency of New Orleans, and an authority on urban problems, recently addressed the American Society of Planning Officials. His address is timely and informative, and I am inserting it in the Record and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY JAMES R. KING, DIRECTOR, CITY DEMONSTRATION AGENCY, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

MODEL CITIES AND NATIONAL URBAN POLICY

It is a pleasure to meet with you today to discuss Model Cities and National Urban Policy for I believe that the Model Cities Program has already influenced national urban policy and will continue to influence our nation's urban policies for many years to come.

In addition, I believe that Model Cities has had a notable impact on local urban policies—especially in the area of Mayor and City Council involvement in coordination, and citizen participation in the local decision making process.

This total system approach should not be confused with "Comprehensive Planning", for this term has come to describe broad based planning in a sub-system such as transportation or health.

Nor should it be confused with an "interdisciplinary" approach in which representatives of several subsystems, health planners, manpower planners, etc., join together to look at one subsystem—say transportation.

The Model Cities Program required the development of a total system approach which would interface such subsystems as health, transportation, manpower, etc. This

kind of planning at the local level had not previously been required by any Federal program.

Perhaps equally important the interfacing of subsystems was required not only at the delivery point—the city—but at the Federal and State level as well. This was an unfamiliar exercise for most Federal Departments at both the Washington and Regional Office level and was practically incomprehensible at the State level.

I don't believe I need to point out to this audience the objectives of a total-system approach. Obviously such a system is necessary if all possible interactions are to be assessed. For example, the development of a comprehensive health plan (a subsystem) and a comprehensive manpower plan (another sub-system) would have to be examined for possible points of interaction (projected jobs in the health field, for example) if a total system maximizing program investments is to be established.

I also need not dwell on the fact that the limitation of model cities projects to "target neighborhoods" prevents the plans from being either "comprehensive" or "total system" plans. However, most model cities directors have recognized that they are in the formative stage in the development of total system "model" regarding urban programs, and have been satisfied in "defining" the target neighborhood as the parameter of the total system for purposes of dealing with the maximization of program investments.

No matter how close, or how far, we are from a rigorous "model" regarding total system planning for urban neighborhoods we must still contend with the fact that system planning can only identify appropriate program investments within the framework of established goals and priorities. Systems planning is not decision making.

No amount of planning can set the goals or establish the priorities. Neither can planning make the decision to make the appropriate program investment at the appropriate time. These decisions are made by those who must finance the projects and, in recent times, these decisions have been strongly influenced by citizen participation, both direct and indirect.

The Model Cities program recognized the distinction between planning and decision making when it lodged program control in the hands of local general purpose government.

This policy not only recognized the necessity of "taking into account" the role of the politician in the decision making process, it also gave credibility to total systems planning by requiring that Model Cities Directors be answerable to the Chief Executive in their City—most often the Mayor. This integration of planning and decision making is imperative to the implementation of a total system approach because budgetary decisions made by city government do, in fact, dictate the success or failure of any plan.

In addition, the Model Cities legislation in demanding that the City Council and the Mayor "approve" the plan actually required City Officials to play their rightful and proper role in setting priorities and establishing goals. Most city officials gained their initial experience with goal and priority setting in connection with Model Cities, for most cities have no goals and therefore have no priorities other than those approved for the Model Cities target areas. How many cities can you name that have passed resolutions establishing goals and budgeted against those "legal" goals on a priority basis?

The Department of Housing and Urban Development also continued to influence the local decision making process by requiring that Model Cities establish a structure for participation by neighborhood residents in that process.

This requirement forced Model Cities to continue and expand the dialogue between client and deliverers of services that had be-

gun with local CAP programs. However, under Model Cities the city through its model city agency became the "convener" and often "arbitrar" in disputes between deliverers of services and clients receiving services. This role, it might be suggested, is not an improper role for the Mayor and City Council to play since the clients of such agencies are also the "constituents" of those elected officials.

Citizen Participation in Model Cities is therefore characterized less by "advocacy" and more by "joint planning" between neighborhood residents and deliverers of services, with city government insuring the continuity and legitimacy of the process.

Most Model Cities are now in some phase of execution. Therefore, it is appropriate to inquire as to their success to date.

The development of a total system approach is, unfortunately, still a dream in the mind of most Model Cities Directors. The scope of the task has proven to be too great and the procedural problems of setting up the planning process to extensive.

This is not to say that progress toward total system planning has not been made. Rather it is to say that everyone underestimated where we were and how far we had to go.

In most cities a simple listing of all program investments—essential base line data—is unavailable. In the absence of such data total system planning is virtually impossible.

In addition, more sophisticated techniques for quantification of interrelated program impact on target populations will need to be developed if we hope to select program approaches based on the anticipated result of a "cluster" of programs operating simultaneously, as opposed to the present system of selecting program approaches based on their singular effect on the target population.

In the 147 cities presently engaged in the Model Cities Program these and many other systems planning problems are being approached through experimentation. There is every reason to believe that these experiments, if allowed to run their course, will resolve many if not most of the critical problems in total systems planning for urban neighborhoods.

The reason for such optimism lies in the fact that most Model Cities have been successful in setting up a process that would permit attention to be focused on total system planning.

Most Model Cities Programs have already made an impact on the local decision making process. And it is here that the foundation for total system planning has been laid.

By taking the time to set up the process of goal setting through democratic involvement of neighborhood residents and elected officials, Model Cities programs across the country have made the first step toward elimination of independent sub-system planning. As the Federal Government extends this decision making process to all Federally funded programs, city-wide, Mayors and City Councils will draw on the Model Cities experience to set city-wide goals and priorities. With this done, it can be expected that the political demand for total systems planning will ultimately produce the refinements in technique necessary to develop a creditable total system plan.

There can be no question that cities will move into total system planning in response to proposed Federal general and special revenue sharing programs. There can also be no question that control of the decision making process will reside with elected officials—not with planners or program operators.

Elected officials will set the goals and priorities

under general revenue sharing as well as several key special revenue sharing packages and those experienced in total system planning will be called upon to develop program approaches designed to maximize the utilization of available resources in reaching stated goals in the least amount of time. The Model Cities "experiments" will serve as "guidelines" both in terms of process and in terms of plan.

It would therefore be counterproductive to "fold" the Model Cities program into the new Community Development Program as proposed by the President. If we expect local government to gain experience in total system planning we must complete the 147 experiments we have started.

It has all to often been the policy of this country to address a long standing problem by dealing with the approach rather than dealing with the problem. The Model Cities approach could hold the key to urban problem solving.

This view is supported by the only official administration evaluation on the Model Cities program: "The Report of the Presidents' Task Force on Model Cities". It states: "Despite over-regulation and under-support, the model cities program has made a useful contribution. It has succeeded in making some city halls more aware of the special problems of poor neighborhoods; it has brought some mayors and citizens groups into mutually advantageous relations; it has given some encouragement to the improvement of management methods, and, especially in the larger cities, it has given rise to some projects that are both new and promising. Our impression is that on the whole the model cities proposals, although they do not open new vistas, compare very favorably with the general run of proposals being supported by other federal programs and by local governments. In short, the model cities program is better than what went before."

We think that if the cities are given greater freedom and more substantial support the program will be a great deal better still."

Also, in the National Municipal Policy Statement, 1970, of the National League of Cities, clearly emphasizes that "The President should take steps to assure full support for the Model Cities concept throughout each relevant federal program and federally-funded state program by earmarking sufficient funds for use by Model Cities and by requiring that the chief executives of the Model Cities have the opportunity to review and comment before approval on all federal and federally-funded state programs having substantial impact on the model neighborhood."

Finally, in the most recent policy statement of the Community Development Committee, United States Conference of Mayors, support for the Model Cities Program is clear. This policy statement insists that, "Government is obligated to support and adequately fund Model Cities for the full term of the program as it was envisioned by Congress. Current and future funding for the program must not fall victim to a trade-off with the Administration's revenue sharing proposal."

What will result in this year's legislative process remains to be seen. However, just this once, could we not complete the experiment prior to judging the final outcome?

I urge you to review the Model Cities Program in terms of the task undertaken and the long-range results that can be anticipated from the steps that have thus far been taken.

So viewed, Model Cities is in my opinion, an unqualified success for future urban policies in this country are going to be developed in the cities and in the Congress of the United States not in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 years, the economy of the State of Alaska has suffered setbacks. Presently, we are experiencing one of the highest unemployment rates in the history of our statehood and, I might add, probably the highest unemployment rate in the entire Nation. There are many other areas besides Alaska that are suffering from these severe economic conditions. However, I believe that the economic conditions in Alaska are very unique.

Under Federal law, the U.S. Congress is authorized to appropriate more than \$500 million for public works projects throughout the United States. However, Congress has not seen fit to appropriate the total amount authorized to date, even though Alaska and other areas of the country are in dire need of these public works projects. Alaska and its vast size and tremendous requirements would seem to indicate that Federal money for public works projects would be distributed in a more equitable manner.

The Alaska State Legislature has requested that the U.S. Congress authorize expenditure of the total amount currently authorized to be appropriated for public works projects as well as give its early favorable consideration to pending legislation calling for accelerated expenditures of money for public works projects. Because of the severe economic conditions in Alaska, the legislature has requested that the Federal Government designate Alaska as a separate and single region for the disbursement of money appropriated for public works projects. As a member of the House Public Works Committee and from personal observation, I wholeheartedly agree with the legislature's request. I am, therefore, including a copy of the legislature's resolution in the RECORD:

ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas under federal law the United States Congress is currently authorized to appropriate as much as \$500,000,000 for public works projects throughout the United States; and

Whereas Congress has not seen fit to appropriate the total amount authorized to date, even though Alaska and other areas of the country are in dire need of public works projects and are enduring one of the highest unemployment eras in our history; and

Whereas there is, in addition to the above-mentioned authorization, legislation pending before Congress which calls for an accelerated public works program in the amount of \$2 billion; and

Whereas Alaska in particular has great need for public works projects of all types and in all areas of the state; and

Whereas Alaska is in a region composed of California, Oregon, Idaho, Washington, Montana, Hawaii, American Samoa and Guam; and

Whereas Alaska's vast size and tremendous requirements would seem to dictate that federal money for public works projects be distributed in a more equitable manner, with Alaska being designated a separate region for distribution purposes;

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that the United States Congress is urgently requested to authorize the expenditure of the total amount currently authorized to be appropriated for public works projects as well as give its early favorable consideration of pending legislation calling for accelerated expenditures of money for public works projects; and be it

Further resolved that the Legislature urgently requests the federal government to establish Alaska as a separate and single region for the disbursement of money appropriated for public works projects.

PUMP PRIMING IS NOT THE SOLUTION

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Monthly Labor Review for May carried a most interesting and timely summary of a major study recently published by the Urban Institute entitled, "The Unemployment-Inflation Dilemma: A Manpower Solution." This study supplies solid empirical support for the view that we cannot spend ourselves into full employment in the classic pump-priming sense. In the words of the study:

The crux of the problem is that when we attempt to increase production and decrease unemployment by expanding aggregate demand, frictions in the labor market increasingly deflect the extra demand into pressure on wages and prices rather than into real output. The result is that excessive inflation occurs before we attain full employment.

I believe this conclusion casts considerable doubt as to the wisdom of recent proposals by the leadership of the other party to unleash a new surge of demand through stepped-up Government spending. It also underscores the need for a new balance and realism in our manpower training programs. Rather than continue to focus almost exclusively on either training or providing temporary jobs for those at the bottom of the job ladder, we must develop a more balanced policy that focuses on hard-to-fill jobs as well as hard-to-train people. The result of our current emphasis, according to this study is fierce competition for low-level jobs while critical shortages further up the skill ladder cause long-term vacancies and wage inflation.

The study concludes that to achieve full employment without inflation requires a reduction in labor market frictions. Although training at the bottom is needed, manpower programs aimed at tight labor markets where the needed high-skilled workers are scarce is a more effective means of reducing the unemployment rate.

I believe that this article has particu-

lar relevance to the current debate of over the emergency public service employment bill and include it at this point in the RECORD:

A MANPOWER APPROACH TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT-INFLATION DILEMMA

(By Charles C. Holt, C. Duncan MacRae, Stuart O. Schweitzer, and Ralph E. Smith)

The trade-off or compromise between unemployment and inflation has been a fact of life in economic policy development during most of the post-war period even though a declared policy on the issue has never existed. The conclusion we reached in a study at The Urban Institute is that monetary and fiscal policy—with our present economic structure—cannot achieve both full employment and price stability on a lasting basis.

The crux of the problem is that when we attempt to increase production and decrease unemployment by expanding aggregate demand, frictions in the labor market increasingly deflect the extra demand into pressure on wages and prices rather than into real output. The result is that excessive inflation occurs before we attain full employment. Our analysis of the labor market structure, however, indicates that broadened and redirected manpower programs and policies hold promise for reducing both inflation and unemployment by reducing frictions—provided the programs are implemented on a sufficient scale.

Analysis of postwar employment and inflation data indicates that any achievable "mix," using standard tools of money supply or public expenditure levels, would in equilibrium yield excessively high levels of unemployment or inflation. In fact, the trade-off appears more unfavorable than some of the earlier work in this field had suggested, and, as George Perry reported in his Communication in the February Monthly Labor Review, the trade-off may have worsened in recent years.

For example, our analysis shows that unemployment of a steady 3.8-percent level, the target figure originally cited by the Nixon Administration, would be accompanied by an annual rate of price inflation of five percent and an unemployment level of 25 percent among black teenagers. Additional 1-percent reductions in the jobless level would trigger price increases of several percentage points.

When aggregate demand changes, the resulting change in unemployment occurs more quickly than the inflation rate change which typically occurs after several quarters. As a consequence, there have been occasions when both of these sensitive indicators moved in the same direction. But the analysis of historical data indicates that these are temporary effects which pass when the traditional long-term relationship between unemployment and inflation reasserts itself. The present high-inflation, high-unemployment situation, although surprising to some, could have been predicted with the use of our statistical model.

A WAY OUT OF THE DILEMMA

Can this "either-or" relationship be altered to drive both unemployment and inflation down to more satisfactory levels? Can the trade-off relation be circumvented? Much can be accomplished through structural changes in the economy and there are various approaches to making the changes. In our study at The Urban Institute, we concentrated on the frictions in the labor market and means for reducing them. We found that problems previously considered the province of personnel men—job turnover, search, and vacancies—bear directly on national economic problems.

In the area of wage dynamics, our analysis

indicates that severe skill shortages can be a significant factor in inflation. Where heavy demand for a particular product or service produces a high job vacancy rate and a low unemployment rate in particular regions or occupations—in other words, more jobs than there are people to fill them—wages tend to move sharply upward in an inflationary pattern. Conversely, in areas with few job vacancies and many unemployed workers, employers do not have to offer large wage hikes to recruit and retain their work forces.

These observations lead us to believe that training and placement programs that respond to skill shortages as they arise would help counter wage inflation by funneling in an adequate supply of trained labor. Such programs, in turn, would exert a measurable "spill-over" effect against excessive pay demands in other industries. Moreover, they must be accompanied by efforts to reduce institutional barriers erected by employers and employees to protect their own interests.

In sum, to be effective instruments of national policy, manpower programs must focus not only on hard-to-train people but also on the hard-to-fill jobs. The lack of emphasis on this second approach is the most obvious shortcoming of present manpower efforts.

INTERACTION OF PROGRAMS

There is a high degree of interaction between three types of manpower programs whose purposes are: To help the disadvantaged; to reduce skill shortages; and to match jobs and workers better and faster. In our view, all these approaches are necessary and interrelated; programs oriented toward reducing inflationary skill shortages may be essential if those for the disadvantaged are to be fully effective.

The focus of the manpower programs administered by the U.S. Department of Labor has been increasing on meeting the job needs of the unskilled, poorly educated workers. A little more than 1 percent of the U.S. work force received training or work experience in fiscal 1969 under these programs, but it has been estimated that only 0.1 percent of the labor force received training aimed at reducing specific skill shortages. The overwhelming share of the funds was used to help hard-core, disadvantaged workers.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare operates longstanding programs in Vocational Education and Rehabilitation which are aimed at basic skill needs and worker handicaps. In general, these programs are not designed to reduce inflationary skill shortages. The system of public school education contributes to vocational development of young people, but probably not very effectively for students not going on to college.

Although training at the bottom skill levels is needed, manpower programs aimed at tight labor markets where the needed high-skilled workers are scarce is a more effective means of reducing the unemployment rate. As workers leave their old, low-skilled jobs and move into the tight markets, they create job opportunities in occupations and industries that can be more easily filled.

Both equity and efficiency require that attempts be made to upgrade workers throughout industries, since some low-level employees will have to move out of the way if the disadvantaged are to find jobs on the first rung of the employment ladder. Increased attention should be devoted in particular to the problems of blue-collar workers.

In the long run, training programs limited to bottom-level skills can produce an employment crisis. Upward mobility of workers trained at this level may be hampered because of their limited skills, while a glut of

newly trained candidates for the same jobs reduces their employment chances. The result could be fierce competition for low-level jobs while critical labor shortages further up the skill ladder cause long-term vacancies and wage inflation.

CONCLUSIONS

Present manpower programs are not being operated on a sufficient scale to produce much impact on inflation and unemployment. Nor has enough attention been given to program design and research. Neither the government nor the private sector has made the necessary commitment in energy or funds.

Simply reducing demand for production—the economists' standard remedy for curbing inflation—will create unemployment and hamper present training efforts for the disadvantaged unless other manpower programs are begun to stimulate upgrading.

If manpower programs are to make a major contribution to national policy, they must be stepped up, aimed at both skill shortages and the disadvantaged, and made more effective. This will require substantial increases in expenditures by government and private industry.

The cost of these proposed programs may be kept in perspective by comparing it with the bill for inflation-fighting using aggregate demand policies. Estimates of lost production have run as high as \$50 billion in 1 year. The urgency of finding alternatives to the monetary and fiscal policy approach is clear.

Stepped-up government action in the manpower area merits serious consideration in view of the disastrous effects of inflation and unemployment on the national economy. Less measurable but perhaps equally serious is the damage done to the national equity objectives (implicit in the full employment goal) when particular groups of individuals willing to work are continually subject to especially high unemployment rates.

To recapitulate, our research shows that frictions in the labor market obstruct the achievement of low unemployment except when the pressure of aggregate demand is high. Yet high demand pressure tends also to produce inflation. Hence, to achieve full employment without inflation requires a reduction in labor market frictions. To accomplish this requires examination of the layoffs and quits that account for the high turnover flow through the labor market and the barriers to rapid job placements. We find that reducing turnover and speeding placements through a better informational system can reduce unemployment and job vacancies symmetrically so as not to generate inflation. It should be stressed that the typical strategy for reducing unemployment—through monetary and fiscal measures that increase aggregate demand—operates by increasing vacancies. Since the high ratio of vacancies to unemployment also touches off inflation, new approaches such as those we propose are required to escape the unemployment-inflation dilemma. Since the labor market is segmented by skill, region, education, and so on, a program to reduce turnover and speed up placements must address itself to skill shortages, as well as to disadvantaged workers.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Some of the specific manpower policy recommendations emerging from the authors' analysis of the labor market bottlenecks include the following:

Recruit to fill skill shortages from workers who are already employed in segments of the market where labor supply is ample, as well as from the unemployed. Identify jobs that remain vacant for long durations and specifically train persons to fill them.

Restructure hard-to-fill jobs to better

adapt them to the skills of available workers.

Establish a nationwide employment and counseling service aided by computers to speed up the matching of jobs and employees, reducing the duration of unemployment in all occupations.

Improve the quality of job matching to increase job tenure by reducing the likelihood of quits and layoffs.

Increase cooperation between private and public employment services.

Substitute capital in the form of machinery and automation for labor that is in short supply.

Promote regional mobility of plants and workers through better market information and relocation allowances.

Redirect demand away from regions, industries, and occupations with high vacancy-unemployment ratios to slack markets by government procurement, stockpiling, and tax policies.

Increase efficiency in the use of critical labor at the plant level by better sales forecasting and the use of overtime, inventory, and backlogs to smooth manpower requirements.

Reduce the barriers to jobs and to job upgrading because of discrimination in firms and unions.

Some of these recommendations reinforce objectives of present programs. Others go far beyond them in the stress on critical vacancies and in the increased scale of programs needed to attain the desired macroeconomic impacts. The full study published by The Urban Institute attempts to advance our theoretical understanding of the functioning of labor markets so that the indirect impacts of programs can be taken into account as well as the direct ones. The study includes recommendations for research and experimentation as well as for policy.

While we believe that the above approaches are most promising, we do not presume that our emphasis on wage dynamics and its implications for manpower programs is the only approach to structural change needed to solve the unemployment-inflation dilemma. Research is also critically needed on incomes, antitrust, union, and trade policies.

We do believe, however, that our research builds a useful bridge between microanalysis and national policy, indicating that the manpower approach offers promising potential for dealing effectively with the urgent inflation and unemployment problems. If we are correct, the expansion and redirection of manpower programs should become a much more urgent item on our national agenda than it has been in the past. Until we address the frictions in the labor market, the inflation and unemployment dilemma is likely to persist.

PRESIDENT'S CANCER PROPOSAL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to the House last week, the President's proposal to mount an effective program against cancer is an objective which all of us support in principle. Quite naturally, there can be no legitimate differences of opinion as to the exact procedures to adopt.

Radio station WBBM, Chicago, in an editorial broadcast May 18, discusses this subject and indicates a preference

for the President's proposal over that of others in the field.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT'S CANCER PROPOSAL

President Nixon's proposal for an all-out battle against cancer deserves universal public support. We believe his suggestions are entirely reasonable and workable.

The President wants a Cancer Bureau to remain within the National Institutes of Health. Another proposal has been made by Senator Kennedy to make the Cancer Bureau independent. We believe the Senator is wrong in his approach.

The Cancer Bureau must by its very nature remain in very close contact with other medical research groups. This can be done by leaving the new agency within the National Institutes of Health.

The President's pledge to personally oversee the cancer program, of course, should not be taken literally. He simply hasn't the technical knowledge or the time to do it. But we understand him to mean that he will support the cancer program with all his prestige and power. Both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees have already approved the one-hundred-million dollars the President asked for to fight against cancer. Money, of course, is not going to be the only factor in waging a war against this terrible disease. But we believe that nothing should be done to limit that battle—either through a lack of funds or strangling it with the red tape of a new bureaucracy.

POLLY BERGEN HAS ROLE IN RED CROSS BLOOD PROGRAM

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. Speaker, last week I learned some interesting facts about the Red Cross blood program from a very enthusiastic, charming, and pretty lady who is giving full support to the program—Miss Polly Bergen, who is a native of my district.

An outstanding businesswoman, singer, and actress, Miss Bergen is especially knowledgeable about this blood program. She made a special trip to Capitol Hill to tell us more about a venture that saves lives every week.

According to Miss Bergen and her Red Cross counterparts, the blood program collects over 3 million units of blood each year from volunteer donors. It operates a rare blood registry, collects blood for defense needs when requested by the Federal Government, and conducts a research program to insure maximum effectiveness of the program.

All who participate in the program benefit—especially donors who can be greatly relieved to know that their own and their families' blood needs will be met.

Victims of major disasters receive Red Cross blood, and, of course, a good supply of blood helps the doctor and hospitals give prompt, efficient treatment to patients.

The operation of the program is very efficient. Blood is collected in centers and

by bloodmobiles and is then processed for use as whole blood or components. All parts are used.

Most duties are carried out by volunteers, and voluntary contributions finance this and other Red Cross programs.

I would urge every healthy person over 18 to check into the possibility of donating blood. Nothing can substitute for blood and millions of units are needed every year.

THE EMERGENCY CONVERSION LOAN ACT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Emergency Conversion Loan Act, designed to immediately aid those who have been particularly hard hit by the depression in the aerospace industry.

Cutbacks in defense and space research are producing serious problems in the scientific and technological community. In the past, the Federal Government—by spending heavily in these areas—encouraged a great number of scientists and engineers to enter the aerospace industry. Of the more than 2 million scientists, engineers, and technicians, nearly 43 percent received Government-sponsored support in 1968. Yet, today, the employment rate in the aerospace industry has decreased 15.7 percent from March 1970 to March 1971.

My own State of California has been particularly plagued by increased unemployment of professional scientists and engineers as the result of cutbacks in Federal defense and aerospace contracts.

After the "Sputnik," aerospace was the new American frontier and southern California was its center. By the mid 1960's, California was doing one-fourth of the Nation's defense production and nearly half of its space construction. But today, the aerospace bubble seems to have burst and as many as 30,000 career professionals—engineers, physicists, scientists—are victims of the recession in the aerospace industry in California.

Mr. Speaker, prompt aid is urgently needed.

The bill I am introducing today would provide immediate financial assistance to unemployed engineers, technicians, and scientists in order to assist them in converting their talents to solving problems, such as crime, poverty, ill health, poor housing, and pollution.

This legislation would qualify jobless engineers, scientists, and technicians for conversion loans, provided by banks in amounts up to 60 percent of their prior salary, but not to exceed \$12,000. These loans would be disbursed by banks in monthly installments up to \$1,000.

Repayment would be required beginning 3 months after reemployment at a

salary equal to two-thirds of the prior rate of pay. These payments would be made in monthly installments over a 10-year period, at 3-percent interest.

During the period of unemployment, the National Science Foundation would pay all interest on the loan and would also pay the difference between 3 percent and the actual amount of interest charged during the repayment period.

Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency measure and is designed to meet an emergency situation. This bill would supplement the bill, H.R. 1209, which I introduced January 22, 1971. H.R. 1209 is a long-range measure to give future guidance to Government and industry in where our priorities will lie 5 and 10 years from now. H.R. 1209 is needed for a long-range program, but it does not meet the current emergency situation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Emergency Conversion Loan Act to meet the immediate needs of those in the aerospace community who have found themselves looking for jobs, but to no avail.

YOU'RE TAKING HIPPIES TO LUNCH

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, along with several of my colleagues, I have protested the ruling of the Secretary of Agriculture in allowing a cash refund on food stamps. It has led to abuse of the program as pointed out in the following editorial attributed to the Chattanooga News-Free Press and reprinted in the Ocala Star-Banner on May 17, 1971.

YOU'RE TAKING HIPPIES TO LUNCH

We asked a non-working hippie recently: "How do you eat?" he smiled and responded: "My friends feed me. I've never been hungry."

"Where," we persisted, "do your friends get what they give you?" He smiled again, waved his hand and said: "Maybe they have wealthy parents."

That may be the story in some cases—but it's not the whole story. Bill Fiset wrote recently in the Oakland, Calif., Tribune about how you as a working taxpayer are financing hippies. Fiset gave the case of a specific hippie:

"He boasts that for 50 cents he buys \$28 worth of (food) stamps. . . . Each week he uses the stamps to buy exactly \$27.51 worth of groceries and gets 49 cents back in cash as change, the maximum amount of cash he can get on a purchase.

Then he adds one penny for the 50 cents to get his \$28 worth of stamps for the next week. The fourth week of the month he sells his food stamps to friends for \$15 cash. Thus in a month he's paid out 53 cents for \$112 worth of stamps, for which he gets \$83.53 worth of food and \$14.47 net profit in cash.

From the food stamp saleswoman: "Can you imagine how this adds up when you have 15 hippie kids living in a commune house, all doing the same thing? No wonder they laugh at the Establishment." No wonder welfare programs are in trouble.

You may be taking a hippie to lunch—without knowing about it. And the hippies are certainly taking you for a ride.—Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press.

CHAOS AT HUD STYMIES COMMUNITY PLANNING—PENNSYLVANIA

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, absence of clear Federal guidelines to qualify for redevelopment money has caused the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to suspend needed planning assistance programs.

No doubt this is true of other local communities across the Nation—a situation which I find appalling.

I am including at this point in the Record for the attention of my colleagues a letter from the Secretary of Community Affairs for Pennsylvania to Secretary Romney concerning the chaotic nature of HUD's renewal program and its devastating effect on local communities.

Perhaps others will join in this effort to urge HUD to get its house in order.

The letter follows:

HON. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY ROMNEY: I wish to share with you a problem which is not only troubling this Department but is a threat to effective redevelopment planning in many communities in Pennsylvania.

Until more precise Federal guidelines are received as to the type of redevelopment plans required to qualify for Federal grants, this Department will enforce a policy already circulated last month that "requests for State planning advances for urban renewal projects . . . (will be) held in abeyance until some clarification of HUD intent is received."

It will no doubt be many months, or even years, before Congress acts, one way or another, on proposals for special revenue sharing for community development. We cannot wait. We should not be asked to wait when there are programs already on the books with current appropriations available.

Already, as a result of the lack of guidelines and my unwillingness to risk sparse Commonwealth tax dollars in a guessing game on Federal procedure, some local redevelopment authorities are threatened with a shutdown due to lack of our planning advances.

As a former State executive I am sure you experienced the frustration of periodic shifts in Federal procedures at the administrative levels. That is what is happening to us now.

If the present situation remains in effect very long, not only will local and state agencies later face "start up" costs when a redevelopment planning procedure is stabilized and articulated, but we run the risk of legislators mistakenly thinking that, with the lapse of uncommitted funds, redevelopment budgets can be cut at the State level, too.

In recent years, too many local redevelopment authorities have been required, to review, re-review and review once again their redevelopment planning to accommodate

shifts in Federal procedures. Now, there is no procedure at all.

We seek your personal interest in this problem so that clear Federal guidelines for redevelopment planning can be issued applicable to the immediate months and years ahead.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. WILCOX,
Secretary.

STOP IT, ANTI-AMERICANS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in a front-page signed editorial in the Sunday, May 23, 1971, Indianapolis Star, Eugene C. Pulliam, Sr., publisher of the Star, hurled down the gauntlet of challenge to all those who make a career out of hating their country.

I certainly hope that Mr. Pulliam's words will be heard over and above, and will drown out, as he puts it, "those with the biggest mouths and the smallest consciences."

The conscience of this American Republic is more to be found in Mr. Pulliam's words than in all the cheap and vapid demagoguery that has assaulted us lately, either in the streets of the Nation's Capital, or in the press, as irresponsible elements have sought to justify and encourage the erosion of our national fiber:

STOP IT, ANTI-AMERICANS

Stop it, you anti-Americans! Stop criticizing everything and everybody and every motive and every action except your own. Stop constantly sniping at your government. What in the world is the matter with you? You have the most wonderful nation on earth, a nation that has gone to extraordinary lengths to uplift the poor, feed the hungry, comfort the afflicted, and extend justice to everyone. Yet here you are, applauding the very people who degrade and mock America, who tell you how selfish and corrupt Americans are.

Your own eyes and your own common sense should tell you that in no other land, under no other system, is the individual more respected or better treated. Nowhere is a person as free to do what he wants with his life. Nowhere in the world, despite our occasional overemphasis on getting and spending, are charity and service to mankind more practiced or revered than right here in America.

For the past couple of years you have allowed a small handful of hypocritical critics to flagellate us and our government.

Be realistic, America. Where is your sense of proportion? We aren't a debased or rotten nation. We have our share of criminal misfits, but most of us are pretty decent people—hard-working, law-abiding, God-fearing. All of us want a better life for ourselves and our children, and most of us want a better life for our neighbors too.

But this anti-Americanism is corrupting our national soul. It's having a harmful effect on our children, who are beginning to believe it. This false picture is making it easier for the haters, the doomsayers and the malcontents, those with the biggest mouths and the smallest consciences, to mis-

lead and confuse us. It is twisting our values, making it difficult for our children to know right from wrong.

Thousands of American boys have been killed in Vietnam by being trapped in Viet Cong villages where men, women and children were paraded as villagers, when actually they were armed with Viet Cong cocktails, bombs and what have you. Our boys were trying to be decent to the villagers and suddenly they found themselves completely surrounded by the whole village, armed to the teeth. But the poor bleeding hearts in America, these anti-American so-called patriots, instead of having any sympathy for our boys, who of course had to fight back, felt sorry for the old men and children who got hurt in the mix-up. Of course they would get hurt in that kind of a mess. We had a lot of boys killed in that action. The anti-Americans had no sympathy for our boys, but they had all kinds of sympathy for the poor villagers who were simply used, innocently or otherwise, by the Viet Cong. This is war, make no mistake about it, but these anti-American loudmouths seem to believe we have no right to wage it in our own defense.

One United States senator actually made a statement that the American prisoners of war in Hanoi might as well just stay there, because they certainly wouldn't have been prisoners of war if they had had enough sense not to enlist for a useless and barbaric war. Well, the facts are they didn't enlist—they were drafted. And many of the very same men who voted to support President Kennedy when he went into Vietnam and who supported the Tonkin Resolution, later, when the war became unpopular, turned about face and blamed the whole thing on President Johnson. And now they are blaming the war on President Nixon, who didn't have a single thing to do with starting this war. But the very men who are loudest in their criticism of President Nixon and the present situation in Vietnam, which is gradually being solved, are the very ones who really helped start the whole mess. This is the worst display of national hypocrisy we have ever witnessed in this country.

It is unbelievable that so small a minority of Americans could create such a terrible atmosphere in this country. If it were not for the loudmouths the world would not know anything about what is going on here, because it is so much more peaceful here, and safer, than anyplace else in the world. But to hear these bleeding hearts yell, you would think Russia is a Utopia compared to America.

Stop this anti-American rot. Because if you don't, America's youth will be consumed by the stench of hypocritical rhetoric.

Stop it, America, before it is too late!—E.C.P.

A LETTER FROM A VIETNAM VETERAN

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received an eloquent letter from a Vietnam veteran urging me to work to set a date for withdrawal of American forces from Indochina. The writer, former Navy Lt. Thomas C. Downing III, of Gaithersburg, Md., served from January 1970 to January 1971 as an adviser to the Vietnamese Navy in the Mekong Delta.

He sent me the certificate of his Bronze Star for meritorious service.

It has become increasingly clear that the critical element in the defense of South Vietnam is the determination of the South Vietnamese themselves. It is equally clear that their self-reliance is not strengthened by continued dependence on American help. Mr. Downing writes:

It is my opinion that the South Vietnamese have the wherewithal to defend themselves if they are willing to make the necessary sacrifices. We certainly are not fostering diligence in them by remaining in Vietnam, for as long as we are there they will fail to assume their full responsibilities. I saw example after example of this phenomenon during my tour. The Vietnamese rarely would do something for themselves if they could get an American advisor to do it for them.

I heard other accounts of excessive reliance on American men to do the job from other veterans who visited Washington recently. If there is any group of Americans which deserves to be heard, it is the men who have done the work of this war. For years, we have heard optimistic reports from the chiefs. It is time we heard from the indians.

THE TENNESSEE FEDERATION OF YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS ADOPTS RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S REVENUE SHARING PROPOSAL

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence that the President's proposal to share revenues with the States has widespread grassroots support, I wish to call attention to a resolution adopted by the Tennessee Federation of Young Republican Clubs at its May 1 meeting this year. In placing the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is also appropriate to include the federation's letter to President Nixon with which the language of the resolution was transmitted to him. The resolution and the letter follow:

TENNESSEE FEDERATION
OF YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS,
Selmer, Tenn., May 22, 1971.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.
Re: Resolution

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please find enclosed a copy of the Revenue Sharing Resolution recently passed by the State Executive Board of the Tennessee Young Republican Federation.

As stated, we believe that the plan is just and equitable, and that it is a pioneer proposal in the returning of the rightful governmental functions to the States and their citizens.

We commend you for your dedication to the progress of "De-Centralization," and wholeheartedly support your efforts in the Viet Nam Policy, Economy, and other areas of progress toward the betterment of our country.

You are "OUR PRESIDENT," and we are extremely proud of you and the manner which you have conducted the Office of the President.

We are looking forward to '72 and another Great Tennessee Victory for you, Baker, and the other members of the Tennessee GOP Delegation.

With best regards,

JIMMY DANIEL,
State Chairman.

RESOLUTION

The Executive Board of the Tennessee Federation of Young Republicans held its regular meeting on May 1, 1971, at 10:00 o'clock a.m. in Nashville, Tennessee.

Whereas, said Executive Board sincerely believes the Revenue Sharing Plan proposed by President Richard M. Nixon to be in the best interest of the citizens of the United States and the State of Tennessee, and that the Plan provides just and equitable distribution of tax dollars;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Executive Board of the Tennessee Federation of Young Republicans wholeheartedly endorses the Congress of the United States to enact into law the Revenue Sharing Plan proposed by President Richard M. Nixon.

This 1st day of May, 1971.

NEED FOR WELFARE REFORM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the need for welfare reform concerns us all, but just as important is the way we go about reforming this gargantuan system. Recently, Gov. Ronald Reagan of California gave a speech about welfare reform to the American Association of University Women in Fresno, Calif. He has managed to put this entire situation into perspective and I would like to share his remarks with my colleagues:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

I realize there are many vital issues that interest this distinguished audience . . . higher education . . . campus unrest . . . tuition . . . school financing . . . environmental protection programs. But there is one situation facing California which cannot be ignored.

California and the rest of the nation must once and for all face up to the need for welfare reform.

To fully grasp the urgency of the situation, you have to realize just how fast welfare has grown and what it is costing our state and nation—not only in dollars, but in values that are worth far more to our society than the money we spend on welfare.

Only ten years ago, the welfare caseload in California was 620,000 people. Today that is the annual rate of increase in the caseload. One out of every nine citizens—about 2½ million people—are on welfare or Medi-Cal or both—at a cost of 3½ billion dollars a year.

Unless we do something to reverse this staggering growth, it will be 1 out of 7 by the middle of next year.

This crisis is not confined to California. The rising numbers of people on welfare and the staggering cost of public assistance is literally pushing state and local governments

to the edge of bankruptcy . . . in New York . . . in Pennsylvania . . . in California . . . in virtually every state. It has become an intolerable financial burden because it is forcing state and local governments to delay or underfund other essential programs in order to pay for an ever increasing welfare caseload.

There is a growing public revolt against welfare all across the country. This is not because our people have no concern for the poor. No people in all history have given more of their resources to help those in need . . . no people have taxed themselves more to meet man's moral obligation to assist the disadvantaged and those temporarily in distress.

The humanitarian instincts that prompted our system of public assistance are still deeply felt by our people. But they have watched welfare change over the years—into something no one ever intended when we started formal public programs to assist the poor.

Our people have simply lost faith in the welfare system as it has evolved over the past three decades. They see it for what it is now—a hodge-podge of confusing and sometimes conflicting laws and regulations . . . a system bogged down in red tape and corrupted by legal loopholes that have allowed some who have well-paying jobs to qualify for and receive the welfare benefits that are meant for the poor.

Almost every day, some new and shocking example of welfare abuse comes to light. Yet, every time someone proposes a realistic and effective reform to eliminate welfare fraud and legal loopholes, the cry goes up that reform is an attempt to deprive the poor. Let us examine that charge.

Does anyone really believe it is fair for families earning \$1,000 or more per month to be on welfare? The present rules have permitted some isolated examples of this type of abuse.

Is it right for a family earning \$7,200 a year—a figure well above any poverty line yet suggested—to receive the same amount of welfare assistance as a family of the same size which has no outside income? The present system of federally mandated income exemptions and legal loopholes not only allows this type of inequity, it actually encourages it. And examples of this are not so isolated.

Should working citizens be forced to pay higher and higher taxes to finance free unlimited medical benefits for those on welfare—benefits that are two to three times greater than the basic health protection most citizens can afford for their own families?

Is there something wrong with trying to adopt reasonable regulations that will eliminate costly over-utilization of medical benefits—through limitations that still leave welfare families with a far broader health program than many working citizens have for themselves?

Should the state simply give up efforts to tighten laws designed to collect child support from the more than 230,000 fathers who have abandoned their responsibility to help support their children?

In the last fiscal year (1969-70) counties collected from only 15 percent of absent parents of children on Aid to Families with Dependent Children—an average of about \$75 per month from each absent parent.

Our welfare reform includes tougher laws and financial incentives to the counties to enable them to greatly increase their collection in child support cases.

If we could raise the rate from 15 percent to just 50 percent, collecting the same average \$75 per month it would mean well over \$100 million toward the support of these children now borne by the taxpaying citizens.

Other types of abuse are possible under the current welfare system. I am sure many of

you have actually seen examples yourselves, or perhaps your sons and daughters have observed them.

The Food Stamp program, for example, was designated to stretch the food purchasing power of our neediest citizens. It was not intended to help finance experiments in group living or as a subsidy for able-bodied persons who are fully capable of work but who have—for their own reasons—chosen to drop out of society.

A man has a constitutional right to the pursuit of happiness—and that can include dropping out of our system. But he cannot ask the rest of us to underwrite his pursuit without violating our constitutional rights.

Many young people today express impatience with society and contempt for what they regard as its misplaced priorities. But how can anyone respect a society that continues to allow the educated and able-bodied to take advantage of welfare loopholes and, in effect, to steal bread intended for the poor?

Stealing is perhaps too soft a word to describe the legal abuses that have occurred in the Food Stamp program. But it certainly is accurate because when someone who really does not need help claims a welfare benefit, it means that much less for those who must depend upon welfare for their very existence.

It is because of these types of abuses . . . legal and illegal . . . it is because of welfare's chaotic red tape . . . conflicting regulations and misplaced priorities . . . that public assistance has become a costly and tragic failure.

It is failing its very reason for existence. Because we have to stretch the available funds to include some who should not be on welfare at all, our public assistance program is unable to provide sufficiently for those who really need help the most. These are the truly needy . . . the blind, the elderly, the disabled and those children from families with little or no outside income and no employed breadwinner.

Every dollar wasted through administrative duplication . . . welfare fraud or legal abuse . . . means that much less is available to provide for the basic needs of the truly needy.

One of the chief purposes of the 70-point welfare reform program we have submitted is to lift the level of support that the state provides for those who need help the most and to restore a degree of dignity to the lives of those who must rely upon public assistance.

Time prevents me from detailing the entire program, but I would like to briefly acquaint you with the main goals.

First of all, we want to provide automated monthly pensions for the elderly, the blind and disabled. The 600,000 persons in this category should not be consigned forever to the welfare structure. They should not be regarded as simply another entry in a social caseworker's notebook. Because of the permanence of their dependency, they are in fact pensioners. We want to provide their monthly checks through a pension program similar to Social Security. Everyone in these categories would receive the check they now get, plus regular cost-of-living increases. And by eliminating the costly social worker administrative structure as it affects these groups, we would hope to realize sufficient funds to increase those monthly checks in time.

California already provides the nation's most generous overall level of public assistance. We rank first or second among the states in three of the four major categories of aid—grants to the blind, aged and disabled and our monthly payments are \$38 to \$55 per month higher than the national average. We lead 35 other states in average

monthly payments in the AFDC category with grants of \$5 per person higher than the national monthly average.

With the reform program we have proposed, we will be able to increase the monthly grants to those on AFDC who have no other outside income or very little. A random sampling in Los Angeles showed that our welfare reform would allow us to provide increases ranging from 19 to 43 percent per month in AFDC benefits, depending on the size of the family.

This can be accomplished by imposing—among other reforms—a realistic limit on the amount of outside income a family may have and still qualify for welfare benefits. And frankly I think our proposals in this regard are quite generous. Our ceiling would not eliminate supplemental welfare aid to those whose incomes fell below the ceiling.

For a family of four in San Francisco, for example, welfare assistance would taper off to an end when the family income reached about \$6,084 a year. (This figure should give you some idea of how high earnings can be now with the individual still retaining welfare eligibility). If the family's income is less than that amount, it would still be eligible for supplemental assistance, including medical benefits, Food Stamps and free school lunches.

Such a ceiling is essential if we are to divide the available welfare funds among those who need help most.

The AFDC program is the largest, most emotional and most expensive category of welfare. About 1 million, 650 thousand persons receive benefits on AFDC. It is this category that is most prone to abuse and it is in this category that we propose a fundamental change of direction.

We do not dispute society's obligation to provide for needy children. But we insist we also have an obligation to restore dignity and direction to the lives of those on welfare.

We now have third and even fourth generations of families on AFDC and the program is growing every year. There are those who suggest that most of this growth is because of the national economic slump and a higher than normal rate of unemployment. The facts show otherwise.

The number of people on AFDC grew by 25 percent in 1968-69—a time when California had the lowest rate of unemployment it had known in 15 years.

The problem with the AFDC program is far more basic. It simply has no goal. It started out to be a temporary helping hand, it has become a way of life.

We have created a segment of society which looks upon poverty as a perfectly acceptable career. I do not share that view and I do not believe most Californians accept it either.

Nothing could be more destructive to our society than to subsidize a permanent and growing poverty population that must be indefinitely supported at public expense.

Is there any dignity in being dependent? Can self-esteem and self-respect grow in such an atmosphere of humiliating defeatism? Is it humane or generous to consign generation after generation to the demeaning indignity of the dole?

We do not accept that degrading prospect. And so we have proposed a drastic change of direction for welfare. We want to begin measuring welfare's progress—not by how many new people are added to the rolls each year—but by how many we restore to economic self-sufficiency.

We proposed to restore the dignity and discipline of work to the lives of those able-bodied AFDC adults who now are regarded as simply another "welfare case."

Employment in a job sufficient to pay one's way should become the goal of the wel-

fare system. The able-bodied adult must be regarded as temporarily unemployed—not as a permanent dependent.

Under our proposal, these adults would have to be either seeking employment, training for a job or participating in the Public Assistance Work Force to continue receiving welfare.

The main goal of this work-oriented program would be employment in a private or regular public sector job—ultimately at wages sufficient to support the entire family.

If a person is not directed into the active job-market or into a training program, he would be expected to help with the public assistance work force.

We have heard protests that this kind of rule is cruel or inhumane—that it is demeaning to require work for welfare.

It is none of those things. Society expects you and your families to work to support not only yourselves, but the government and all those who are dependent upon government.

There are many things that the able-bodied adult could do to make a constructive contribution to the society that supports them. They could help patrol urban school grounds to guard against vandalism or protect children from violence . . . they could take part in environmental recycling projects . . . maintain park and recreational facilities. Women could provide child care so that other mothers could be free to either train for a job or work.

If it is not demeaning for volunteer crews of students—many of them possibly your sons and daughters—to pick up litter along the roadway, why is it demeaning to ask the able-bodied on welfare to make a similar contribution to improve the environment?

While this work program is initially aimed at able-bodied male recipients, it also would offer women on AFDC an opportunity to become usefully employed and to escape the dreary cycle of dependency that welfare has become.

The U.S. Labor Department says almost half of the married women in America today who have children under 17 are now working to help support their families and very probably to help pay the taxes their family owes to government. Is it unfair to give AFDC mothers the same opportunity to earn economic independence—when adequate child care is assured? Are we asking something unusual, out of the ordinary of them? Thirty-seven percent of all the married women who work are mothers of children under 5 years of age.

Almost 30 percent of the women on AFDC and more than one fourth of the male recipients have the equivalent of a high school education or better.

Many taxpayers who help pay for welfare have less than a 12th grade education. Still they worked their way into economic independence.

Society owes every citizen an equal opportunity to make maximum use of his talents . . . to travel as far as his own energy and skill can take him. Society has a moral obligation to help those who through no fault of their own are unable to provide for themselves. But society is not obligated to indefinitely subsidize those who simply refuse to try.

We hear pious declarations that we are attacking the result, not the cause. Well, when our citizens are working 4 months out of the year just to pay the cost of government and that is insufficient to finance necessary government services because of one runaway program—welfare, then welfare must be restructured so that we can go forward with positive programs . . . increased financial aid

to education . . . better technical training . . . more modern health facilities . . . positive programs that are essential if we are to eliminate or even reduce the root causes of human misery.

Every person here knows the value of higher education to our society, not only in dollars, but the intangible strengths that an educated people provide in a free nation.

Our state budget for higher education is \$676 million this year, the highest amount in the state's history. But welfare and Medicaid consume almost twice as much.

We are investing \$337 million in the University of California system—40 percent more for 26 percent more students than we had four years ago. But the cost of the AFDC program increased by 42 percent and the enrollment in this program went up 39 percent in just one year.

We are providing \$20 million a year for student scholarships and loans. \$20 million will not pay for one week of welfare.

We have been told that higher education needs more state financial assistance—millions of dollars more. Can we ask the working men and women for even more of their earnings when we know we have not done all that is possible to get the most and the best use out of the money they are already providing?

Unless we bring welfare's excessive cost spiral under control . . . higher education will not get those millions . . . there will be less and less money for education and training—the positive cures for poverty—and the state will go on paying more and more to finance an unworkable, discredited system that falls the helpless victims it is supposed to rescue.

We need your help. Specifically your letters and those of your friends directed to your own legislators—your own assemblyman and state senator. It does not do much good to write to those who do not represent your particular district—they need to hear from their own constituents.

We do not expect to convert any of those self-appointed leaders of the "professional poor." Their power depends upon a continuation of the human misery and the dependency that the present welfare system has produced. They will never agree to any change that really cures poverty. The poor have become their clientele and they are not about to reduce their number.

No, we hope to convince reasonable men and women from all walks of life that we cannot go on as we have been going—that we cannot afford the cost in dollars. But even more we cannot afford what welfare is costing us in the destruction of the spiritual and moral values that created our society . . . the ideals of individual and family responsibility.

We must offer the poor the same opportunity this nation has always offered the down-trodden—an equal chance to earn—through their own efforts—a respected place in society and the material rewards that go with economic independence.

That is the ethic upon which America created the freest and most prosperous society ever known to man. It is the vision and the dream that built California.

Welfare was born of the compassion of our people—the most humane, open handed society the world has ever known. It has become a monster destroying that which it was intended to help—our most precious resource—our people.

We must turn away from the philosophy that some men must be condemned to exist forever off the confiscated earnings of others.

We must reaffirm our faith in the values of work, self-reliance and individual dignity. Without those values, freedom and dignity cannot survive.

With them, our state and our nation can reach new heights of greatness.

This choice is ours to make. I believe we must make it now.

SERENITY IN AUSTRIA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an interesting and thoughtful commentary on the political situation in Austria was the subject of a column carried in the Joliet, Ill., Herald-News of May 11, 1971, written by Dumitru Danielopol, foreign correspondent of the Copley Press.

Since a small and peaceful country such as Austria is too often overlooked, and certainly does not dominate the attention of the media, I felt this column contained information that should be more generally analyzed.

The editorial follows:

SERENITY IN AUSTRIA

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

VIENNA, AUSTRIA.—For a political writer, Austria poses a problem. It's a country in which nothing ever seems to happen.

The Austrians move along in sensible well-ordered channels. They don't become overly excited. Their candidates wear "conservative" and "socialist" labels, but the differences often seem to end there.

A few days ago a visitor was hardly aware that Austria was electing a president. The voters returned Socialist President Franz Jonas to office for another six years after a campaign that was more of a whisper than a lion's roar.

Jonas, defeated, People's Party candidate Dr. Kurt Waldheim a former diplomat.

The People's Party is conservative. It represents industrialists, farmers, and civil servants. The Socialist Party—Modeled after that of Sweden—is far from radical. It respects the principles of private enterprise and a free market economy.

The election result will change little in Austria.

"It's not a question of principle that separates the two parties, it's only a matter of style, of nuance," said one observer.

Perhaps it's not surprising in this country that went through the hell of the Hitler-Anschluss of 1937 and a similar hell of Soviet occupation. Somehow Austria retained its character, its poise and its identity.

It also has retained an abiding faith in the United States. There have been few anti-American displays here. Even 25 years later Austrians still speak of the Marshall Plan which helped them get on their feet after World War II—that's jolly well more than most other European countries.

And despite its strict neutrality, Austria has shown tremendous compassion towards political refugees from Eastern Europe—especially from Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968.

There is a special kind of understanding about American efforts in Vietnam. Only a generation ago Austria suffered Communist occupation. It remembers.

"Austria is working hard to be the bridge between East and West," said an American diplomat. "They have good relations with everyone, even with Italy with whom they are about to settle the Tyrol."

Vienna is making overtures toward Red China and there will probably be an ex-

change of diplomats soon. But characteristic-ally Austria does not want to turn her back on Nationalist China with whom she has very good relations. In its view, Taiwan is similar to Austria—a small country living in the shadow of big powers.

"Taiwan cannot be overlooked," said one Austrian official. "It is a viable entity. It should remain free and a member of the United Nations, no matter what."

Incidentally, the peace and serenity that mark Austrian life apply also to the labor front. In 1970 only 215 working hours were lost due to strikes.

THE NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE ACT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 4271, the "Newsmen's Privilege Act," which was introduced in this body on February 10 by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN). This bill has the broad bipartisan backing of 52 House Members. In essence, the measure would protect the confidentiality of a newsman's sources and unpublished materials. Except in specified instances, a reporter could not be forced by any court, grand jury, agency of government, or the Congress to divulge his sources or notes. The exceptions include certain defamation proceedings and grand jury or other proceedings which are required to be secret by law and in which a Federal district court has determined that the disclosure of the information is needed to prevent a threat to human life, espionage, or foreign aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased with President Nixon's strong statement of support for the principle of news source confidentiality—a statement he made in response to a question at his May 1 news conference. To quote from his response:

Now, when you go . . . to the question of subpoenaing the notes of reporters, when you go to the question of Government action which requires the revealing of sources, then I take a very jaundiced view of that kind of action unless it is strictly—and this would be a very narrow area—strictly in the area where there was a major crime that had been committed and where the subpoenaing of the notes had to do with information dealing directly with that crime. . . . As far as the subpoenaing of notes is concerned, of reporters, as far as bringing any pressure on the networks, as a government is concerned, I do not support that.

In response to that same question, the President made the very valid point that the concept of a free press does not include freedom from criticism. Just as the press has a right to criticize, others have a right to criticize the press. In the President's words:

I believe . . . that each of us, as a public figure, has a right to indicate when we think the news coverage has been fair or unfair.

This right to criticize should not be

confused or equated with censorship or control of the media. The President indicated his support for the December 1969 statement of the Senate Republican Policy Committee—a statement which reads:

Whether news is fair or unfair, objective or biased, accurate or careless, is left to the consciences of the commentators, producers, and network officials themselves. Government does not and cannot play any role in its presentation.

I think it is vitally important that the distinction between criticism and control be made, for there are some thin-skinned individuals who indiscriminately lump these together and in knee-jerk fashion interpret any criticism as unwarranted harassment, attempted censorship, or an abridgment of the first amendment right to a free press.

The Whalen bill which I am cosponsoring clearly addresses itself to first and fourth amendment issues of free press and privacy by insuring the protection of both a newsman's sources and unpublished materials. I am hopeful that this bill will gain even wider support and that early action will be taken on this measure.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the full text of a speech made by Congressman WHALEN to the Blue Pencil Club of Ohio on the subject of his bill, as well as the language of that bill:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation for this opportunity to talk about the Newsmen's Privilege Act which has been introduced in both the House and Senate in the 92nd Congress.

I sincerely hope that today's discussion will be mutually beneficial.

During my formal remarks, I will cover three areas:

First, the background and status of the bill.

Second, what the legislation does.

Third, its justification.

Then, upon completion of those comments, I trust that you will feel free to make any observations and recommendations which, in your opinion, will contribute to the parliamentary progress of this legislation.

I. BACKGROUND AND STATUS OF H.R. 4271

H.R. 4271 is not a new bill. Similar measures were introduced in the late 1950s. The precursor of H.R. 4271 was introduced in the 91st Congress by Representative Richard Ottinger, of New York, and several colleagues, of which I was one. Despite the fact that our proposal was referred to the House Judiciary Committee on March 5, 1970, fully nine months before adjournment, no hearings were ever held. Mr. Ottinger, as you may recall, relinquished his seat in the House of Representatives to run for the U.S. Senate. Failing to achieve that goal, he no longer serves in the Congress.

This January I decided to reintroduce the bill. Additionally, for reasons I will mention later, I sought to broaden support for this legislation by urging colleagues to join me in cosponsoring it. That effort already has produced results. To date, 52 House Members have co-sponsored or introduced identical legislation. Included are 18 Republicans and 34 Democrats, an encouraging bipartisan alignment. A further effort will be made to secure support of other Congressmen.

The prospects for the bill obtaining a hear-

ing are good. On February 24, 1971, House Judiciary Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler referred H.R. 4271 to Judiciary Subcommittee No. 3, chaired by Congressman Robert Kastenmeier (D-Wis.). Since that time I have been in frequent contact with Chairman Kastenmeier. He has indicated that staff work has begun and that the measure possibly might be called up by the subcommittee for hearings this year. I have recommended to Chairman Kastenmeier that several federal departments be asked to provide their views concerning this pending legislation. I specifically suggested that the Justice Department and the White House, in the person of Mr. Herbert Klein, Director of Communications, be invited. Spokesmen for the various media organizations of course would be asked to present their views. The result would be, I believe, the most comprehensive discussion of the subject that ever has been held. Let me say, however, that we are still in only the very preliminary stages. What I have just described represents, in my view, the optimum.

II. OBJECTIVES OF H.R. 4271

Let me now describe briefly what the bill proposes. Copies of the exact language have been distributed so I will not read it line by line. In essence, the measure would give reporters the same privilege that doctors, priests and other professions have by tradition and also by law in most states—the confidentiality of their clients' conversations with them. As one former government official succinctly put it, newsmen are to be held accountable only for what they publish or broadcast, not for what they have in their notes. I believe that sums up, in part, the thrust of what is intended. If enacted, the bill clearly would prevent the government, or anyone else for that matter, from embarking on "fishing expeditions" in reporters' notes and files.

The "privilege" accorded by the bill would apply to reporters, editors, commentators, journalists, writers, correspondents, announcers or other persons "directly engaged in the gathering or presentation of news for any newspaper, periodical, press association, newspaper syndicate, wire service or radio or television station." It protects the newsmen's sources and unpublished or unbroadcast material. And the newsmen cannot be required by "any court, grand jury, agency, department or commission of the United States or by either House of, or any committee of, Congress" to divulge that information.

Three exceptions to the privilege are specified and have been the subject of some controversy. The privilege would not apply:

"(1) to the source of any allegedly defamatory information in any case where the defendant, in a civil action for defamation, asserts a defense based on the source of such information; or

"(2) to the source of any information concerning the details of any grand jury or other proceeding which was required to be secret under the laws of the United States."

The third instance in which the privilege can be divested relates to a threat to human life, of espionage, or of foreign aggression. In such cases, a U.S. district court must be asked for the divestiture of privilege. But the court cannot grant the divestiture unless "after hearing the parties, (the court) determines that there is substantial evidence that disclosure of the information is required to prevent a threat to human life, of espionage; or of foreign aggression."

The bill has received the endorsement of many media and organizations. Yet, there have been reservations voiced by some, including, editorially, *The Journal Herald* which is one of the daily papers in my Congressional District. I feel *The Journal Herald* has presented a cogent argument against the exceptions delineated in the bill. Not be-

ing "hidebound," I would like to hear more discussion as to whether the qualifications to the newsmen's privilege should be modified.

III. H.R. 4271—ITS JUSTIFICATIONS

Finally, I would like to touch upon the need for this legislation. Let me state unequivocally that I believe there is a growing threat to the freedom of the press in the United States. I am convinced that any diminution of the liberty that the press now enjoys would ill-serve our Nation. I would not care to speculate whether there is in existence any plot in high places to curb the power of the press. But even the suggestion of such an undertaking requires that every appropriate legislative step be taken to guarantee that the First Amendment is not weakened.

My good friend and colleague, Senator Charles Percy, Wednesday night gave a speech which touched on the issue of freedom of the press. I would like to echo a few of his sentiments.

First, the press is not perfect. The press is people. There is no person who does not err. I would venture to say that every reporter in this room has written at least one wrong story, if not more. But, as one of my friends has frequently remarked "It's amazing how well informed we are with such a yellow press." I think the brightness of the color attributed to the press more often than not stems from the jaundice in the eye of the beholder.

Second, Senator Percy used a quote that goes to the heart of the issue of journalistic freedom. It was the observation of the late Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter that "Without a free press there can be no free society. That is axiomatic."

Thomas Jefferson also commented on the press in a slightly different but equally pungent statement. He said in 1787: "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate to prefer the latter."

Let me conclude with one further observation. There is reason to hope that the courts will sustain the confidentiality of sources and unused information. This might seem to negate the need for this legislation. In part, I would agree. However, the court cases are not testing the confidentiality except in matters that affect the courts. The Newsman's Privilege Act broadens the protection beyond just the courts. It also encompasses Congress, federal departments, agencies and commissions. The recent CBS News confrontation with a House subcommittee makes obvious to everyone in this room the need for such specific protection.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for affording me the time to present my views on the Newsman's Privilege Act.

H.R. 4271—NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE ACT OF 1971

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act be cited as the "Newsman's Privilege Act".

NONDISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Sec. 2. Except as provided in section 4, no person shall be required by any court, grand jury, agency, department, or commission of the United States or by either House or of any committee of Congress to disclose any confidential information received or obtained by him in his capacity as a reporter, editor, commentator, journalist, writer, correspondent, announcer, or other person directly engaged in the gathering or presentation of news for any newspaper, periodical, press association, newspaper syndicate, wire service, or radio or television station.

NONDISCLOSURE OF SOURCE

Sec. 3. Except as provided in section 4, no person shall be required by any court, grand jury, agency, department, or commission of the United States or by either House or of any committee of Congress to disclose the source of any information received or obtained by him in his capacity as a reporter, editor, commentator, journalist, writer, correspondent, announcer, or other person directly engaged in the gathering or presentation of news for any newspaper, periodical, press association, newspaper syndicate, wire service, or radio or television station.

QUALIFICATIONS

Sec. 4. (a) The privilege conferred by section 2 shall not apply to any information which has at any time been published, broadcast, or otherwise made public by the person claiming the privilege.

(b) The privilege conferred by section 3 shall not apply—

(1) to the source of any allegedly defamatory information in any case where the defendant, in a civil action for defamation, asserts a defense based on the source of such information; or

(2) to the source of any information concerning the details of any grand jury or other proceeding which was required to be secret under the laws of the United States.

(c) In any case where a person claims a privilege conferred by section 2 or 3, the person seeking the information may apply to the United States district court for an order divesting the privilege. Such application shall be made to the district court in the district wherein the hearing, action, or other proceeding in which the information is sought is pending. The order shall be granted if the court, after hearing the parties, determines that there is substantial evidence that disclosure of the information is required to prevent a threat to human life, of espionage, or of foreign aggression.

WILLIAM E. WALK, JR., RECEIVES
FRENCH MEDAL

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the opportunity to inform this assembly that a singular honor has been bestowed upon one of my constituents, Mr. William E. Walk, Jr., of Ontario, Calif. Mr. Walk was presented with the French Legion of Honor Medal by Premier Georges Pompidou on March 31. Reserved for individuals "who have performed great service to mankind," this award is given only in the name of the French Republic itself. Walk, current president of Rotary International, was sponsored for the honor by Louis Delacarte, president of the Rotary Club of Paris.

In commending Mr. Walk to the "Legion of Honor" committee, M. Delacarte cited Walk's service in the field of the humanities and his program which calls upon all Rotary members to "bridge the gaps" between people, nations, and races.

William Walk's goal to bring about international understanding through community group involvement can be an ex-

ample to all Americans—to build a better world, begin at home.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the imminent increase in funding for cancer research:

FUNDING FOR CANCER RESEARCH

As the Congress sifts through the Nation's priorities, renewed emphasis in the fight against cancer is coming to the top. There is no question about Congress' determination to step up the efforts to control this dread disease. We are faced now with the decision of (1.) creating a new authority to intensify the search for a cure, or (2.) pouring added resources into the present programs of research and care.

A Senate Health Subcommittee has completed hearings on a bill to establish an independent cancer authority to direct this effort. I introduced this legislation in the House at the opening of the 92nd Congress.

This approach would establish an independent governmental agency to bring together into a single unit the various Federal research programs now being administered by several agencies. It would be given free rein in its operation and in its allocation of funds to track down the cause, and effect a cure, for cancer.

The President has proposed, instead, to keep the authority for Federally-sponsored cancer research under the general administration of the National Institutes of Health, but with independent funding and with a director who would report only to the President.

In both approaches, the amount of government funding for the program would be substantially increased. Under the independent agency approach, the funding for research would be doubled from the present level of some \$200 million annually. President Nixon, who earlier reduced the funding level for cancer research, now proposes to increase it by some \$100 million annually. Public pressure for increased money to fight cancer has been growing, particularly in light of the fact that in 1969, the government spent for each citizen: \$410 for national defense, \$19 for the space program, \$19 for foreign aid, and 89 cents for cancer research.

There is no need to sell the nation or Congress on the urgency of the problem. No family has been left untouched by the tragedy of cancer. Despite advances in the detection and treatment of cancer, the incidence of the disease is increasing at a rate which makes it the Nation's No. 2 killer. More than 324,000 cancer deaths will occur in the United States this year, or more than one death every two minutes. More than half that number will be under 65 years of age, and, cruelly, 4,000 will be children.

Some 30 years ago, only one cancer patient in five had a chance of survival. Today, the survival rate stands at about 40 percent. Some forms of cancer, reached by surgery, are now being eliminated in 60 to 80 percent of the cases. New advances in radiation techniques are improving the survival percentages, and new drugs are prolonging the lives of leu-

kemia victims. Still, the cause of cancer has eluded our medical scientists.

At this point, when the public is demanding that more funds be channeled into the efforts to find a cure for cancer, a controversy is building on two points, (1.) who controls the funds, and (2.) how fast can an infusion of new money be effectively used toward the goal of finding a cure.

Opinion is divided, even among researchers. Some contend that the magic "breakthrough" is not close enough to begin a concentrated research effort in any particular area of cancer research. Others argue that recent basic research discoveries indicate that the cause of cancer may be discovered soon, and the time is ripe for a concerted effort in this field—similar to that which put man on the moon.

Those who favor an independent cancer authority to provide direction and money, say that the current efforts at research are buried under six tiers of bureaucracy which cause delays and duplication of research efforts, a general lack of direction, and needless competition for research funds.

Those who support the Administration's view that the National Institute of Health should continue to oversee research efforts argue that cancer straddles virtually all of the life sciences—from biology to chemistry to genetics—and that wide-ranging research holds the only hope for finding a cure.

Regardless of the approach decided upon by the Congress, it is apparent that significantly increased funding of cancer research will be forthcoming.

CONGRESSMAN McCLORY CONGRATULATES YOUNG VOTERS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of House Joint Resolution 401, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, I am addressing the following letter to a number of young voters in my congressional district. A copy of my letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1971.

DEAR FRIEND: Congratulations on helping to write a new chapter in Illinois history! Your recent action in registering to vote—thus indicating your desire to assume to full responsibilities of citizenship—makes you a new kind of "pioneer," in our nation and in our state. Next year, when you vote for President, U.S. Senator, and U.S. Representative, yours will be among the first "under 21" ballots ever counted in Illinois.

Also, I am confident that—even before the 1972 elections occur—the 26th Amendment to the Constitution will have been ratified, enabling you to vote for all offices, not only on the national level but in the state and local elections as well.

I look forward to working with you and for you in helping to make ours the kind of nation we all feel it must be.

The power of the ballot is mighty and I am confident that you will guard this power jealously and exercise it responsibly.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT McCLORY,
Member of Congress.

CLOSING OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION OFFICE IN JUNEAU, ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration is about to take action that if carried out would mean that the citizens of the southeastern part of Alaska would suffer needless delays and countless other difficulties in attempting to carry on business transactions with this agency. I have been informed that the Small Business Administration is about to close its Juneau office.

As you know, the State of Alaska is experiencing its worst economic depression in history. Besides the high rate of unemployment, business profits are off, and business sales are down. Many citizens of southeastern Alaska are single entrepreneurs and rely a great deal on the services of the Small Business Administration.

I am told that one of the reasons given for the removal of the Juneau office was that there were certain legal actions pending and economic expansion was not expected. However, I have been informed that a Federal court has largely removed the legal obstacles which the Small Business Administration has alluded to. The citizens of southeast Alaska cannot be served adequately by offices in Fairbanks and Anchorage. The large geographical size of Alaska makes adequate service almost impossible.

The Alaska State Legislature has expressed its strong protest against the closing of this office in Juneau. I include that resolution in the RECORD:

CLOSING OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION OFFICE IN JUNEAU

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas federal officials have recently made public the decision of the Small Business Administration to close its Juneau office; and

Whereas, if this action is carried out, it would mean that all the citizens of Southeastern Alaska would suffer needless delays, aggravation, and countless other difficulties in attempting to carry on business transactions with the Small Business Administration; and

Whereas one of the reasons given for the removal of the Juneau office was that certain legal actions were delaying an expected economic expansion, not only in Juneau, but in all of Southeastern; and

Whereas in recent days a federal court has largely removed the legal obstacles which the Small Business Administration has alluded to; and

Whereas the citizens of Southeastern Alaska cannot be adequately served by Small Business Administration personnel making periodic sojourns to Juneau;

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that it expresses its strong protest against the closing of the Small Business Administration office in Juneau and urgently requests the Small Business Administration to recon-

sider and rescind its decision to close its Juneau office.

SUPREME COURT IDEOLOGIES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article by Mr. Leo Rennert of the McClatchy Newspaper Syndicate.

Mr. Rennert's article demonstrates the danger in too simple ideological categorizations as they apply to our Supreme Court Justices.

The article follows:

IRONIC TWIST DEVELOPS ON SUPREME COURT (By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's two appointees on the US Supreme Court have been denounced by a couple of colleagues for gross deviationism from what had been expected to be their greatest virtue—"strict" construction of the Constitution.

In fact, if Justice Hugo Black is to be believed Chief Justice Burger and the court's newest member, Harry Blackmun, are basing their decisions on "the loosest construction that could be employed."

In a similar vein, Justice William O. Douglas lectured Burger and Blackmun the other day that "strict construction" of the Bill of Rights is necessary "if every man's liberty and privacy are to be constitutionally honored."

The Black-Douglas critique of their two younger brethren is highly ironic when it is recalled that Nixon campaigned hard in 1968 against a court he charged was dominated by "liberal" constructionists.

He promised that, if elected, he would redress the balance by appointing judges who would leave personal views out of their decisions and rigidly follow a "strict" interpretation of the Constitution's dictates.

It was with these credentials in mind that he named Burger and Blackmun to the court.

Yet, today, the court's two oldest members are openly accusing the two newest ones of practicing what Nixon so roundly condemned when Earl Warren was the tribunal's dominant figure.

BLACK'S VIEW

Listen to Black last April 5 as he dissented from a 5-4 majority opinion which saw Burger and Blackmun on the winning side:

"Of course the court's construction of the Constitution is not a 'strict' one. On the contrary, it proceeds on the premise that a majority of this court can change the Constitution day by day, month by month, and year by year, according to its shifting notions of what is fair, reasonable and right."

"There was little need for the founders to draft a written Constitution if this court can say it is only binding when a majority finds it fair, reasonable and right to make it so."

"That is the loosest construction that could be employed."

"... Our ancestors determine to draft a written Constitution which the members of this court are sworn to obey."

"While I remain on the court I shall continue to oppose the power of judges, appointed by changing administrations, to change the Constitution from time to time according to their notions of what is 'fair' and 'reasonable.'"

"I would decide this case not by my views of what is 'arbitrary,' or what is 'fair,' but rather by what the Constitution commands. 'I dissent.'"

Sounds familiar? Isn't this exactly the kind of charge which Nixon and other political conservatives leveled for years against the Warren Court?

Yet, here is venerable old Justice Black accusing Nixon's additions to the court of committing this most horrible of sins—substituting their judgment for the clear intent of the Founding Fathers.

What has happened in so short a period of time? Have Burger and Blackmun succumbed to the subversive climate of Washington? Should the House Internal Security Committee be alerted? Is it time for "Impeach Burger and Blackmun" billboards to spring up across the nation?

And why is House Republican Leader Gerald Ford silent about all this? And J. Edgar Hoover for that matter?

NOTHING PROFOUND

Well, nothing very insidious is really happening. No dark conspiracy is at work.

In fact, it was all very predictable. The conservatives' unhappiness with the Warren Court was not so much with the means it used to reach its conclusions as it was with those conclusions themselves.

It really mattered little that the Warren Court was or was not guilty of "liberal" constructionism. What its critics abhorred were its landmark cases expanding constitutional protection to the poor, the unpopular, the downtrodden.

If some of these precedents now are to be reversed or whittled down by the Burger court, Nixon and Atty. Gen. John Mitchell are not going to complain about the methods used to establish a more conservative outlook.

Even if those methods involve some "liberal" interpretations of constitutional law.

Actually, there is very little meaning or substance in these "liberal" and "strict" constructionist tags anyway.

No member of the court has ever confessed to twisting the Constitution and every justice sooner or later accuses his colleagues of doing so when they stubbornly refuse to bow to his superior insights.

Consider the opinion which so upset Justice Black on April 5. Writing for the five-member majority, Blackmun held that Congress could strip an American of his citizenship if he was born abroad to an American parent and failed to reside in this country for five years between the ages of 14 and 28.

Less than four years ago, Black recalled, the court ruled that all Americans—not just some—had a "constitutional" right to remain citizens unless they voluntarily relinquished their citizenship.

The 1967 ruling was based on the 14th Amendment which states:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside."

To Black, this language is very clear.

"The court held (in 1967) that no American can be deprived of his citizenship without his assent," he declared in his biting dissent.

"Today, the court overrules that holding. This precious 14th Amendment says American citizenship should not be blown around by every passing political wind that changes the composition of the court."

But to Blackmun, the language of the 14th Amendment also was clear. The Constitution, he said, only offers absolute citizenship protection to those born or naturalized "in" the United States. Thus, citizens born abroad are in a different category.

Black, however, said this was merely a "narrow, restrictive and super-technical" interpretation of the 14th Amendment.

The word "in" as it appears in that amendment, he said, really meant to encompass citizens born "within" the United States or those naturalized "into" it. Thus, the location of birth is immaterial.

Whose interpretation is the "strictest" one? Black's? Or Blackmun's?

The answer is fairly simple. Blackmun's. As of now. He had one more vote than Black. Five to four. Everything else is semantic camouflage.

Even Black, who would have us believe that there can be only one reading of the Constitution, let the cat out of the bag when he complained that Blackmun's opinion was not based on a "generous reading of the 'great purposes' of the 14th Amendment."

That creates a whole new ballgame. In addition to "strict" and "liberal" constructionists, we now can look forward to a third grouping—the "generous" constructionists, i.e. Black.

And Black alluded to the possibility of setting up even a fourth category of constitutional interpreters when he blasted the Blackmun-led majority for its "narrow and extraordinarily technical reading" of the 14th Amendment.

Let us see now. We started with "strict" and "liberal" constructionists. To this, we added the "generous" kind. And now we also have to contend with the "narrow and extraordinarily technical" type.

What next?

In the interest of candor and communication, would it not be preferable for all concerned to recognize that the Constitution—Black's protests to the contrary notwithstanding—does indeed "rise and fall with this court's passing notions (and) every political wind that changes (its) composition"?

FATHER ANTHONY B. ORLEMANSKI

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, Father Anthony B. Orlemanski, founder and pastor of Corpus Christi Church in Cleveland, will retire at the end of next month.

For 36 years he has been pastor at Corpus Christi Church. In tribute to his many years of dedicated leadership, the 1,800 families in his parish have planned a dinner in honor of his retirement. The dinner will be June 13, 1 week after Father Orlemanski's 75th birthday.

Corpus Christi Church was a small parish serving Cleveland's Polish families on the West Side when it was founded by Father Orlemanski in 1935. Under his leadership the parish grew and prospered. About 15 years ago the parish moved to a new, larger building. Today more than 600 boys and girls attend classes at the parish school.

Serving the church is a family tradition with Father Orlemanski. He was the fourth priest in a family of 10 children. He was ordained in 1922 at St. John's Cathedral in Cleveland. Next April he will celebrate the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

Father Orlemanski was first appointed pastor of St. John the Baptist Church at Campbell, Ohio, and served as pastor of Assumption Church in Grafton before coming to Corpus Christi Church in Cleveland.

The growth of the parish and its school are a tribute to this fine priest. I am proud to know him as a friend.

THE RFC, AN RX FOR THE DEFENSE AND AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an article by Harold V. Gleason, chairman of the board of the Franklin National Bank of New York, in which he proposes a new RFC as a prescription for the defense and aerospace industries, now in financial trouble.

Financial aid, not available by ordinary banking facilities could be given to firms making the difficult transition from military to civilian manufacturing. Such a new RFC may be helpful also in fields of endeavor other than defense and aerospace industries. Moneys for pollution prevention, which may involve vast expenditures beyond the reach of certain firms might be defrayed out of reasonably long-term loans from the RFC. Other benefits are also described.

The following article expounds these ideas:

THE RFC, AN RX FOR THE DEFENSE AND AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES

NATIONAL PRIORITIES HAVE SHIFTED

(By Harold V. Gleason)

The United States is already well on its way towards reordering its national priorities. (See Table 1) The arguments for a substantial shift away from defense spending into larger and more civilian programs are impressive. National defense expenditures represent some 34 per cent of the Federal budget.¹ Human resources comprise 42 per cent and miscellaneous the balance. Defense spending would represent more than half of Federal budget expenditures if the trust funds, which pay their own way, were excluded. The Federal Government receives about 64 per cent of all taxes collected in the country which includes 91 per cent of all individual incomes taxes.² But, most of the basic needs of our civilization are supplied by the states and cities, i.e., welfare, education, sanitation, public transportation, etc. And, as the middle classes flee to the suburbs, and the poor crowd into the cities, the tax bases of cities have been weakened while their expenditures continue to rise. Mayor Moon Landrieu of New Orleans has remarked, "The cities are going down the pipe", and Mayor Kenneth Gibson of Newark has pointed out, "Wherever the cities are going, Newark's going to get there first".³

TABLE 1.—PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTION, 1955, 1966, AND 1969

[In percent]			
Function	1955	1966	1969
Total Federal Government expenditures.....	100.0	100.0	100.0
Basic necessities.....	23.2	27.2	29.5
Education and manpower.....	2.3	3.7	3.8
Health.....	1.7	4.3	8.0
Transportation.....	1.8	4.3	3.5
General government.....	3.4	3.8	3.6
Defense.....	60.0	45.9	44.2
New housing.....	—	—	1.2
All other.....	7.8	10.0	6.2

Source: "Economic Report of the President," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1971, p. 100.

Footnotes at end of article.

In addition, national concern over pollution has further exacerbated the tug-of-war between civilian and military spending.

However, the maintenance of military "superiority" over the Soviet Union continues to be of paramount State interest to the United States. Mr. Robert C. Moot, Controller, Department of Defense, has expressed concern over the Soviet Union's spreading naval competition and ballistic missile development.⁴ He cites the following statistics: The Soviets have an 80 vessel nuclear submarine fleet as against 88 United States Nuclear subs, 31 of which are scheduled for conversion to multi-warhead Poseidon missiles. But, the Russians are building 10 new nuclear subs a year and have the capacity to build double that number. Other defense analysts have warned that while we have been preoccupied with Vietnam, Soviet spending on defense related research has substantially exceeded that of the United States, and the U.S.S.R. may have passed us in ICBM development and construction.⁵

Total national defense outlays reached a high of \$81.2 billion in fiscal 1969, fell to \$78.4 billion in fiscal 1971, but are scheduled to rise to \$77.5 billion in fiscal 1972.⁶ Undoubtedly, several billion of dollars could be saved by tightening up on cost over-runs, reforming procurement procedures and elimi-

nating unneeded and overlapping weapons. But, on the other hand, the \$15-20 billion defense slashes being advocated by some of our national leaders today fall more into the realm of myth rather than reality. The basic reason for this is that the nation is currently getting less bang per buck for each defense dollar being spent. Since 1965, inflation has eroded the true purchasing power of defense dollars by about 30 per cent.⁷ Measured in constant dollar terms, inflation can be said to already have slashed defense budget programs by approximately \$20 billion. In addition, increased military pay and benefits are expected to consume 65 per cent of the \$90 billion projected for the defense budget by 1975.⁸

So, in reality, defense budget programs have already been subsequently whittled down. And, it is likely that the prospective "peace dividend" from the winding down of the Vietnam war may disappear in the defense labyrinth. (See Table 2.) Therefore, rather than anticipating substantial cuts in defense spending, it is more likely that the emphasis will be placed on getting more of a bang for a buck within a slow rising defense budget. There may be greater emphasis on a small but well paid professional army and very expensive weapon systems.

TABLE 2.—DEFENSE TRENDS IN FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR STRATEGIC AND GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES VARIOUS FISCAL YEARS, 1962-71

[In billions of current dollars]

Authorization category	1962 (January 1961 estimate)	1962 actual	1964	1968	1970	1971
Strategic nuclear forces.....	15.7	17.0	17.1	16.6	17.7	18.0
General purpose forces (other than additions for Vietnam)....	29.2	33.2	34.5	37.5	41.7	43.3
Vietnam additions.....	—	—	—	23.0	17.0	11.0
Total.....	44.9	50.2	51.6	77.1	76.4	72.3

Source: Charles Schultze, "Setting National Priorities: The 1971 Budget," p. 19.

If, indeed, this is to be the future trend of defense spending, then only the financially strongest and largest defense firms will be able to produce such costly military hardware. For example, the Navy wants more nuclear carriers which are estimated to cost \$1 billion apiece. During World War II, the average cost of a non-nuclear powered carrier was only about \$87 million. (See Rise in Weapons Cost, which follows). And, the current Federal budget carries forward a minimum ABM system whose ultimate price tag is probably unknown.

Hence, the following conclusions appear likely. First, if the nation's civilian needs are to be met without a worsening of inflation, they will have to be closely matched to tax revenues produced by a rising gross national product as well as from additional tax increases. Secondly, it appears that actual defense spending will trend upwards in future years, although continuing to represent a declining share of the total Federal budget. And finally, the expected shift in defense spending towards more sophisticated and expensive weapons, higher military pay plus inflation are likely to accelerate the attrition of weak non-competitive defense contractors. It is estimated that 2 million people have lost their jobs in the defense and aerospace industries over the last two years, and an additional 1 million unemployed can be expected in 1971.⁹

THE TROUBLED AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

Within the nervous defense industry, the problems of the aerospace sector have been magnified because of the SST defeat for Boeing, NASA's budget cutbacks and fewer defense contracts. Approximately 90 per cent of all aerospace sales go to the Pentagon,

NASA and the commercial airlines (see Table 3). Aerospace sales have fallen from a high of \$29.5 billion in 1968 to an estimated \$23.5 billion in 1971.¹⁰ The Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, which received more than \$1.8 billion in prime contracts last year and produces the Poseidon missile and C5A transport, is dangerously close to bankruptcy.

RISE IN WEAPONS COST SINCE WORLD WAR II

Fighter: World War II cost \$53,000; today: \$12,000,000.

Tank: World War II cost \$70,000; today: \$600,000.

Destroyer: World War II cost \$6,500,000; today: \$90,000,000.

Submarine: World War II cost \$5,000,000; today: \$170,000,000.

Carrier: World War II cost \$87,000,000; today: \$1,000,000,000.

Bomber: World War II cost \$640,000; today: \$25,000,000.

Source: Michael Getler, "Defense Costs Peril Strategy," *The Washington Post*, April 19, 1971, p. A19.

Aerospace employment, currently a little over 1 million is down 25 per cent from three years ago and may be down to 962,000 by the end of the year (See Table 4).¹¹ Because as much as 25 percent of the employees in many aerospace companies consist of engineers and scientists, they pose a unique problem.¹² Their high levels of education and narrow technical training make it difficult for them to find comparable employment opportunities. Recent employment experiences for them have ranged from mathematics instructors to department store clerks.

Many aerospace manufacturers have attempted to step-up their diversification into civilian fields. However, their conversion ex-

periences have been slow and spotty despite their technical competence. They are striving to overcome the following obstacles: limited financial resources, a lack of competitive marketing skills and the fact that it takes many small commercial projects to replace one fat government contract.

TABLE 3.—AEROSPACE INDUSTRY SALES BY PRODUCT GROUPS

[In millions of dollars]

	Total sales	Aircraft	Missiles	Vehicles	Non-aerospace
1970 ¹	27,690	15,500	5,000	4,290	2,900
1969 ¹	28,271	15,858	5,034	4,499	2,880
1968	29,484	17,090	4,719	5,108	2,567
1967	27,267	14,981	4,417	5,290	2,579
1966	24,610	11,951	4,053	5,969	2,637
1965	20,670	9,747	3,626	5,329	1,968
1964	20,594	8,911	5,242	4,720	1,721
1963	20,134	8,527	6,003	3,774	1,830
1962	19,162	8,944	6,311	2,182	1,725
1961	17,997	8,847	6,266	1,264	1,620
1960	17,326	9,126	5,762	878	1,559
1959	16,640	9,714	5,042	386	1,478
1958	16,065	10,582	4,036	1	1,446

¹ Estimated.

Source: "Aerospace Industries Association," August 1970

To my knowledge, the Federal Government has not yet revealed an overall national economic plan to cope with the defense industry's conversion problems.¹³ The White House has made a small stab at this problem by announcing a \$42 Million "technical mobilization and re-employment program" to provide jobs for about 15,000 out of 100,000 engineers and scientists out of work.¹⁴

Too often in the past, piecemeal governmental policies have either been ineffective or have worked at cross purposes. But, nothing less than a comprehensive economic plan may be needed to deal with the complex problems confronting the defense industry.

My suggestion calls for a revival of the highly successful Reconstruction Finance Corporation to help solve, what many consider to be, a genuine national emergency.

THE HISTORY OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION Creation of the RFC

The pattern for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had its origins in the War Finance Corporation created during World War I.¹⁵ The WFC was set up to make advances to banks making loans to enterprises essential to the war effort, or in exceptional cases, to make such advances directly to such enterprises.

In 1931, President Herbert Hoover proposed an 18 point legislative program to deal with the Great Depression.¹⁶ Point number 2 recommended creation of a Reconstruction Finance Corporation to provide loans to all financial institutions, railroads and industry.¹⁷ Congress established the RFC in January, 1932 but omitted direct RFC assistance to industry.¹⁸ It was not until June 1934 that it authorized the RFC and the Federal Reserve banks to make direct loans to industrial businesses.

The original act set up a potential fund of \$2 billion, obtainable by the sale of \$500 million of its capital stock to the United States Treasury and it could sell up to \$1.5 billion of notes debentures and bonds.¹⁹ This seemed like a lot of money at the time. But, it was only the beginning of a flow that ultimately totaled \$50 billion, authorized to fight, first, the Depression, then, the Second World War.²⁰

TABLE 4.—EMPLOYMENT REDUCTION PLANS IN THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

	1968	1971
Lockheed	93,000	75,000
Boeing	102,000	44,000
North American Rockwell	114,000	76,000
McDonnell Douglas	124,700	92,000

Source: "The Troubled Blue Yonder", Time, Apr. 5, 1971, p. 77.

The primary objective of the original act was to provide loans which could not be provided through regular banking channels.²¹ The loans granted by the RFC were somewhat riskier than many prudent banks cared to make. But this is not to say that RFC loans during the Depression were intended to be a "free giveaway". On the contrary, they were made on the expectation that they would be repaid.²² Furthermore, these loans had to be secured by collateral. The principal reason for turning down loan requests was unsatisfactory earnings prospects.

The rates charged on RFC loans were consistently higher than those charged by commercial banks. This difference can be partially explained by a difference in the risk assumed in each case. In addition, such rates were defended as a means of avoiding competition between governmental agencies and the commercial banks.²³

RFC activities during depression and war

In 1932, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected President of the United States for the first of four consecutive terms. Roosevelt installed his old friend, Jesse Jones, a Texas banker, as head of the RFC.²⁴ Under Jones' stewardship, the activities of the RFC were greatly extended to include loans to newly established public financial institutions, as well as to existing public agencies, private financial institutions and other businesses.

Between 1932 and 1945, the RFC loaned and spent approximately \$35 billion, although it had been authorized many more billions than were ultimately used.²⁵ It grew to be America's largest corporation and the world's biggest and most varied banking organization. Over the Depression period, the RFC lent out \$10.5 billion. But, all of it was eventually returned to the Treasury, including \$500 million in profits.²⁶

Some 5,000 banks failed during the depression; had it not been for the RFC, several thousand more would have.²⁷ Through the creation of several subsidiaries, the RFC's role was expanded to economic pump priming. For example, the RFC mortgage Company and the Federal National Mortgage Association were organized to help provide mortgages, and the Export-Import Bank to stimulate exports. In addition, it helped finance the Rural Electrification Administration which provided rural electricity. Credit must also be given the RFC for the many public projects which are dotted throughout our country. Such projects as bridges, tunnels, toll highways, dormitories, recreation centers, water and sewer systems and many other various city and state improvements were all financed by the RFC during the depths of the Depression. All of these projects not only provided tens of thousands of jobs themselves, but also indirectly provided employment to supplying and transportation companies which manufactured the required materials or moved them to their place of use.

During World War II, the RFC lent \$22.5 billion and incurred a loss of \$9.3 billion. But, the loss had been expected and was necessary for the national defense.²⁸ The RFC's war efforts preceded our actual involvement by over a year. In June, 1940 Congress grant-

ed it probably the most powers ever given a single federal agency. It authorized the RFC to negotiate contracts to produce and stockpile critical and strategic materials which would be necessary in the event of war.

One of the many new subsidiaries of the RFC during the war was the Defense Plant Corporation.²⁹ It was created in August, 1940 primarily to build and operate plants and facilities for the production of war material, and to do other things for our national defense. By 1945, the DPC had disbursed approximately \$9.2 billion on 23 hundred projects in 46 states and a few foreign lands. It built plants, shipyards, pipelines, bought and sold equipment and materials, paid subsidiaries and did whatever else was needed for the war effort. Except for a small number of cases of management-fee agreements, its defense plants were operated under lease by private companies for their own accounts.

As a result of its investment, DPC owned at the time of its dissolution in June, 1945, between 10 and 12 per cent of the total industrial capacity of the nation.³⁰ The process of liquidating this vast industrial empire took several post-war years. Under Reorganization Plan No. 1, effective June 30, 1957, the RFC, itself, was abolished. Its remaining functions were transferred to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, General Services Administration, Small Business Administration, and the Secretary of the Treasury.³¹

How the RFC might operate under current conditions

If the RFC concept were to be revived to deal with current problems in the defense industry, financial assistance from the RFC would be forthcoming to those defense firms who must make the difficult transition from military to civilian manufacturing. In addition, financial assistance would also be provided to certain defense contractors whose survival is vital to the national defense. The decision as to which defense contractor would continue, as against which would be phased out, would have to be judged within the context of over-all national security.

To provide financial assistance to all of these companies, the new "RFC" could begin by implementing the following six proposals:

1. Encourage the formation of bank syndicates to share the risks and costs of financial assistance and which might include some RFC participation.

Loans which may entail a higher degree of risk than bankers would normally deem to be prudent would be guaranteed by the RFC.

3. In certain cases, the RFC would make direct loans to defense companies where expectations for repayment would either be over too long a time period for banks to consider, or where repayment prospects, in fact, would not be likely.

4. The RFC would provide direct loans to defense employees for retraining and relocation expenses.

5. RFC resources would be used to finance and build socially desirable projects, i.e., mass transit and pollution control systems using the skills and technology available in the defense industry.

6. Leasing plant facilities constructed with RFC funds to defense contractors who would provide operation and maintenance services.

An act of Congress would be necessary to revive the RFC and to provide it with similar borrowing and lending powers similar to those it had in the past. But, this would create one more Federal agency seeking funds in the credit markets and generating upward pressures on interest rates. Therefore, Congress should also require the review and coordination of its borrowing operations with those of all other Federal credit programs

which are currently either within or outside of the Federal budget.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Defense and Aerospace

"Aerospace Industry: Its Formula For Survival", *U.S. News and World Report*, February 15, 1971.

"Aerospace Tries to Pick Up the Pieces", *Business Week*, December 12, 1970.

"Aerospace: The Troubled Blue Yonder", *Time*, April 5, 1971.

Alsop, Stewart. "The Cities Are Finished", *Newsweek*, April 5, 1971.

Beecher, William. "Soviet Believed Installing MIRV'S", *The New York Times*, April 23, 1971.

"Billions For Defense", *Forbes*, December 1, 1970.

The Budget Of The United States Government Fiscal Year 1972. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington; 1971.

"Climbing Costs Threaten To Force U.S. Retreat From Present Military Strategy", *The Wall Street Journal*, April 2, 1971.

Economic Report Of The President. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington; 1971.

Gallbraith, John Kenneth. *The New Industrial State*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1967.

Geist, Lee. "Aerospace—More A Paradox Than An Industry", *The Exchange*, August, 1970.

Gerrity, John. "No Administration Plan On Horizon To Help Nation Convert To A Peacetime Economy", *The Weekly Bond Buyer*, April 12, 1971.

Getler, Michael. "Defense Costs Peril Strategy", *The Washington Post*, April 19, 1971.

Gottschalk, Earl C. Jr. "Aerospace Companies, Workers Hurt By Cuts In Government Outlays", *The Wall Street Journal*, May 15, 1970.

Herbers, John. "What Makes Proxmire Run?", *The New York Times*, April 4, 1971.

Laird, Melvin R., Secretary of Defense. "Peace Dividend From The Pentagon", *Nation's Business*, October, 1970.

Loehwing, David A., "Break In The Clouds?", *Barrons*, October 5, 1970.

Melman, Seymour (ed.). *The Defense Economy*. Praeger Publishers, New York, 1970.

Melman, Seymour. *Pentagon Capitalism*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1970.

Muskie, Edmund S. "A Reply To Fuller", *The New York Times*, April 14, 1971.

"Packard", *Duns*, August, 1970.

Samuelson, Robert J. "Ailing Aerospace", *The Washington Post*, April 4, 1971.

Schultze, Charles L. *Setting National Priorities, The 1971 Budget*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C., 1970.

Snyderman, Nat. "Million Additional Defense, Space Jobs Seen Lost", *Electronic News*, January 4, 1971.

Statistical Abstract Of The United States, 1970, 91st Annual Edition, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970.

Wilson, George C. "Senator Proxmire Moves To Cut Arms Spending", *The Washington Post*, April 13, 1971.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation

Burns, James MacGregor. *Roosevelt: The Lion and The Fox*. A Harvest Book, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York, 1956.

Congress And The Nation, 1945-1964, Vol. 1. Published By Congressional Quarterly Service, Washington, D. C., 1965.

Congress And The Nation 1945-1965, A Review of Government And Politics In The Post War Years. Published By The Congressional Quarterly Service, Copyright by The Congressional Quarterly, Inc., Washington, D. C., 1965.

Ebersole, J. F. "One Year Of The Reconstruction Finance Corporation", *Quarterly Journal Of Economics*, May, 1933.

Friedman, Milton, and Schwartz, Anna

Jacobson. *A Monetary History Of The United States 1867-1960*. National Bureau Of Economic Research, New York, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1963, 4th printing 1969.

Glover, John Desmond. "Industrial Loan Policy Of The RFC", *Harvard Business Review*, Autumn, 1939.

Hoover, Herbert. *The Memoirs Of Herbert Hoover, The Great Depression 1929-1941*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1952.

Janeway, Eliot. "Point Of View", *New York News Syndicate, The Weekly Bond Buyer*, March 15, 1971.

Jones, Jesse H. *Fifty Billion Dollars, My Thirteen Years With The RFC (1932-1945)*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1951.

Jones, Jesse H. *News Release*, January 15, 1945.

Jones, Jesse H. *Reconstruction Finance Corporation Seven-Year Report*. To The President Of The United States, February 2, 1932 to February 2, 1939.

Klemme, Ernest M. "Industrial Loan Operations Of The Reconstruction Finance Corporation And The Federal Reserve Banks", *The Journal Of Business*, October, 1939.

Myers, William Starr and Newton, Walter H. *The Hoover Administration, A Documented Narrative*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1938.

Stein, Herbert. *The Fiscal Revolution In America*. The University Of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1969.

Studenski, Paul and Krooss, Herman E. *Financial History Of The United States*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.

White, Gerald T. "Financing Industrial Expansion For War: The Origin Of The Defense Plant Corporation Leases", *Journal Of Economic History*, November, 1949.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *The Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1972*, U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 6.

² *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1970*, 91st Annual Edition, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970, p. 406.

³ Stewart Alsop, "The Cities Are Finished", *Newsweek*, April 5, 1971, p. 100.

⁴ "Pentagon Cuts: The Worst Is Yet To Come", *Businessweek*, September 12, 1970, pp. 94-96.

⁵ William Beecher, "Soviet Believed Installing MIRV'S", *The New York Times*, April 23, 1971, p. 1.

⁶ *The Budget of the United States Government, op. cit.*, p. 569.

⁷ Assumes the inflation rate averaged 5 per cent per year over the past six years.

⁸ "Climbing Costs Threaten To Force U.S. Retreat From Present Military Strategy", *The Wall Street Journal*, April 2, 1971, p. 1.

⁹ Nat Snyderman, "Million Additional Defense, Space Jobs Seen Lost", *Electronic News*, January 4, 1971, p. 20.

¹⁰ "Aerospace: The Troubled Blue Yonder", *Time*, April 5, 1971, p. 76.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

¹² Seymour Melman (ed.) *The Defense Economy*, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970), p. vi.

¹³ John Gerrity, "No Administration Plan on Horizon To Help Nation Convert To A Peacetime Economy", *The Weekly Bond Buyer*, April 12, 1971, p. 9.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Paul Studenski and Herman E. Krooss, *Financial History Of The United States*, McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952, p. 300.

¹⁶ Herbert Hoover, *The Memoirs Of Herbert Hoover, The Great Depression 1929-1941*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1952, p. 98.

¹⁷ The RFC was to be used for the following purposes:

(a) to establish and finance a system of agricultural credit banks that would make loans for crop and livestock production not to be had during the depression from existing banks,

(b) to make loans to the existing Farmers'

Intermediate Credit Banks to enable them to finance the marketing of crops,

(c) to make loans to building and loan associations, savings banks, insurance companies and other real estate mortgage agencies so as to enable them to postpone foreclosures,

(d) to make loans to banks and financial institutions "which cannot otherwise secure credit where such advances will protect the credit structure and stimulate employment",

(e) to make loans to the railways to prevent receiverships,

(f) to finance exports that would aid farmers and the unemployed,

(g) to finance modernization and construction of industrial plants and utilities so as to increase employment and plant efficiency,

(h) to make loans to closed banks upon their sound assets so as to enable them at least partially to pay out deposits to a multitude of families and small businesses who were in distress because their deposits were tied up pending liquidation or reorganization of these banks.

¹⁸ The management of the Corporation was vested in a Board of Directors of seven members, consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, the Farm Loan Commissioner, *ex officio*, and four other presidential appointees with two-year terms. The Board was given almost complete discretionary powers as to personnel, organization, expenses and rates of interest to be charged.

The Federal Reserve banks were "authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents" for the Corporation. Regional loan offices were set up in each of the Federal Reserve bank and branch cities, advisory committees and a paid manager being appointed for each of such loan agencies. Local operations were conducted wherever possible on Federal Reserve bank premises. Loans were made, collateral held, and collections made at these agencies; only loans to the railroads, farm loan banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks were at the main office in the District of Columbia.

¹⁹ Studenski and Krooss, *op. cit.*, p. 371.

²⁰ Jesse H. Jones, *Fifty Billion Dollars, My Thirteen Years With The RFC (1932-1945)*, The Macmillan Company, New York, p. 3.

²¹ J. F. Ebersole, "One Year of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," *Quarterly Journal Of Economics*, May 1933, p. 468.

²² John Desmond Glover, "Industrial Loan Policy Of The RFC", *HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW*, Autumn, 1939, p. 466.

²³ Ernest M. Klemme, "Industrial Loan Operations Of The Reconstruction Finance Corporation And The Federal Reserve Banks", *The Journal Of Business*, October, 1939, p. 380.

²⁴ James MacGregor Burns, *Roosevelt: The Lion and The Fox*, A Harvest Book, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York, 1956, p. 2.

²⁵ Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 315.

³⁰ Gerald T. White, "Financing Industrial Expansion For War: The Origin of the Defense Plant Corporation Leases," *Journal Of Economic History*, November, 1949, p. 158.

³¹ *Congress And The Nation, 1945-1964*, Vol. 1, Published By Congressional Quarterly Service, Washington, D. C., 1965, p. 1467.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a land of progress and prosperity, it is

often easy to assume an "out of sight, out of mind" attitude about matters which are not consistently brought to our attention. The fact exists that today more than 1,500 American servicemen are listed as prisoners or missing in Southeast Asia. The wives, children, and parents of these men have not forgotten, and I would hope that my colleagues in Congress and our countrymen across America will not neglect the fact that all men are not free for as long as one of our number is enslaved. I insert the name of one of the captured:

Capt. George William Clarke, Jr., U.S. Air Force, xxxx, Hampton, Va. Married. The son of Mr. and Mrs. George W. Clarke, Sr., a 1962 graduate of Howard University. Officially listed as captured October 16, 1967. As of today, Captain Clarke has been a prisoner in Southeast Asia for 1,315 days.

NEEDS OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently, 54 executives of the Western Electronics Manufacturers Association met with Members of Congress and Senators from the western States. Mr. R. C. Mercure, president of WEMA, spoke at this meeting and delivered one of the most succinct and impressive speeches concerning the electronics industry that I have heard.

His two main points were that the United States needs a national policy with respect to science and technology, and that we must also give consideration to a means of developing international trade in high technology items.

Since this speech is important to all American industry, I commend the full text to the attention of all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPEECH OF R. C. MERCURE

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Congress, I am Merc Mercure, President of WEMA.

On behalf of the 54 industry executives who have crossed the country to be here today, I want to welcome you to our Congressional Luncheon. I also want to thank Senator Warren Magnuson of Washington for obtaining the use of this room for us today.

Since this is a once-a-year affair, we like to keep it informal, with most of the talking being done by you with our industry executives during the reception and across the table, rather than by me at the podium. Therefore, I will be brief.

WEMA is a trade association of 580 companies in electronics manufacturing and information technology in the thirteen western states.

Our members range from small firms employing literally a handful of people to very large companies. The bulk of our membership is best defined as small to medium-sized companies serving both government and commercial markets.

Many WEMA companies sell to foreign customers as well as domestically. And, let me assure you that in a year such as the one we have just gone through, the ability of some companies to sell internationally has been the difference between life and death.

In past years, WEMA's government affairs work centered almost exclusively around federal procurement matters, such as the creation of the Commission on Government Procurement, independent research and development, and uniform cost accounting standards.

We're not going to drop our interest in working to take some of the paperwork, waste and frustration out of government procurement. But, we have to do much more than simply focus on procurement issues. We are very concerned about our industries' future survival in a world that is much broader than the United States Government market.

For example, this past year has clearly brought home the catastrophic effects of the cyclic nature of defense and space spending. The high technology companies involved in fulfilling the government's needs—and the people those companies employ—were hit particularly hard by this shift in national priorities. Not that there's anything wrong with shifting priorities, but the immediate impact of the rapid decline in defense and space budgets, without offsetting programs, is of great concern to us all. A large number of people are now stranded with little hope that the normal marketplace will be able to absorb them in the fields for which they were trained.

Many of you have taken the lead in attempting to devise policies and programs to ease the shift in national priorities. We applaud you for the attention you have given this problem. But, the sheer number of proposals you have submitted demonstrates one thing clearly: long-range policy objectives have not been developed to guide you in your efforts.

Recently, there has been talk in the Congress and the Executive Branch of a need for a complete overhaul of the nation's science and technology policy. Movement in this direction has not yet developed into a cohesive program, but there is one excellent proposal—that a national science and technology policy be stated and maintained as a public law. We think that is an appropriate place to start. Indeed, we believe it should have your immediate attention. If there had been such a policy five years ago, it might have been possible to:

- (1) alleviate or minimize the effects of today's aerospace and defense cutbacks;
- (2) zero in on domestic problem-solving and create a market for new electronic hardware and computer software years before the need became urgent;
- (3) prevent government cutbacks of science and engineering research at colleges and universities throughout the country.

The WEMA Board of Directors this month unanimously approved a resolution that this Association work for the establishment of a national science and technology policy.

As a first step, I will shortly be calling together the leaders of our industries in the West to ask their views on what the objectives of a national science and technology policy should be and how those objectives might be achieved.

You will be hearing more from us on this issue. This is not just industry's problem, nor it is just Government's problem. It is our problem, and Government and industry must work together to cope with it.

The second general matter I want to touch upon today is our industries' involvement and stake in the international marketplace. Like everyone else, our companies face competition from foreign manufacturers. Most of us have been successful in maintaining a technological lead over our foreign competitors. As a result, our companies have been able—so far—to increase their international sales every year.

But we live in a tough competitive world—a world in which the comfortable technological gap that we enjoyed for so long has or

is being closed rapidly by other industrial nations. In part, this is a result of a conscious government/industry cooperative effort by our foreign competitors. This internationally-oriented government/industry partnership is best exemplified by the Japanese.

Here's how it looks to us. The available evidence makes it clear that the Japanese Government has a major policy the shifting of resources towards the production of high technology products, including many items produced by our western companies. Today our computer industry is preparing for the invasion of Japanese computers into the U.S.

The high-technology sector of Japanese industry is especially well protected from U.S. competition. Japan's average duty on higher technology items is almost 10% greater than on low technology products. By contrast, in the United States the average duty on higher technology products is substantially below that on low technology products.

It's the same with non-tariff barriers. Most of Japan's remaining restrictions are on such items as computers and other sophisticated electronic equipment. These are the types of high-technology products in which the United States has been the world leader. There are very few Japanese import restrictions on lower technology manufactured goods. As somebody said in the recent *Time Magazine* article, a United States company can build a factory in Japan to make wooden sandals. But, computers—no way!

On the other hand, U.S. quantitative restrictions and other non-tariff trade barriers give no differential to high technology products.

Japanese industrial development laws give financial aid to industries which promise high growth or which have large research and development expenditures. This help may take a number of forms, including tax incentives and long-term loans at low interest rates. It doesn't happen here, even though our foreign trade has worried the last two administrations.

I raise these points to illustrate the type of government/industry cooperation our companies are competing with internationally. When we compare the Japanese policies—or, for that matter, the policies of any of our other Western European competitors with our own—it becomes clear—at least to those of us in industry—that the United States does not have a coherent trade policy designed to stimulate exports or even to encourage reciprocity in our trading relations with other countries. Rather, our trade policies for too long have evolved from diplomatic meetings, motivated mainly by political policy considerations and wholly divorced from economic realities.

These are tough times. Cutbacks in federal spending and a general softness in the economy have caused severe unemployment and economic problems throughout our country. We in the West have been especially hard hit, as you know. Right now, both Government and industry should be looking for ways to build up our sales in international markets. At the same time, we should be negotiating in a no-nonsense way for reciprocity with our trading partners. Specifically, what can be done? It is our view that our country should move to:

- (1) reduce U.S. unilateral controls over trade in peaceful goods with Eastern Europe to the level applied to our major trading partners;
- (2) insure that the Export-Import Bank, our Government's only commercial financing facility, has the capability flexibility to meet the growing needs of business;
- (3) push U.S. participation in the European Multipartite Accord;
- (4) enact legislation enabling the formation of Domestic International Sales Corporations;
- (5) give the President the authority to

conduct aggressive trade negotiations to knock down import barriers of other countries.

Action like this will go a long way to insure that our industries continue to compete internationally and continue to provide jobs at home.

Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you very much for your attention. We appreciate your being here with us today. I hope you have found this gathering to be a pleasant one, and we will be looking forward to seeing you again next year.

CLARIFICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, as American involvement in Southeast Asia continues, and as it becomes evident that the pattern of American participation in wars on foreign soil is substantially different from anything we have experienced in the past, it is necessary for that Congress to reexamine and redefine the use of its constitutional authority to declare war.

Congress has plenty of authority, but it has difficulty in exercising this authority. The result of congressional inaction has been an established precedent of police actions and undeclared wars. It is important to note that this has been an abdication of congressional authority rather than a usurpation by the executive.

In order to clarify the President's authority to act in his capacity as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, but at the same time allow Congress a reasonable time to act in accordance with its constitutional authority, I am today introducing a bill which will establish a procedure for Congress and the executive branch of Government to participate jointly in the formation and responsibility for military policy.

My bill will require the President to inform Congress prior to, or within a reasonable period of time after engaging U.S. troops in combat. It would further require that troops must be withdrawn unless Congress passes specific enabling authorization for this action within 30 days.

This bill would alter current practice as follows:

First. It would reassert and update the role of Congress in declaring war in an age of undeclared wars.

Second. It would clarify the President's authority to act decisively in emergency situations when the prior approval of Congress is impracticable.

Third. By requiring a congressional mandate for Presidential action, it would help to generate an essential unity in America when forces are committed to combat on foreign soil.

Fourth. It would prevent spur-of-the-moment action by providing a 30-day period for careful review.

THE SURPLUS OF TEACHERS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the teacher shortage of recent years has been followed by a teacher surplus. Just how large the excess number of educators is depends on what statistics are used.

According to the Office of Education, a component of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the number of graduates with teaching degrees will exceed the number of teaching jobs available in public elementary and secondary schools by 19,000 in the school year beginning in September 1971, as compared with 6,000 for 1970. The surplus will increase to 29,000 in 1972, 32,000 in 1973, 45,000 in 1974, and 55,000 in 1975.

Later data compiled by the National Center for Educational Statistics, an agency of the Office of Education, are even more discouraging to those who will be seeking positions as teachers. These data give the following figures for the surplus: 1970—20,000; 1971—33,000; 1972—44,000; 1975—72,000; 1978—93,000. The bureau of appointments of the Illinois State University foresees a national surplus of 600,000 teachers by 1975.

Articles that appear in the U.S. News, July 6, and the New York Times, July 19, shortly before the present school year began, give details about the difficulties would-be teachers are experiencing. According to the news-magazine:

In California, more than 5,000 teachers have been added to the job market because of staff reductions made this year by hard-pressed school districts.

The Los Angeles city school system . . . intends to eliminate nearly 2,000 teachers from the rolls of its junior and senior high schools this autumn.

In Cleveland, plans for hiring an additional 1,200 teachers have been suspended and the present teaching force is to be cut back by 1,000. . . .

The number of teacher vacancies for the September term in Florida, projected at 2,803 in April, has now been reduced by more than 50%.

A recent survey in Minnesota showed that fewer than 42% of June's teaching graduates registered with placement offices have found jobs.

In some Indiana schools, according to college placement officers, from 100 to 150 graduates may be applicants for the same job.

Clarion [Pennsylvania] State College . . . reports 900 applicants for 75 openings in the Pittsburgh area. . . .

Applications in Great Falls [Montana] . . . have totaled 1,500 for 125 vacancies.

Storm Lake, Iowa, got 150 applications this year for 15 openings. . . .

The public-school system in Washington, D.C., reports it has . . . about 7,500 applications for 150 vacancies.

According to the Times story, in Tacoma, Wash., 400 graduates out of a class of 630 had not found teaching jobs. The article continued:

At Sacramento State College, only 300 of 892 potential teachers who graduated this year have found jobs. The local school dis-

trict has more than 4,000 applications for its 200 openings. . . .

In Chicago . . . 100 new applications arrive daily. . . .

Many suburban school districts in the Chicago area report 20 to 50 applications for every opening.

Cincinnati . . . will hire 500 new teachers . . . More than 5,000 applications have been received.

. . . In Moorhead [Minnesota], where applications have run around 500 annually, the figure this year has tripled.

. . . In Uniondale, New York, 400 have applied for seven elementary school openings.

It can safely be assumed that some candidates for teaching positions send applications to more than one school. On the other hand, the two news stories that I have quoted cover only a few of the thousands of situations.

There are several reasons for the surplus of teachers, one of the obvious ones being the decline in the birth rate from 4,100,000 in 1963, to 3,400,000 in 1968. Revolts by taxpayers, who are angry because of the constantly increasing cost of education and, in many cases, disgusted with the results, have curtailed funds available for teachers' salaries. Unemployment in other fields has caused some of the jobless and their wives to return to teaching. The number of teachers will be swelled by the return of men presently stationed in Southeast Asia but the ending of draft deferments will offset this more or less.

While all predictions based on statistical projections have to be taken with a grain of salt, it is obvious that the surplus of teachers will continue for some time. For that reason, future authorizations and appropriations for educational programs ought to be scrutinized with greater care, as a tremendous amount of Federal money is currently being used to educate teachers.

While part of the answer to the problem of what to do about the teacher surplus would be a reduction in the number being graduated by the colleges and universities, some consideration ought to be given to a statement made early in 1970 by Geoffrey H. Moore, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. In discussing the change from a shortage of teachers to a surplus, he said:

With manpower constraints lifted, more communities may introduce or expand kindergartens, nursery schools, and curriculums for the handicapped and for the gifted. In addition, as the supply situation improves, local school officials may feel they can improve the quality of education by hiring additional teachers to reduce class size. The resulting effect on manpower requirements could be very significant.

MEDICAL SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL JEOPARDY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the urgent need for quali-

fied health personnel throughout the entire United States. The present shortages that we are now faced with are tremendous, but the projected shortages are truly frightening. According to the U.S. Public Health Service there was a shortage of 17,800 dentists and 150,000 nurses as of 1970. If the present rate continues, there is a projected need of 56,000 and 210,000, respectively, for 1980. This is a total manpower shortage of almost 100,000 people in just these two areas alone. This figure does not include projected increased needs in other health related fields.

This situation relates to the financial problems faced by many, if not all, of our health schools. Many such schools have had to resort to the use of emergency funds to continue with their programs. However, even this source of financial aid will soon run out. The Federal Government, through the Manpower Act of 1968, has provided aid to these schools, but this aid in the form of grants has not been sufficient to cope with the situation. The 1968 act authorized more funds than were actually appropriated.

According to a report by the National Committee To Save Our Schools of Health, there are three basic courses of action for the Congress to take. The first is a simple extension of our present program. The second is an extension with increased authorization for amounts to be appropriated. Finally, they call for a complete restructuring of the present system. It is obvious to me that the first course of action has pitifully failed, and that the second does not go far enough to curb this rising tide.

Mr. Speaker, it is all too evident that concrete action is needed in this area. I would like to call upon the Members of Congress to investigate the different possibilities for future action and to take all the necessary steps to bring this growing problem to a halt.

OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH STATUS REPORT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the 1968 Omnibus Housing Act this Congress set a decade housing goal of 26 million units, including 6 million subsidized units. That goal would mean producing 2.6 million units annually or at approximately twice the current rate. This was and is an ambitious goal, and some would argue, perhaps an unrealistic goal, but in terms of our housing needs it may even have been a conservative estimate. We were thus confronted with the challenge of how to meet these real needs given the realities of existing capabilities. In response to that challenge, the Congress authorized Operation Breakthrough, an attempt to produce houses on a volume basis utilizing, to the maximum extent feasible, new technologies and materials.

When George Romney took office as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, he gave Breakthrough his per-

sonal attention and high priority in his Department. Intense competition was initiated which resulted in 600 housing design and site proposals. Out of this competition, 22 prototype producers and nine sites were selected, and this month the first Breakthrough bungalow rolled off the assembly line. Secretary Romney was on hand for the ceremony, and he hailed the event as signaling "the coming of a real revolution in housing."

Breakthrough has encountered many problems along the way, and will likely encounter many more in the future. Breakthroughs do not come easy, especially when you are trying to break with the horse and buggy housing era with its tangled web of restraints. But there are many encouraging signs at which we can take heart. The response and cooperation of industry, labor, and State and local governments have made possible things people would not have dreamed possible a few years ago. Slowly but surely the barriers are falling and Operation Breakthrough is becoming a reality.

Two recent articles have given a balanced appraisal of the problems, progress, and prospects of Operation Breakthrough, one from the May issue of Government Executive, and the other from the May 20 New York Times. I include both of these articles at this point in the RECORD, and commend them to the reading of my colleagues:

[From Government Executive, May 1971]

DIVERSE PROBLEMS CROP UP, BUT—OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH, RECIPIENT OF KUDOS, CRITICISM, MOVES AHEAD ON PROJECTS

HIGHLIGHTS

1. Operation Breakthrough, HUD's ambitious research and development program, is seen as a catalyst that will benefit the entire housing industry.

2. Gains being promoted by Breakthrough activities include statewide industrialized housing agreements, local code revision, labor agreements, improved data retrieval and dissemination processes. But there is doubt much truly new technology will emerge from its prototype projects.

3. Industry meanwhile is active in a variety of systems housing projects, while awaiting a "real dollar" commitment to housing by Uncle Sam.

Operation Breakthrough. It has a beautiful ring to it. It is a title that any advertising man would have been proud to have dreamed up. But what will it accomplish in solving the Nation's housing crisis? Is the program worthwhile? Will it eventually be consigned to that intellectual scrap heap of outworn Government slogans upon which such tantalizing Federal catch phrases as "The War on Poverty" or "The Great Society" have been dumped unceremoniously and without noticeable public lament?

Possibly too much may be expected of Breakthrough. This kind of program has built-in elements of both success and failure.

At the very outset, it was suspect because it was mounted at an unpropitious time from a fiscal standpoint. It is underfunded. It is not of the sizeable scope that such a program should be. Therefore, so the thinking goes, it inevitably will be a bust.

But Breakthrough also is a success, if only because it exists. It is the outgrowth on the Federal level of the thrust for more Government involvement in housing generated by many respected urbanologists over the years.

And during those years, it should be noted, neither the Federal Government, big industry as a whole, nor the public showed much interest in the national housing problem. The headlines reading, "Half of U.S. Popula-

tion Cannot Afford to Buy a \$21,000 Home," were to come later.

Operation Breakthrough, it is important to emphasize, is not a flashy instant creation of the present Administration. It is an evolutionary development, a response to demonstrable political, social, and economic needs that could have been called something quite different and have been launched one Administration earlier or later, depending upon prevailing conditions.

The pressures, in other words, have been building for some time among builders, financial institutions, corporations, construction labor, and housing consumers.

The program's precursors most notably include the National Commission on Urban Problems otherwise known as the Douglas Commission (so named for Sen. Paul Douglas, who headed it), the Committee on Urban Housing (the Kaiser Committee), and housing technology task forces within HUD and the Commerce Department. All of these groups drew heavily on the findings of highly respected housing experts.

This is not to denigrate the efforts of HUD Secretary George Romney, Dr. Harold Finger, the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, or of the Breakthrough program's staff.

The consensus is that they are doing quite a bit more than might be expected under very trying conditions. Industrialized housing markets are being assembled that did not exist before. Labor unions are entering into agreement with systems producers that would have been unheard of a few years ago. Outmoded building codes which require the use of archaic construction methods, equipment or materials are being battered down in hundreds of American communities.

Many of these changes would have come about anyhow in the natural social and economic evolutionary process. But it is reasonable to assume that HUD's Operation Breakthrough effort has served as a catalyst to bring about change earlier than would have been possible without such Federal involvement.

Breakthrough has gotten a dialogue going among the interested parties and this is no mean achievement considering past history. It also has dangled the plum of future Federal expenditures before big U.S. corporations, spurring interest in the housing market that had not previously existed.

Still and all, the Breakthrough program operates in a kind of larger Never-Never Land which has much to do with the prevailing politics and social customs in the United States and with the greater financial community, to which housing is only one of many potentially profitable facets. One myth concerns the number of housing units targeted in 1968 as a minimum building requirement during the following decade. The figure—26 million units, including six million units for low and moderate-income families—has by now acquired the status of a magic number, but it is considered all but meaningless by many knowledgeable housing experts.

To meet the goal over the 10-year period, of course, requires building an average of 2.6 million units a year, and the best the housing industry ever has done has been some 1.9 million starts in 1950. In 1969, there were only 1.5 million starts and 1970 was a grim year for the housing industry.

MANY MOBILE HOMES

For example, the mobile home industry in recent years has been supplying up to 25 percent of all the Nation's single-family dwellings, and, in fact, has been largely instrumental in keeping the housing crisis from developing into a national disaster. Should mobile homes be included in totting up housing starts toward meeting the 26 million goal? Perhaps, even though this presumably is stretching the goal-setters original intentions to some degree.

There also is considerable evidence to sup-

port the view that far more than 26 million units will be needed by the end of the magic decade—that projected demographic data available at the time of the original estimate now is meaningless.

Another old saw is the labor costs are primarily responsible for sending housing costs out of sight.

The National Association of Home Builders, however, points out that, even though construction wages and the cost of lumber and other materials have skyrocketed in recent years, the construction cost of housing per square foot has remained relatively constant over the last 20 years.

During the same period, however, according to available figures, costs of both housing financing and land have risen more than 300 percent.

"The Government is not really committed to housing as a top national priority," one corporate spokesman said. "It's not the fault of the *Breakthrough* people. It's a worthwhile program and undoubtedly will produce long-range benefits."

"But the big Federal financial commitment just isn't there and that's what's needed to make corporate boards of directors sit up and take notice. There's enough available technology around right now to do most of the job. What's missing is an assured long-range market."

The *Breakthrough* approach, in fact, emphasizes technology less than it does financing, land use, planning, market assembly, transportation and other factors.

This approach represents a recognition that housing costs never will be cut in half by using the best industrialized housing system, and that an anticipated production cost reduction of some 10 to 15 percent, now considered realistic, still would not solve the burdens of other soaring housing costs.

The most visible part of the *Breakthrough* iceberg is its demonstration program.

Some 600 proposals were originally received from private firms and consortiums and state and local governments for prototype sites, housing systems and site planning and development.

Proposals submitted for complete housing systems eventually were narrowed down to 22 producers (see the box accompanying this article) and to eight prototype sites located in nine states on which advanced housing systems are to be demonstrated. Site developers were chosen and ground has been broken on all sites.

A variety of housing systems techniques and materials is envisioned. "Flexible land use" is being stressed and a mix of housing types appropriate to an area—single-family, multi-family and high-rise units—is anticipated.

HUD also is emphasizing innovative approaches to traffic, recreational space and environmental problems in the prototype projects, as well as "advanced services" like the development of solid waste disposal systems and a "total" community energy system.

The Department has been in the process of negotiating contracts with the housing producers. There have been problems and some producers have balked at some Federal stipulations for the projects.

DIVERSITY OF PROTOTYPES

HUD Assistant Secretary Finger, anticipating such problems, said earlier this year: "We may have to part company in some cases. Even (so) . . . this should not affect the program seriously. We have enough diversity in our housing prototypes to be able to sacrifice a few designs. . . ."

Apart from the prototype projects, the *Breakthrough* effort projected through several phases is a long-range attempt to pull together all elements of the housing industry into a viable whole.

Operation *Breakthrough* Director Alfred Perry told *Government Executive*: "There are many facets to this—cutting down the thou-

sands of individual building code requirements to manageable size, encouraging new construction methods and financing, zoning, and labor practices.

"It's very difficult and frankly we're doing better in some areas than others.

"We're trying to open up markets for other than traditional building materials to enlarge the range of choices and encourage competition and we have had some success in encouraging industrialized labor agreements between the plumbers, laborers, carpenters, electricians and other unions with industry.

"We're trying to do something about the transportation problem. Obviously when you get into volume industrialized housing nationally there could be tremendous highway congestion problems. We feel that rail or air cargo transportation of modules offers a lot of promise and have been working in these areas.

"We also are concerned about the possible future shortage of housing business managers and technicians and are exploring ways to increase the supply of such personnel.

"Getting codes revised is relatively easy in some areas and difficult in others. Our market aggregation people have helped push passage of state industrialized housing laws. We have regional meetings. We work with state officials and legislatures, our many *Breakthrough* agencies, and local governments. This is a many-sided effort."

For Fiscal 1971, HUD earmarked subsidy funds under Sections 235 and 236 and the rent supplement program for assisted housing developments using *Breakthrough* systems.

While industry watches *Breakthrough* activities with interest, many firms and consortiums are actively engaged in trying to create their own markets.

As one of many such efforts, for example, Westinghouse's Urban Systems Development Corp. is building a factory in Fredericksburg, Va., which will produce some 1,400 modular units for garden apartments and townhouses yearly, and putting up a second factory near New Haven, Conn.

Chemical companies, metal and other materials firms are researching or producing a variety of interesting materials.

Conventional or "stick" on-site builders in Florida, near Washington, D.C., and other areas are venturing into modular component building.

General Electric Reentry and Environmental Systems Div., Philadelphia, has a development production factory on the West Coast turning out modular housing for military families at George AFB, Calif. under a DOD contract. Another developmental plant outside Philadelphia is tooling up to produce modular garden apartments which will be shipped to HUD's Operation *Breakthrough* site in Memphis, Tenn. (Story will appear in June issue.)

In California, Environmental Systems International, headed by architect Barry Berkus, is turning out "mobile modules" at the rate of 40 a month, and they are selling well.

Some conventional builders are not convinced that large-scale industrialized building will become a national actuality in the foreseeable future.

Said one builder, "I just don't see that you're ever going to do away with conventional methods for the bulk of home building in this country.

"Every year, we use more and better sizeable components—prefabricated roof trusses, preassembled kitchen, door and window units and so on.

"But there's a limit to the degree of sameness you can impose on highly individualistic buyers who prefer and require different kinds of housing in different parts of the country.

"Then there's transportation. If you transport much over 500 miles from the plant, as things now stand, the operation probably will be unprofitable.

"I don't see that you're ever going to have a Big Three—or a Big Ten for that matter—controlling the market the way you do in the automobile industry. But there may be a lot of companies with parts of the market and they're going to have to locate plants relatively close to the market."

As NAHB spokesman said, "You have to sell a heckuva lot of houses to make factory building pay off. Right now, the idea just isn't economically attractive to many people.

He said: "A lot of small builders are wondering how they're going to fit in, whether they're going to wind up in the same kind of role that automobile dealers now have in relation to the manufacturers."

Breakthrough has drawn criticism in a number of quarters and on diverse grounds.

National Bureau of Standards Performance Guide Criteria reviewed by the National Academies of Science and Engineering and others have been criticized in part as too strict or unnecessary—particularly in the fire safety area—by materials interests and builders. Others believe the Guide puts too heavy emphasis on the more easily identifiable criteria.

Other critics have pointed out that the prototype projects seem likely to demonstrate very many really new technological uses and that too many diverse systems are being demonstrated on each site and that there is a shortage of intermediate-density units projected in favor of very high or very low densities.

On the positive side, *Breakthrough* is seen as making a valuable contribution in the area of cost data information and retrieval. And, although it has received criticism for allegedly failing to foster significant research and development due to budget inadequacies, there is no doubt that the program has had an important catalytic effect—as Assistant Secretary Finger puts it, "In providing the stimulus for change in our entire process of housing . . ." Such stimulus has been noticeably lacking in the past.

VARIETY OF APPROACHES STRESSED IN BREAKTHROUGH

Operation *Breakthrough's* 22 housing systems are aimed at applying a variety of new concepts, building techniques and materials to problems involved in easing the worsening national housing crisis.

Wood, metal, fibrous glass, plastics, and concrete are being used in module, panel and service core units.

Concrete, which has had wide acceptance in Europe but has not been used extensively in the United States, is being demonstrated through flexible design and building concepts by Forest City Enterprises, Dillon, Inc., Townland Marketing and Development Corp., CAMCI, Inc., Rouse/Wates, Inc., Descon/Concordia, Henry C. Beck's Building Systems International, and Shelley Systems, Inc.

Christiana Western Structures is applying wood panel techniques and the Home Building Corp., Levitt Technology, Hercules, Inc., Boise-Cascade, the Pentom Corp. and Scholz Homes, Inc. demonstrating diverse techniques.

Material Systems, Inc. and TRW, Inc. have adapted space technology to the provision of fibrous glass and plastic reinforced modular systems, and the Pantek Corp. and Pentom are using polyurethane foams, polymer moulding agents and other materials.

While metal homes are a rarity in this country today, metal panel concepts are being demonstrated by General Electric, Republic Steel, and Alcoa, and the Sterling Homex Corp. is using reinforced metal modules. National Homes Corp. uses modules framed with metal studs and gypsum-board wall finish.

Breakthrough officials stress that the building systems which eventually will emerge as best for solving specific problems may well be quite different than those of the prototype projects, but that the testing and eval-

uation of such actual systems is necessary if the required answers are to be found.

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1971]

HOUSING PLAN TURNS OUT FIRST FACTORY-BUILT UNIT

(By John Herbers)

BATTLE CREEK, Mich., May 19.—George Romney, standing outside a gleaming factory that sprang up in a cornfield during the last few months, pushed a button today, and out rolled a housing module looking like a boxcar with picture windows. It was, at long last, the first unit produced under Operation Breakthrough, the Government program started two years ago to stimulate volume production and thus take manufacturing of homes out of the horse and buggy stage.

The module is to be installed tomorrow in Kalamazoo—25 miles from the factory, on one of nine Breakthrough sites across the country, and dozens more are to follow it in the next few weeks. They will be stacked as two houses on a 47-acre wooded site and sold or rented to middle-income or low-income families.

Despite unexpected delays, which served, unintentionally, to demonstrate impediments to be overcome, Mr. Romney, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, said that the rolling of the module off the assembly line signaled "the coming of a real revolution in housing."

There were the following indications that some basic changes were beginning to be made:

Housing factories are going up around the country with the potential of producing more units at less cost than has been realized under on-site construction, which involves a vast proliferation of builders.

The states are enacting laws that exempt factory-produced housing from local building codes, which have stood in the way of mass production.

The building trade unions, whose wage demands and restrictive practices have contributed to soaring costs, are performing the factory work at the more moderate scales of industrial workers.

Neither Mr. Romney nor officials of Levitt Building Systems, Inc., owner of the factory here, suggested at today's ceremony that more than a beginning had been made in the factory production of housing.

NATION'S LARGEST PRODUCER

But Mr. Romney said it was significant that Levitt, the nation's largest housing producer, was moving to the assembly line. He predicted that by 1980 "two-thirds of the housing will be industrialized."

Operation Breakthrough, authorized by the Omnibus Housing Act of 1968, was designed to speed this process and to reduce other strictures in the complex system of home-building.

Mr. Romney, coming into office in 1969 as prices were climbing and as the housing shortage was becoming critical, particularly for low-income groups, gave Breakthrough a high priority.

The idea was to select representative building sites across the country, to have building codes, zoning and other restrictive practices set aside and to invite competition for design and construction, meshing engineering, managing, financing and selling to achieve a wide variety of quality units.

Breakthrough, however, ran into a wide range of troubles and is now about a year behind schedule.

CONGRESS CUTS FUNDS

Some key members of Congress termed the breakthrough "gimmickry" and slashed the appropriation, forcing the Department of Housing and Urban Development to reduce the number of sites from 11 to 9 and to make other economies.

There were unexpected difficulties in nego-

CXVII—1047—Part 13

tiating contracts with private and public interests and there were heated disputes between Mr. Romney and the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

In several of the cities involved, citizens rose up against the developments for various reasons. One was that they would include federally subsidized units for low-income families.

In Kalamazoo, the plan called for 270 units to be built on land that had been reserved for a park on the edge of the city. Owners of single-family homes surrounding the site organized a "Save Our Park Committee" and charged that none of residents wanted to live beside "a housing development of that kind."

RESIDENTS REASSURED

The opposition finally subsided after the city reserved new land for a park and assured the residents of the area that "only a few" low-income families would be included in the project. Housing development officials confirmed today that the number of poor persons would be restricted.

Ground has been broken on all of the sites, and no housing has been erected. There is still widespread skepticism about the value of Breakthrough. Senator William Proxmire, Democrat of Wisconsin, one of the authors of the legislation authorizing Breakthrough, said recently he believed that the department should have moved much faster and on a much larger scale.

"That is the only way this kind of project would have been effective," Mr. Proxmire said.

However, Harold B. Finger, Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, said. Breakthrough had produced important indirect benefits.

CORPORATIONS ACTING

One is that the big corporations are moving into industrial production faster than they would have without Breakthrough, he said. Charles L. Biederman, president of Levitt Building Systems, said that without Breakthrough "we might have done it five years from now."

Mr. Romney said there were now 15 housing factories in New England alone. In suburban Atlanta, Utility Services, Incorporated, is factory-producing three-bedroom, two-bath houses to be moved intact to sites by helicopter.

Mr. Finger said that since 1969 12 states had passed laws providing that factory-produced housing that passes state inspection is not subject to local building codes. They are California, Ohio, Washington, Hawaii, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Maryland, West Virginia, Georgia, Indiana and Connecticut.

In addition, 23 other states are considering or preparing such legislation, he said.

The building trades unions, Mr. Finger said, have signed agreements with a number of producers to do both the factory work and installation at the site at industrial wage rates. The trades traditionally have received higher wages, largely because much of the work is outdoor and thus seasonal.

FACTORY PRODUCTION

Not all of the Breakthrough housing is to be factory-produced, but the production here gets to the essence of what is involved. Levitt Building Systems is a subsidiary of Levitt & Sons, Inc., which is a subsidiary of International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation. When the company decided to get into industrial production, it erected a 100,000-square-foot factory outside Battle Creek within a few months and plans to build six similar plants elsewhere across the country.

Modules have been factory-produced for

years but never in any quantity in this country.

Wiring, plumbing, carpeting—everything—are installed in the modules, which are pinned together at the site. Ornamentation is then added. The modules are carried by rail or truck.

It is not yet known, officials said, how much saving will result from factory construction. The first units cost about the same as on-site construction, they said, but after production reaches its maximum, about 3,000 to 4,000 units a year in this factory, the costs will go down considerably.

Mr. Romney said that the quality was better than in on-site construction and that workers could be trained in five to six weeks, providing more opportunity for minority groups in construction work.

"This is a tremendous step forward," Mr. Romney said.

"POINT COUNTERPOINT"—PITTSBURGH'S MUSICAL PHENOMENON ON THE RIVER

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, 14 years ago an idea was conceived in my city of Pittsburgh to bring music to the people in a challenging way never tried before.

Under the able and innovative direction of Robert Boudreau, the American Wind Symphony, a 50-member group consisting of woodwind, brass, and percussion instruments played by young talent from all over the United States and abroad, entertain audiences at home in Pittsburgh, and following the season, up and down the Ohio, Mississippi, and the Inland Waterway, on the *Point Counterpoint* barge.

This summer, through the resources of Point Park College, with which it is now affiliated, the Wind Symphony will present a Floating Festival of the Arts, a unique program encompassing theater, music, art, and dance.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to serve as an honorary chairman of the remarkable American Wind Symphony. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include for the attention of my colleagues, "Music on the River," an article in the May issue of Greater Pittsburgh commending this dynamic contemporary musical effort.

The article follows:

MUSIC ON THE RIVER

(By Paula Bern)

A young man with rolled up shirt sleeves and hard-muscled arms sprawled on the grassy river bank. It was his day off from the mill. Music filled the air around him. Good music, powerful music. Music with the life, drama and color of Pittsburgh, and as vital and polyglot as the city itself.

Emanating from a red and white barge anchored on the Allegheny River bank of Point Park, the melody was directed by the baton of Robert Boudreau, the youthful founder and director of the remarkable Pittsburgh phenomenon known as the American Wind Symphony Orchestra.

Conceived in 1957, the Wind Symphony produces just that—music for wind instruments, both classic and modern, always in-

novative, and sometimes daring. An unusual orchestra now affiliated with Pittsburgh's Point Park College, the 45 to 50 member group consists entirely of players of woodwind, brass, and percussion instruments. Representing a veritable gold mine of talent from the United States and abroad, the young men and women are chosen each Spring following arduous auditions conducted by Mr. Boudreau in dozens of universities and conservatories.

"I have had well over 800 youthful musicians play with me in the past 14 years," he reminisced recently. "I find it exhilarating to have an all-new orchestra each year. The challenge of an unknown quantity . . . the excitement of finding subtle nuances in music I've performed twenty or thirty times before . . . this happens because of 50 unknown quantities producing a very dynamic situation."

Home base for the American Wind Symphony is Pittsburgh's historic Point, just a short walk from the bustling streets and soaring skyscrapers of the city's Golden Triangle. Here, where the meandering Allegheny and the muddy Monongahela marry to form the mighty Ohio, Boudreau and his orchestra perform aboard the special designed barge "Point Counterpoint."

Pittsburgh is, however, only one of the many cities and towns which enjoy the extraordinary music of the Wind Symphony. Following the home season each summer, the barge cruises down the Ohio River enchanting persons of all ages in communities as far south as Daytona Beach, Florida. Up and down the Mississippi, through the Tennessee Valley and the Inland Waterway, the Orchestra has created a significant upheaval in musical circles, and imparted to its home-grown audiences the excitement of the contemporary musical scene.

Refusing to believe that the public prefers musical milk-toast in the form of popular and light-classical programs, Boudreau offers his audiences spine-tingling and mind-jarring music with spatial effects enhanced by nature's own concert hall. Although a few toe-tappers sneak in occasionally as encores, the Symphony's major business is expansion of the musical repertoire by commissioning new compositions from some of the most adventurous composers in the world.

"We have the largest commissioning program in the history of music," Mr. Boudreau explained. "Over 200 works have been commissioned and published including Penderecki's *Pittsburgh Overture*, Henk Badings' *Armageddon* and Mayuzumi's *Percussion Concerto*. And how do I find a new composer? Great creativity moves in cycles . . . take a look at history and you'll perceive this rhythm in the social, political, and cultural growth of a people or of a country. I depend upon contacts to set me off in a new direction . . . to make sure that I'm sure that I'm there first when this creative happening occurs. Then I request all the records and tapes of the foremost composer in a particular area. For one month I live with his music letting it act and react upon me and until I no longer see a score, but a man emerging. I must know the composer before I can say, 'Write me a piece.'"

Warm friendships and associations with composers Krzysztof Penderecki, Toshiro Mayuzumi and Henk Badings resulted recently in the outstanding record called simply *American Wind Symphony*. Included on a record issued by Point Park College, the disk offers a trio of largescale, avant-garde works by the three composers. "A bang-up job," the *New York Times* reviews commented, "the *Wind Symphony* played with a fresh vigor revealing how much the young musicians were enjoying themselves."

A spare New Englander trained at Juilliard and the Paris Conservatory, Robert A. Boudreau never will face the generation gap of his over-thirty contemporaries. Idealistic young people can relate to his mission in

life, which is, he states unabashedly and simply, "to service humanity." Music itself is not that important," he declares fiercely, "We must deal with the human spirit and preserve our culture as an integral part of this experience."

Mr. Boudreau maintains a delightful informality in almost every phase of the Symphony's operations except the rehearsal and the performance. A perfectionist and a taskmaster the moment he mounts the podium, he nevertheless revels in easy rapport with his heterogeneous audiences.

Teen-agers wander aboard the barge during a concert and observe the instruments at close range. Pigtails tykes sit enthralled as Boudreau explains a measure of music with beguiling simplicity. Adults frown occasionally in puzzlement at some of the Symphony's forays into hitherto unexplored regions of the modern repertoire.

Some react audibly as did one concertgoer perched atop a telephone pole at the river's edge.

"Hey man," he shouted from his vantage point, "I sure didn't understand some of the stuff you played, but I know I'll never forget it."

Pleased at the power of his music to evoke reactions, Boudreau explains the Wind Symphony's contemporary repertoire in a simple statement: "Twentieth century music should reflect twentieth century life, just as music of an earlier time reflects the civilization of that period."

Echoes of an earlier era will waft across the Hudson River this summer when for the second year the Wind Symphony performs in New York with a brief layover on the East River. Known there as the American Waterways Orchestra, made possible through a grant given by the New York State Council on the Arts, the barge will float down the Hudson accompanied by a flotilla of boats. The spectacular including Pete Seeger's *Clearwater*, will climax a festival reminiscent of the days of King George I and his Thames River entourage.

In conjunction with the Lower East Side Neighborhood Association the orchestra will provide needy New York City youngsters of Chinese, black and Puerto Rican heritage with a total cultural program at the Henry Street Settlement House. Assisting Mr. Boudreau with this pioneer effort are such well known figures as Neal Anderson, vice-president of the New York Board of Trade; Robert H. Huntoon, president of the Industrial Fabrics Division of West Point Pepperell; and Mrs. Robert Dowling, and Mrs. Herbert Brownell, all members of the Symphony's New York Board of Directors.

On tour, the musicians who travel by bus are billeted with families in the communities where they perform. A people-to-people way of life, the interplay of cultures, dialects, languages, and customs engendered by the young artists enrich all who come in contact with the orchestra.

Dividends yielded by Mr. Boudreau's internationally flavored orchestra and programme of global composers are immeasurable, and embrace not only cultural advantages but also industrial, commercial, and political benefits. The State Department's perception of these unique values resulted in the production of a thirty-minute Wind Symphony sound film documentary made by the United States Information Agency.

In 1961, the story of the orchestra was told on the National Education Television Network in an hour-long video presentation appropriately titled, "Music on the River."

Not averse to being dubbed a latter day Huck Finn, Bob Boudreau is quick to deny that he was a child prodigy.

"A child chicken farmer would be more apt," he grinned disarmingly. "My parents were poultry farmers in New England and I grew up amidst the musical-sounds of 10,000 breeder hens!"

Versatile, restless, constantly probing for

new ways to convey music to his fellow humans, the forward-looking conductor hopes to bring his orchestra to churches and synagogues this summer. He describes it as a work commissioned especially for organ and orchestra, a fantastic new concept for a church service which the Wind Symphony will premiere while on tour this summer.

Arthur M. Blum, president of Point Park College, is one of the most ardent supporters of the American Wind Symphony. An administrator who believes that cultural service to the community is an inherent commitment of any university, he invited Mr. Boudreau's group to become an affiliate of the College in 1969, and immediately launched provocative educational plans adapted to the avant garde orchestra.

This summer, with resources offered by the College, a total "Floating Festival of the Arts" is planned along the barge's route. Theater, art, music, and dance will be incorporated within the framework of the Wind Symphony's musical offerings. Drawing on the faculty of the Pittsburgh Playhouse Center For The Performing Arts and the Pittsburgh Ballet Theatre—both affiliates of Point Park—the unusual cultural event will be a first in the nation. A new theater piece by an outstanding playwright will highlight the Festival. To be premiered at the Pittsburgh Playhouse, it will be performed at all of the towns on the orchestra's itinerary. Panels, symposiums, performances, and person-to-person dialogue will be included, with residents of each of the waterfront communities adding their skills and knowledge to the water spectacular.

Another "first" begun just two years ago will be expanded this season when students troop aboard the barge for "music appreciation" classes. Slated June 3 to July 5 from 6 to 10:30 in the evening, the innovative course will be open to the public. Full college credit will be given for two hours of lecture and two hours of listening to live demonstrations by the Wind Symphony.

Mr. Boudreau elaborated, "This is the only course of its type in the world! Just imagine the significance of bona fide college conservatory students playing in a professional orchestra and interpreting new compositions for fellow students aboard a floating barge. We bring in such well known musicians as Dizzy Gillespie and Henk Badings during the four-week program. College credit is given by Point Park and is transferable if the student so desires."

Lauded up and down the waterways by outspoken critics of trite musical expression, the American Wind Symphony evokes uncounted plaudits such as those in a recent article by Alan Rich who commented in typically acerbic fashion: "Maybe Pittsburgh is culturally naive, but a naiveite that brings Penderecki to summer park audiences via the Wind Symphony Orchestra puts New York to shame."

With its reputation as a peripatetic orchestra, it is unlikely that the Wind Symphony could escape the novelty of a few inland forays. Invited last year to Hinton, West Virginia by Eli Goldston, president of the Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates of Boston, and chairman of its subsidiary, Eastern Associated Coal Corporation of Pittsburgh, the orchestra performed at Camp Thomas E. Lightfoot, a summer camp run by the coal company for employees' children. While the hitch-hiking orchestra's barge was being towed from Ashland, Kentucky to Charleston, West Virginia, Mr. Boudreau's talented young musicians performed on the patio of the camp dining hall. From Mozart to Mason Williams, the symphony's clear tones echoed hauntingly over the West Virginia hills and young campers sat quietly . . . and listened.

Reflecting later upon the evening's performance, Mr. Boudreau commented, "These are the kids we're interested in. There are millions of them and music speaks their lan-

guage." He gestured toward a group of youngsters who only moments before had been engrossed with Mozart and who now were wildly gyrating to a hard rock record.

"All music is good if it makes people move," Boudreau continued. "If it doesn't communicate, it isn't doing its job."

Perhaps one of the most unusual works ever commissioned by Mr. Boudreau is *The Pickle Suite*, a delightful tribute to Mr. and Mrs. Henry J. Heinz II on the 100th anniversary of the H. J. Heinz Company. Grateful for the Heinz family's devoted encouragement and support of the Wind Symphony since 1957, Mr. Boudreau commissioned such composers as Robert Russell Bennett, Henk Badings, and Shulamit Ran and poets such as Sara Henderson Hay, Samuel Hazo, and George Starbuck to compose *The Pickle Suite* as musical gift in the form of a contemporary work.

"It was my way of saying 'thank you,'" Mr. Boudreau explained.

Always seeking new experiences, Robert Boudreau has a magnificent sense of showmanship which manifests itself in the performance of Handel's *Music For The Royal Fireworks*. Played while rockets boom and roman candles soar across the night sky, one critic called the performance a "breath-taking experience and from a musician's viewpoint, a most worthwhile one."

Dr. Thomas E. Allen of Magee-Women's Hospital, recently was elected president of the board of directors of the American Wind Symphony and David M. Roderick, vice president of the International Department of U.S. Steel, was named treasurer.

Actively supported as one of Pittsburgh's finest cultural institutions, the American Wind Symphony Orchestra has as honorary chairmen of its board such prominent Pittsburghers as Mrs. Leon Falk, Jr., D. C. Burnham, the Honorable William S. Moorhead, and R. Heath Larry, director and vice chairman of the Board of U.S. Steel Corporation.

Mr. Burnham, chairman of the board of Westinghouse Electric Corporation, terms the Wind Symphony "one of the city's most exciting assets." He adds, "Bob Boudreau is a dedicated man determined to bring good music of an experimental nature to people who otherwise would never have the opportunity of hearing a concert. If the American Wind Symphony performed in a concert hall, instead of on the barge, thousands of men, women and children would be the losers."

From the hundreds of thousands of ordinary citizens up and down the rivers who have been delighted by the music of Robert Boudreau and his American Wind Symphony Orchestra, Mr. Burnham's sentiments bring a loud and hearty assent.

ROOM AT THE TOP

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Stan Greigg, our former colleague from Iowa and former U.S. sailor, has sailed very nearly to the top of the Democratic Party.

The Honorable Stanley L. Greigg has succeeded the late Ira Kapenstein as deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Former Congressman Greigg represented Iowa's Sixth Congressional District in the 89th Congress when, as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, he authored two important farm laws.

Stan Greigg is hardly without knowl-

edge of city problems. He is the former mayor of Sioux City, Iowa, and was the youngest person in history to serve on that city's council.

Nor can it be said that Stan Greigg, at 39, does not understand the honest ideals of youth. His record of achievement includes having served as a popular dean of men at Morningside College.

His wife, Cathy, and daughters, Valerie and Heather, together with ourselves, can take pride in the fact that one of our own graduates has found room at the top.

THE NEED FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems being experienced by many elementary and secondary schoolchildren in my district and elsewhere in New York—is their inability to fully function in the English language—not only in school but in their social and community contacts as well.

Large numbers of these children are Puerto Rican, who only speak Spanish. Because of their severe language handicaps, many of them are falling behind in their reading, writing, speaking, and understanding of English and they are not participating profitably in the schools' curriculums. Furthermore, they are encountering serious psychological problems, especially as the inability to speak English prevents acceptance by their peer groups.

Although faced with tremendous obstacles, some progress is being made in New York to provide meaningful and effective bilingual education programs. While hampered by the lack of more substantial Federal financial assistance in the field, New York City and a few other communities throughout the State are providing subject instruction in Spanish, either concurrently with English or in separate periods.

The current issue of *Inside Education*, a publication of the New York State Education Department, contains a perceptive and well-written article on the current status of bilingual education in New York. As the author aptly notes:

The evidence is clear that when English alone is the sole communication medium it is not an adequate tool.

The article then continues to describe the efforts being made by New York educational institutions to provide meaningful and effective bilingual education programs at the elementary and secondary level.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must clearly exert its authority and take the lead in encouraging and funding expanded bilingual education programs. Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act providing for the bilingual education programs has been consistently underfunded and we must take positive action. I believe this timely article will provide some useful information on the present condition of such programs and

that it presents a good case for expanding far beyond the current efforts. I commend this excellent piece to our colleagues' attention and present it herewith for inclusion in the Record:

BILINGUAL EDUCATION—STILL A HURDLE

When most children enter school, they will learn in a language already familiar. By listening to their teacher and speaking English, they will move to reading and writing in English and all the subsequent learning skills.

But for large numbers of non-English speaking children, English is not primarily spoken in the home, stores, churches, or written in the newspaper they read. Many of these children aren't functioning in the schools, finding language the single, most distinct handicap.

The biggest problem is in New York City, where 250,000 Spanish-speaking children are now enrolled and other foreign-language minorities also exist in pockets. A few upstate cities and communities on Long Island and in Westchester County also have considerable numbers of Spanish-speaking children.

A sampling shows that while these districts have some programs in intensive or remedial instruction in spoken and written English, they typically reach only half or less of the children needing such instruction.

New York City has offered, at the encouragement of the Puerto Rican community, English as a Second Language (ESL) programs for 20 years. It selects only those children who are most severely limited in English for the special instruction. The children may receive a period or two a day getting this help, while they are expected to keep up in the rest of their studies in English.

Because of the heavy influx of Puerto Ricans in New York City, many children enter school with no previous introduction to the English-speaking culture. Half of New York City's Spanish-speaking children speak no English or only halting English when they enter school. Tests show large numbers of these children are retarded in learning in the elementary school from two to five years in most or all subjects in the curriculum. They regularly receive poor grades.

They are the highest single group in drop-out statistics. In all aspects of school success—participation in extracurricular activities, placement on honor rolls, and college acceptance—they score below their peers. The evidence is clear that when English alone is the sole communication medium it is not an adequate tool.

This has been long recognized. But community pressure and state laws have provided obstacles. The law once forbade teaching in any language except English, apparently an outgrowth of anti-foreign sentiment during World War I, and until last year did not allow teaching in the native language until the pupil had been in school two years. That was amended last year to allow three years of bi-lingual instruction and a current bill in the Legislature would extend this.

Communities were not easily convinced that schools should teach in the student's mother tongue, even with the advent of state and federal aid funds for bi-lingual instruction in the late 1960's. Six bi-lingual projects in New York City and one in Rochester now received federal funds under Title 7 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These children receive subject instruction in Spanish either concurrently with English or during separate periods of the day.

Other classes are taught bi-lingually in New York City, but the main emphasis is on English as a Second Language. That program is designed to improve the pupil's competence in English as a way of hurrying him into the mainstream of the school program. Normally, the rest of his instruction is in English also. In one project, 60 teachers with backgrounds in other than English languages

work in 32 high schools to spell regular teachers for one period a day.

Elsewhere throughout the city, junior high pupils unfamiliar with English are placed in orientation classes, while non-English speakers in high school get two periods a day in oral English and reading assistance.

Classes are taught in Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, Yiddish and Chinese. If a teacher can help get some concept across in the native language, use of that language is encouraged, said David Krulick, director of bi-lingual and adult education.

The city now issues teaching licenses for both ESL and bi-lingual teachers, he said. Some of the native language paraprofessionals are attending college at night to work towards their teaching certificates.

Despite this effort, the city schools may not be pursuing bi-lingual learning as aggressively as they can. The head of a city parents group has told the Regents that hundreds of qualified teachers from Puerto Rico have been unable to join the system. The strict requirements of city licensing are a main stumbling block, said Mrs. Evelina Antonetty, director of the United Bronx Parents.

Also questioning the city's alleged shortage of bi-lingual instructors, Carlos V. Perez, supervisor of the Bi-lingual Education Unit of the State Education Department, finds that these teachers can be found "whenever districts want to move ahead with these programs."

He says anyone can learn a second language, not just a few, and "the most favorable results will come when the characteristics of the learner's language and the second language are specified and the various relationships expressed before the teacher moves into the second language in the classroom."

Teaching in the mother tongue "can help to prevent retardation in school performance until sufficient command of English is attained, and development of literacy in the mother tongue as well as in English should result in more broadly educated adults," continued Perez.

He encourages study of native history and culture as part of the language instruction, and participation by children whose dominant language is English, since they pick up a second language and cultural learnings as well. But segregating non-English speakers isn't desirable.

Added federal funds, though modest, are available to schools in New York State as a result of recent amendments to Title 7. Buffalo, North Rockland, and four additional districts in New York City have received a grant for developing bi-lingual programs for the next school year, he said.

The programs for non-English speaking children vary considerably, as the following report shows.

TWO BRONX SCHOOLS ENTIRELY BI-LINGUAL

About 1,500 children are being taught to speak, read and write in both Spanish and English in two schools in the Bronx—P.S. 25 and Community School 211. The schools are experimental (P.S. 25 has federal funds) and all the pupils and teachers who attend have voluntarily selected the schools.

About 85 percent of the pupils and 60 percent of the teachers at P.S. 25 are of Puerto Rican background. Like P.S. 211, most instruction is given in Spanish at first, with the second language gradually increased until sixth grade, when hopefully, children will be equally fluent in both languages, say the principals.

"It's not a transition to learning English and then dropping Spanish," said Herman LaFontaine, principal of P.S. 25. He feels the children will overcome problems in learning the second language easier by this method, and tests have begun to bear him out.

At P.S. 211, a scarred warehouse turned into a school last year, an experiment in open education is also going on. Children

learn in small clusters and there aren't walls between classes. They recite almost continually and sounds of both languages mingle.

For all but one period a day a child is taught in his native language. While classes are non-graded, children are grouped according to ability. Bi-lingual teachers and paraprofessionals help the regular teachers.

ROCHESTER'S SPLIT-DAY LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

About 280 early-grade children in three Rochester elementary schools receive a half day of Spanish and half day of English instruction under a federally funded bi-lingual project there.

Most of these children, beginning in pre-kindergarten, have better Spanish verbal ability than English, says Miss Mary Ward, project evaluator. By second grade, the children are expected to pick up second language skills more rapidly.

Also, 80 non-English speaking pupils at Monroe High School take courses in social studies, math and science in Spanish, plus one or two courses a day in English, said Miss Ward. The thrust is remedial rather than truly bi-lingual.

PARENTS HELP WITH HOMEWORK

At P.S. 155 in Brooklyn's Ocean Hill area (District 23), a bi-lingual class is given at each grade level, with a Spanish-speaking teacher.

"The child acquires an English oral vocabulary as he learns in Spanish," noted Louis Fuentes, director. By third grade the emphasis switches from Spanish to English. Meanwhile, he said, parents have taken greater interest in helping the children with their homework and are now motivated to come to school for classes at night.

Also in Brooklyn, two bi-lingual preschool learning centers serve 155 children in the Williamsburg section (District 14). In these programs, children are grouped according to ability, where they receive pre-reading skills in both languages.

BUILDING SELF-IMAGES IN BUFFALO

Buffalo schools have embarked on an English as a Second Language program in the past year, reaching about 1,000 pupils in nine schools.

Twelve teachers and 33 paraprofessionals who speak Spanish work in this program. Two of the teachers use both languages to get across math and English in high school, while others stress oral English with small classes at the elementary level.

The board of education recently approved a recommendation to contract with New York University for an inservice course for teachers in bi-lingual education.

BRENTWOOD'S BI-LINGUAL READING CONSULTANTS

In Brentwood, L.I., schools, where 11 percent of the children are Spanish-speaking, six bi-lingual reading consultants work with children for regular periods of intensive English language instruction. Children not functioning well in English are given a half hour a day. Some of the children speak English capably but read at first grade level, noted Arthur Brieger, assistant superintendent.

In the high school, a special teacher meets daily with students doing poorest in English, Brieger said, but far more students are in need of this instruction and more teachers needed who are bilingual. Brentwood also offers adult education and equivalency classes for Spanish-speaking adults.

PATCHOGUE EXPANDS ITS PROGRAM

Besides a Spanish-English program at the elementary level, Patchogue, L.I., schools added an English as a Second Language component this year at the secondary level. It reaches 25 pupils in junior and senior high grades, stressing oral English and reading.

Said Mrs. Dianne Catullo, instructor, "Before this we had nothing. They floundered and dropped out. We've also found fewer discipline problems."

A TRY AT THREE LANGUAGES

In the former Two-Bridges District (now District 2) on Manhattan's Lower East Side, Chinese, Spanish-speaking and English-speaking children attend classes together. An experiment to blend instruction in three languages has led to two bi-lingual projects, in Chinese-English and Spanish-English, said Mrs. Leonore Watson, district coordinator. Beginning in kindergarten, the program runs through third grade, and includes stories, art, songs, and arithmetic.

Parents participate—classes have six to 10 children with their mothers, said Mrs. Watson. Paraprofessionals are also on hand. The instruction is given one hour a day, three days a week.

NYC'S CONSORTIUM TO UPGRADE TEACHERS

Meanwhile, teachers from 13 New York City schools receive training for bi-lingual classes through a consortium run by the board of education and Hunter and Lehman Colleges. The colleges also develop curriculum materials and faculty members provide on-site supervision at the participating schools.

According to Mrs. Blanca Ortiz, coordinator for the city schools, "The rationale and objectives are excellent and community involvement is good. But not all the experts in the colleges are bi-lingual. Materials still have to be developed since they are more suited to Mexican-Americans."

WORLD'S FIRST LADY OF SNOW-MOBILING APPEARS BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, only a few years ago if such slogans as, "think snow," "pray for snow," were heard, people would think that snow enthusiasts who uttered those kinds of slogans were fit subjects for the insane asylum.

Yet, snow in northern Wisconsin is rapidly becoming known as white gold dust when people can turn such an adversity as snow into a worthy and valuable asset is an indication of the ingenuity of the American people. Snow has become one of the greatest assets to the economy, recreational, and industrial, and financial growth.

One of the great leaders who has helped convert this adversity into an asset is the world's first lady of snowmobiling, Susie Scholwin of Three Lakes, Wis. She was the founder of the first snowmobiling publication and has set the pace for others to follow in developing this great asset to the snow country.

She has devoted all of her time and energy, and the rapid advance of this new recreation and industry is largely due to efforts of people like Susie Scholwin, the world's first lady of snowmobiling.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the speech that she gave before the Senate committee in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the world might know how faith, initiative, efforts, and ingenuity can turn a great adversity into an absolute and profitable asset:

NEWEST ENDANGERED SPECIES—SNOWMOBILES

I had prepared an outline on this subject, covering Economic Impact, Legislation, Conservation, Ecology, Industry and many other headings. However, I've decided to tell

you a story instead. Not a "once-upon-a-timer", but a true story—a personal one.

In 1948, a husband and wife moved from Chicago, and built a home on the shore of beautiful Butternut Lake, right in the heart of the Nicolet National Forest.

According to plan, they had four children (which was the basic reason they moved from the city—to raise any children in God's Country.)

Being fifteen miles from the nearest town, it meant driving quite a distance each day to take the children to school, to do the shopping, etc. but, in the summer, there was the lake, the fishing, the woods, the TOTAL outdoors to make it all worthwhile. Winters were something just "to be lived through".

Nice winter days on week-ends brought out the sleds, skis, toboggans, and general fun-in-the-snow. Nights were long and lonely. As were the week-ends as a whole. Ice fishing on the lake was good, but the best spot was over a mile away—a goodly hike even with snowshoes (or especially with snowshoes?).

This family spent their time in the very typical fashion of others in similar situations—all across the snow States.

During Christmas of 1964, they were introduced to something called a snowmobile. It was a case of love at first sight and soon one of these mechanized marvels became the proudest possession of our Northwoods family.

The winter of 1964 and early 1965 took on a different tone than those before. Mom and dad loved it—the kids loved it. Winter was not the gloomy thing it had been—but each day was an adventure of its own. It was much easier to get "over to the other side of the lake" fishing—a sled attached behind carried gear or kids—or sometimes both.

Back in those days, the total manufacture and sale of snowmobiles was a mere 20,000. But, two of those machines belonged to this particular family!

There were races held, but they were something minor—racing may be an instinct with people—particularly teen-age boys. The important thing that was discovered was that more and more of the neighbors in the area were buying these fantastic little machines and, lo and behold—winter was turning into FUN! The little snowmobile had become a funmobile—one that made winter something to look forward to! Everyone in the area looked forward to week-ends, with their picnics, trailriding, exploring, scavenger hunts, and social gatherings. People who had had a "bar-room tan" developed rosy cheeks and healthy appetites. Retirees joined in. Many in their fifties and sixties, who were not enthused about the muscular sport of skiing, found that the snowmobile was the answer to their dreams.

Summerhome owners in the area began to visit their cottages during Christmas holidays, and then more often during the entire winter—sometimes almost every weekend.

There came a BOOM to the town. The contractors were busy winterizing summer cottages, gas stations did more business, as did restaurants, bars, grocery stores, and so on.

The first recognized snowmobile trail in a National Forest was built right in the Nicolet—in 1966.

In summer of that year, it became apparent that the snowmobilers and the industry itself needed some "voice"—preferably their own publications.

So, the former Chicagoans, from their house on beautiful Butternut Lake, in the heart of the Nicolet National Forest, created the original Snow Goer publications. The first issue of this publication was out in December, 1966—there were 50,000 copies throughout the United States and Canada,

The magazine was out because it was needed—because there were snowmobilers all over the country and provinces, looking for unity—and a direction.

I said this was a true and personal story. It is. It was my husband and myself who moved north from the city. We were, in 1966, a legal secretary and a building contractor, respectively—but we started the first international snowmobile magazine because it was needed and we filled that need. We fell in love with snowmobiles and what could be done with them—and we still feel the same way today.

Around the same time were formed many associations—the Western Snowmobile Association, the American Snowmobile Association, the United States Snowmobile Association—to add up to a total of 16 associations throughout the United States and Canada.

Production of the vehicles rose to 55,000 for the 65-66 season, then 116,000 for 66-67, 200,000 for 67-68, 285,000 for 68-69, 425,000 in 69-70, 550,000 in 70-71 and predictions are for 700,000 to be produced and sold during the 1971-72 season.

Snowmobiles swept the country—literally. They were a boon to the elderly and infirm, a help to the trapper and logger, fine sport for the avid outdoorsman; great for women and children—and a nuisance for the non-snowmobiler.

Face it—as with any other new thing. There were those who did not respect the rights of others. And, as in automobiles, motorcycles, boats, and guns, the "bad-guys" were (and are) in the minority.

We knew most of the officers of the largest manufacturers back when the sport was a real infant. We still know them today. And they are concerned, as well as the average snowmobilers, about the great amount of bad publicity that is being given to the entire sport. There has been "bad press" until it hurts. It seems about time that some GOOD things were said about the sport and the industry as a whole. But, nice things in print don't sell newspapers and magazines. So what would the percentage be of the better side of snowmobiling being told? With over a million snowmobiles in operation now—and way over two million actual snowmobilers, you will soon begin to see the stirrings of an aroused, wronged, group.

Of all the "scapegoats" in history, I feel that the snowmobile should take the trophy.

Look, once, at the economic impact that this has had on all the snow-belt states. While there are farms and some small industries, many states (with Wisconsin as an example) rely heavily upon the tourist industry as the main source of income. Vacationing, fishing, hunting, boating, etc., are at the top of the list as a livelihood for many small villages and towns. There were just no tourists in winter.

To quote from a letter of 1970, from the Executive Director of the Rhinelander (Wisconsin) Chamber of Commerce:

"Regarding the effect snowmobiling has had on the economy of the area, I might say an estimate taken and based upon the increase in deposits at local financial institutions, including Eagle River and Minocqua (Wisconsin) would figure that these tourist dollars and turned over SIX OR SEVEN TIMES before they leave the area. We estimate that the first dollar spent would pretty well be confined to lodging, service stations, clothing and sporting goods stores, grocery stores, drug stores, local advertising media, snowmobile dealers, restaurants and bars, then this dollar would be passed on to extra help, new facilities (local contractors, suppliers, and laborers) and would also be passed on to the above mentioned places who received the first dollar to their suppliers and fellow businessmen. Also, it should be noted that the advent of snowmobiling has created a new season for taverns, restaurants, resorts, hotels and motels during which was formerly an extremely dry period. In a nutshell,

the primary effect of snowmobiling has been to bring in outside dollars in a much longer period of time."

In the same vein, taking the two-week period during the running of the Eagle River Wisconsin, snowmobile derby, the First National Bank of Eagle River reported on deposits in six local banks, showing an increase in deposits from 1963 to 1968 in an amount of 86%. Figures for 1970 showed an increase of an additional percentage close to five percent.

This particular area is typical of all northern snow states and can be used, safely, as a gauge for most tourist areas with a similar background and location.

For "figure-collectors," the Championship Snowmobile Derby in Eagle River in 1970, through its concessions, sold 11,000 hot dogs, 6,000 barbecues, 230 gallons of hot chocolate, 8,000 cups of coffee, 1,400 half-pints of milk; 5,000 candy bars; not to mention 43½ barrels of beer, 145 cases of pop, thousands of souvenirs—all to an attendance crowd of 39,314.

Let us also remember that it was the snowmobilers themselves who first recognized that there should be legislation governing the use of these machines.

There are effective organizations on national, state and local levels who are constantly trying to bridge the gap between PROPER laws and UNFAIR regulations.

Groups such as the Association of Wisconsin Snowmobile Clubs are springing up. The AWSC, as an example, consists of over ten thousand members, representing about one hundred and fifty clubs. They have a lobbyist and attorney in Madison, the state capitol, to keep them informed and, in turn, who they can inform when questions arise regarding trails, usage, etc. There will be other State groups following their guide lines. The association also assists when local counties, towns, and villages have problems drawing ordinances regarding snowmobiles.

The system of licensing and numbering vehicles in various states is spreading rapidly and the majority of states now have this set up. There are several benefits: the "dues" from licenses can be used to plan, construct and maintain trails. There is, then, a regular fund established, so the non-snowmobilers will not feel their tax dollars are being wasted. The numbering of vehicles is used both for tracking down stolen machines, or for identification of individuals involved in illegal procedures. This is a system the snowmobilers themselves want—and they have worked hard to try to promote the "right" thing.

The Third Annual International Snowmobile Congress was held in Portland, Maine, October 13 through the 15 last year. Present at that meeting were officials from Federal and State agencies, the snowmobile industry, user organizations, and interested individuals. Some of the comments made by "knowledgeable" people bear repeating and I'd like to quote some of them here.

From the Welcoming Address by Eldin Shute:

"In my capacity as Deputy Secretary of State, I bring you greetings and welcome to the State of Maine for the Third Annual International Snowmobile Congress. As one who resides in the Maine Snow Belt of Franklin County, I have been able to observe the growth of snowmobiles in the past five years. Today, in particular, I would like to address myself in my greeting, to the impact snowmobiling has made on our state's economy.

"As a Dismounted Snowmobiler (one who currently doesn't own a machine) and as a sometimes political, I know I won't exactly endear myself to that popular Press Herald pundit, Bill Clark, when I pronounce the fact, "Snowmobiles are here to stay."

"But, between now and the day when anti-snowmobilers such as Clark will be satisfied to accept this as fact, you as a larger

group and your satellite organizations, may have to make adjustments. These adjustments I am sure you are prepared to discuss here and at future meetings.

"Maine is indeed honored by your presence here. It is due in large part, to the dedication of those among you from Maine who have the foresight and the faith necessary to have made your presence a fact.

"Snowmobiling can now be considered a Big Business in this state. Something over 20 million dollars can be directly traced to this sport. And this amount does not include dealership and service salaries, parts, wholesale and retail financing, motel/hotel, food and drink, nor does it include advertising of snowmobiles. Listen to these impressive figures.

"Up until October 1, 1969, it is estimated that the State of Maine has over 35-thousand machines. During the final year, these snow vehicles were under the licenseship of the Motor Vehicle Division of the Secretary of State, 19-thousand snowmobiles were registered. Currently (29,093 snowmobiles are registered at a fee of \$10 each, or over \$290,000 accruing to the three beneficiaries; local municipalities where the owner resides, \$6 from each fee; Inland fisheries and Game Department which receives \$3 towards the cost of administration, Licensing and Enforcement; and Maine State Parks and Recreation Commission, \$1 from each fee which goes toward the cost of clearing, marking snowmobile trails, and their statutory obligation of providing maps and trail charts and other educational and informational materials. Trailer licenses amounted to \$15 million.

"Maine distributors paid for over \$6 million worth of snowmobiles last year. They sold over ten thousand units at an average of \$800 for \$8 million in sales. Over 1,000 trailers were sold at an average cost of \$200 each. Accessories, including sleds, racked up another quarter of a million dollars. Sale of clothing estimated at \$360,000. Parts sales are estimated at \$1,200,000, gasoline and oil at over a million and a half dollars. Add it all up and you'll see nearly \$20 million and a we haven't included financing charges, transportation, and the countless other side benefits to other businesses.

"Snowmobiling then has benefited the Maine taxpayer and the Maine economy, as it has in every other snow belt state.

"Snowmobiling is still in its infancy as a sport and a business. This sport and this business have problems to face as does any other industry of this magnitude. Some of your problems may very well be solved here in Maine—at this Congress."

From an address on Education, by William Severson, Minnesota Department of Conservation:

"Minnesota snowmobilers were requested to register their machines for the first time in 1967 and a total of 18,737 snowmobilers were registered in that year; 26,832 in 1968; and by the end of the 1969-70 winter season 115,113 snowmobilers were part of the Minnesota winter scene. You didn't have to raise your earlaps to know that snowmobiles were here to stay and the problems to be reckoned with also. Complaints of all kinds were being received at Minnesota's Conservation Department, Noise and trespassing were heading the list, but wire cutting, tree farm damage, television interference and traffic menace complaints also received attention. As if this were not enough, some Minnesota sportsmen took to the field in pursuit of flocks, deer, rabbits, and anything else that moved, crawled, wriggled or flew. During pursuit, if they were able to cripple or kill their quarry by running over it with snowmobile skills or tracks, so much the better. Though a small number of the snowmobile fraternity were involved in these deeds, their fame was spreading and our Minnesota legislature, who have always been noted for keeping their ear to the ground, were among

the first to realize that a serious problem was developing. The major portion of the snowmobile industry is located in Minnesota, and it was obvious that legislation was needed to curb the rising number of abuses of our environment, if the sport and the industry were to continue their growth in an orderly and healthy manner. Laws were passed to provide a tool to control the use of machines on roadways and in a variety of other circumstances. The law also called for a comprehensive snowmobile information, safety and education training program.

"Minnesota's Safety Training Program is well under way. Twenty thousand youngsters have been certified in less than one year with classes resuming again. The total should reach 25,000 or more before the end of the first year. Barring any unforeseen obstacle, the program will continue to improve and grow. If your state or province is contemplating a youth training program for snowmobiles, I would have no qualms about recommending this program, but I believe that other systems can be equally successful—if they are given a chance."

From Howard Larson (OMC, Waukegan, Ill.) address on Croplands and Forest Lands:

"Snowmobiles are a lot like that good-looking red-haired boy down the street who looks like he's full of hell . . . and so is blamed for everything that happens in the neighborhood. Of course, snowmobiles are responsible for some problems, as is our boy, but in the spring they are blamed for every seedling which became lunch for a deer.

"It is not my purpose here today to defend or condemn snowmobilers—because snowmobilers are you and I, and every other kind of a person who comprise the population of the states and provinces which are fortunate enough to lie in the North America Snow Belt. They have one thing in common . . . a desire to be out-of-doors in winter, but then they share that with a great many of their neighbors; those who hunt, ski, ice fish or otherwise find that snow is something to seek, not to flee.

"Since snowmobilers are you and I, the acquisition of a snowmobile doesn't, unfortunately, change us any more than does the acquisition of a new car, or a different home. We are still the victims of the habits we have built up in our daily lives. The man who cuts you off at the spotlight or on the highway; the man who litters the city streets, whose philosophy is, "Hurray for me . . . and to hell with you!"—isn't any different when he gets into the out-of-doors. There was a time when most people felt they had an obligation to live by a code. Now, too many of us live up to "rights" we claim are ours.

"What does all this have to do with forest lands and the snowmobile? I advance it only to show that most of our problems concern people; people who are no better nor worse than their neighbors. Snowmobilers may have been skiers, may still be and probably are hunters, fishermen and campers. They have one advantage over their neighbors, they are more mobile. This may be an advantage, also, when we discuss ecology, since the impact on a given area can be much less than when a portion of it is used more intensively. Certainly we know the footprint of a snowmobile exerts a fraction of the pressure of that of a man.

"Since snowmobilers are not one of a kind, neither is the environment they traverse. Some of it is as tough and resilient as any one of them, other of it is as delicate and susceptible to being hurt as the gentlest of them. Only one generalization can be made of our forest and pasturelands—"they are all living entities and all subject to change, whether or not people enter them" I feel it is important to remember this, to never forget it when we plan for ecological studies.

"Secondly, it is paramount to remember that snowmobiles are used . . . or should

be used . . . when the prospects for permanent change in an eco-system are the most remote, the ground is frozen, the plants are dormant, and they face the season when the prospects for revitalization are the brightest—spring.

"I'm not going to discuss trespass problems, or the invasion of tree plantations. There are ample laws in every state and province to cover this. There are registration laws and numbering systems to identify the wrongdoers, and posting laws to protect the property owners. If there are any fingers to be pointed, it is at the governmental units who don't enforce them. The answer is not more laws.

"Let's return to ecology. Much of this northern country is covered with wilderness areas in flat or gradually rolling landscapes. Much of that is underlain with sufficient soil to nurture crops and wild vegetation. It is probably wilderness because it has become marginal farm land for one reason or another. Much such as that in the eastern and far western areas is mountainous or hilly and the only soil is that thin layer which has accumulated from the mulching of vegetation, really that part of the mulch which has escaped being carried to the lower lands during the spring runoff. This is the fragile environment I envision when speakers generalize and refer to environments as a whole being delicate.

"That these forests areas change, both those in the mountains and in the lowlands, is evident from some figures I obtained from the U.S. Forest Service. Admittedly, these are old, since they are for the year 1962, but perhaps that is important to us since this is before snowmobiles became a recreational factor.

"This is a report of the annual mortality of a sawtimber on commercial forest land in the United States by cause. If anyone is really interested, I can also give them the figures by section and region. In that year, there was a total of 1,288,000,000 board feet lost by fire, and 5,416,000,000 feet lost to insects. An additional 3,807,000,000 feet were lost as a result of disease. Important to us is the fact that the greatest loss of 5,664,000,000 feet occurred as a result of weather, animals and overcrowding. The Service also found that 3,560,000,000 feet were lost due to unknown causes . . . probably that little red-haired boy with the hatchet he received for Christmas! This demonstrates quite clearly to me that forest lands are living and do change since, with the possible exception of some of the fire damage, none of this timber land loss was due to man's activities.

"Snowmobiles have been blamed for many of the changes occurring in these forests, but I am here to tell you that trees big enough to contain board feet are pretty able to take on any snowmobiler who is foolish enough to want to tangle with them.

"We have a rightful concern over erosion in the hilly areas, but we've got to remember that erosion has been going on since before the time the Appalachian Mountains were as awesome as the Rockies are today. If it hadn't been going on, we would have no sedimentary rock. I am not implying that we should encourage erosion, and it is because of concern all thoughtful snowmobilers agree with the principle that operations should be on trails, and that trails should be located to minimize their impact on a particular area.

"Perhaps we have been unduly concerned in some areas over the impact of snowmobiles on the environment. I would like to show you a few slides of snowmobile test areas. The first of these are of an area not far from Milwaukee. This is a tract of rolling land about 60 acres in size. About five years ago, it was cornfield but was then abandoned with the hope that it would become eligible for sub-dividing. During the past summer, it was used for endurance test-

ing, and for other types of engineering testing, including some skid areas where we work on improving snowmobile brakes. A full 5,000 man hours have been spent on that 60-acre plot in testing, most of them at wide open throttle. Drivers go out immediately after a rain, so the ground is frequently soft.

"You will see from these slides that there has been some damage. In fact, it would be remarkable if that amount of testing could be carried on without disturbance. There are worn areas here, but you will also notice how after a rain, the green begins to reappear. Few areas will receive this intensive use at a time of year when snowmobiles have no business being in use.

"Here are some slides of an area in the North which was used by Outboard Marine all last winter for testing. This same area was also a favorite ground for all of the snowmobilers from two small cities within twenty miles of the test area. There are between 3,000 and 4,000 snowmobiles owned by residents of the immediate area and several extremely strong snowmobile groups. These people not only made use of this area during the weekends, but there was a great deal of activity in the evenings.

"It was used by Outboard Marine for a period of six months, since snows come early in this area and remain late. Three drivers averaged thirty hours of endurance testing each week during this period with, again, most of the operation being at high speed. Here, however, the vehicles were run on snow cover. Both the drivers and the area residents had some favorite areas and these slides show them. Trucks have also been operated in the area, so all of the tracks you see are not due to snowmobiles. The vegetation has recovered beautifully, and I'm confident no permanent damage has been done.

"This one slide shows the snowmobile track which was developed by the snowmobile clubs. A grader was used to bank the turns and, even here, vegetation has come through the bare earth. This track was used every Saturday during the winter months for racing. These photos were all made last week with the purpose of showing you that recovery can be rapid.

"Our company intends to do some environmental testing of its own this coming winter, and I, for one, would like very much to see this done by as many other companies as possible. Production testing and endurance testing produce the severest possible impact, and the industry operates in enough different areas to be able to produce meaningful research far faster than would be possible by a university-oriented study. How such industry studies should be made, I'm not prepared to say, but we have enough talent within this industry to work out meaningful procedures . . . and I know that we can secure opinions as to how it should be conducted from the very cooperative conservation departments with whom we are privileged to work.

"This industry has been accused of a great many things by a lot of well-meaning people. I happen to think that the snowmobile's biggest sin is that it annoys some people . . . sometimes . . . and it annoys them particularly because of noise. In order to get rid of that problem, many are willing to blame the snowmobile for everything that happens in the forests.

"In conclusion, I would like to remind you that we do have a commitment to retain the forests and prairies which have been our heritage. We must pass them on, not unchanged, but as a living treasure to succeeding generations. There are several ways of doing this. At one time, to quote from an Ontario publication, the philosophy was, 'Woodsman, spare that tree! Touch not a single bough! In youth it sheltered me, and I'll protect it now'.

"The province goes on to say, 'The old way of growing trees, of letting nature take its course, was never satisfactory. An untended

stand of trees usually became a forest slum'. This does not mean that snowmobilers, campers, hikers or anyone else should be permitted unsupervised in forest areas. The snowmobile has opened the doors to enjoyment of our winter wonderlands . . . but more people than any of us ever suspected were interested in being there. How to view them and the environment they are enjoying with the equipment at their disposal is perhaps best summed up in a statement of Aldo Leopold, one of the great pioneers of conservation and an unquestioned authority. He said, 'The task of the future is how to live with our inventions. Leisure and security are of little value if, in the process of getting them, the objects on which they could be profitably expended will have disappeared.'

Quoting from an address by Paul Doherty of the New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game on the "Effects on Fish and Game Management":

"The effect of the snowmobile on fish and game is a question that is hard to answer at this time. Actually the snowmachine hasn't been with us long enough to truly say how it will or will not affect our wildlife resources. I don't think any snow state has had long enough time to arrive at any definite conclusions.

"From my own standpoint, as Chief Conservation Officer for the Northern part of New Hampshire, I can only state my observations over the past few winters. I can, however, say that these observations have been made first-hand and are the direct result of many days in the field in areas where snowmachines are used a great deal.

"New Hampshire is a small state, yet we have a fine wildlife resource and plenty of elbow room left in the northern third of the state. Nearly 20,000 snowmobiles were registered during last winter, which for a state of somewhat less than 9,000 square miles, is quite a few.

"Perhaps the place to start is with the white-tailed deer, for more has been said, and written, about the effect of the snowsled on deer than any other form of wildlife. To date, the use of the snowmobile has had little or no effect on our deer kill. With the season opening on November 10 and closing on the first Sunday in December, New Hampshire can expect little snow during this period except in the extreme northern end of the state. Any snowmachine owner knows that to operate a machine in the woods on the first 6-10 inches of new snow doesn't make much sense. For this reason snowmachines are of little use during this period.

"We do have occasional years when northern New Hampshire does have a good cover of snow during the deer season. Again using a machine to actually hunt from isn't very effective. To attempt to drive deer in the type of terrain and cover we have doesn't prove very effective either. At best, a hunter can use his snowmobile only to his advantage getting himself into the back country and hauling his deer out.

"As for the effect of the snowmachine on wintering deer, I have seen almost no cases where snowmobilers have invaded deer yards to the point that harm was done to the animals. As a matter of fact, snowmachine tracks in deer yarding areas have shown that the deer use these trails to reach food. It has been said that the snowmachine tracks lead dogs into the yarding areas—this, of course, can be true, but by the same token, Conservation Officers can hunt these dogs more effectively when they are using the frozen tracks as runways.

"To date I have seen few small game hunters that used snowmobiles to any great advantage. A few, but only a few, rabbit hunters use snowsleds to haul their dogs into hunting areas. Perhaps the reason for this is that many of the good areas are close to roads anyway.

"Bobcat hunters can use the snowmachine

to haul their dogs to the backwoods hunting areas. However, we have few real cat hunters anymore and therefore they make but small inroads into cat populations using the snowmachine or not.

"The black bear is legal game from September 1 to the end of the deer season. It goes without saying, then, that bear hunters cannot use a snowmobile to any advantage, even during those years when the snow comes early, because then bruins dens up when the snow comes to stay.

"Trappers can, and do, make good use of the snowsled. If any wildlife resource was to be really affected by the use of the snowmobile it will be the few beavers. Beaver trapping holds the interest of quite a few outdoorsmen; almost all use a snowsled as New Hampshire's beaver season can run as late as March 31. With the snowmachine a trapper can cover many miles in a day and can reach even the most remote beaver flowage. In sections of the northern part of the state, the effect of snowmachine use can already be seen in beaver populations. In other species of fur bearers, I have as yet to note any change due to trapping via snowsled.

"Winter fishing holds an interest for many people, as fishermen now use snowmobiles to reach their favorite spot. One thing the snowmachine has done here is to spread the fishermen out. Before the snowsled fishermen didn't walk far from their car. Now large lakes have fishermen well spread out thanks to the snowmachine.

"It is true that the ice fishing pressure on some ponds has increased, and some concern for fish populations has been heard. It is here that fish and game officials must keep a close watch and make changes in regulations when necessary.

"None of us know for sure what the future will bring where snowmobiles and fish and game are concerned. I feel certain, at this time, that the snowmobile has had little effect on our wildlife resources in New Hampshire. I do feel strongly that those of us in fish and game must watch the increase of the snowmachine closely, and with the interest of wildlife for the future in mind, make any and all suggestions necessary. Should the use of the snowmobile become a threat to any species, rules and regulations then must be put into effect that will give the wildlife resources the necessary protection yet keeping the sport of snowmobiling in mind."

Quoting from an article written by Benjamin F. Hoffman, Vermont Department of Forests and Trails—"Signs and Trails":

"Along with the growth in snowmobiling, the interest and need for snowmobile trails has grown. Well designed trails offer a constructive means of controlling snowmobile use and accomplish several things, namely:

"1. Reduce game harassment by routing snowmobiles away from game habitat areas;

"2. Reduce vandalism and property damage by directing activities away from areas susceptible to damage;

"3. Reduce accidental trespass and noise intrusion;

"4. Simplify the search and rescue problem;

"5. Reduce conflicts with other winter uses;

"6. Reduce accidents;

"7. Localize any litter problems;

"8. Provide opportunities for the less venturesome snowmobile; and

"9. Attract snowmobilers, thus having a definite economic impact.

"Obviously, trails must be designed to accommodate snow machines. The two previous conferences have produced criteria for trail design and construction, and this information has been published by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Trails must also be marked, and with the great mobility of the snowmobiler, either riding his machine or trailering his machine, trail marking must be standardized. At the

1969 and 1970 Congresses, a standard signing system was adopted.

"This subject should be a major assignment for the Trail and Sign Committee at the next Congress.

"A number of states are considering the establishment of trail systems involving the binding together of their entire area in one system.

"Money to accomplish this may well come from snowmobile and recreational vehicle registration fees.

"It is desirable that a recommended standard for resolving user conflicts be established in the same manner as the standard signing procedure."

Quoting from Howard L. Potter, Special Assistant to the Fed. Co-Chairman, Upper Great Lakes Reg. Comm., Duluth, "Social and Political Impact":

"Last year at our Congress we came to you with a proposal that we do an Economic Impact study of snowmobiling in the Upper Great Lakes Region which consists of the 119 northern-most counties of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. I would like to give you some of the results that we have.

"We in the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission realize that not enough of the people within our area are up-to-date as to what the total snowmobile picture is. Therefore, we have attempted to obtain a cross-section of the snowmobile user to arrive at the statistics of 'Mr. Average Snowmobiler'. We contracted for a study to be made last April by the Directional Marketing Company of Grand Rapids, Michigan, under the direction of the West Michigan Tourist Association. Our whole study was aimed at obtaining information that would be valuable to expanding their winter economic picture. It was hoped that the results would cause some of the Chambers of Commerce to sponsor snowmobile meets, contests, and the such. This is all in keeping with the charges given to our commission to improve the economic conditions within the three states.

"First, the age group of the snowmobile owner. Bear in mind, that these figures represent the age group of the owner and not necessarily representative of the age group that uses the machine. These findings indicate that the age group for two-thirds of the registered owners falls between the thirty-five to fifty-five age group, and probably has two or three children at home who will be using the machine more than the owner himself. The sport is definitely family oriented.

"Eighty-four per cent of those interviewed related that their machines were for family activities instead of their own personal use. The median age for the registered snowmobile driver is thirty-two years old.

"When it comes to enjoying snowmobiling it does not seem to make much difference as to what a man does for a living. The median income, before taxes, of the snowmobiler is \$10,650. Forty-two per cent fall into the category of \$7,500 to \$12,500. Another large number is the \$15,000 plus category.

"In addition to obtaining the cost of the machine, the brand names were also tabulated. There were thirty-nine different makes reported, with two leading names making up forty-eight percent of the total. This undoubtedly is not representative across the region due to local manufacturers. This table shows that over one-third are in the \$800 to \$1,000 price range and approximately one-fifth in the \$600 to \$800 price range. The remainder falls into the \$1,000 to \$1,200 price range. The 1970 registrations may raise these figures somewhat. Over thirty-five per cent of the people contacted expected to buy a new machine during the 1970-71 season. Our study does not evaluate those which would buy their first machine for this winter because we only contacted the registered owners.

"Eighty-three per cent of all the machines

represented in the survey were less than four years old and thirty-five per cent were 1970 models. Very few 1967 and older machines were still used. Perhaps we should ask the industry why this has happened and whether or not the '69, '70 and '71 machines will have a longer life span.

"Our survey shows that their own fields, their neighbor's fields, or other private property will get over fifty per cent of the snowmobiler's use. The combination of public, federal, state, county, and city lands make up the other forty-seven per cent of the use. The question, "what do you like to use your snowmobile for and what attracted you to the area you like best" was asked of all those who indicated that they had traveled over six miles to an area. Trail riding is almost equal to all other activities. This should be of interest to resort owners who were thinking of getting a part of the winter action. The number of machines owned for commercial use is surprisingly small and is only about two per cent.

"The following profile for the snowmobiler is that he is about forty, has two children at home, considers snowmobiling a family sport, and earns about \$10,650.74 a year—before taxes. Last year there was a seventy-six per cent chance that he would not go on an overnight trip, but this percentage will be reduced to about fifty-two per cent for the 1970-71 season. If he does go on an overnight trip, he will be away from home about 7.4 nights and in all probability will not stay at a motel. We suspect that this is because so few motels are open in the winter in the area where the snowmobiler wants to be.

"Mr. Average Snowmobiler owns nearly one and one-half machines which cost him about \$903 each when they were purchased new. He will spend nearly eighty hours during the winter on his machine. Mr. Average Snowmobiler's annual cost of his winter sport will be over \$615 of which \$200 is for expenses other than the purchase of a new machine. We believe that the \$37 shown for overnight trips would be substantially increased if some of the motel and hotels in the snowmobiling area would stay open.

"The projected increase of the three states involved in the survey shows the purchase of approximately 160 thousand new machines and an additional 110 thousand families will be involved in snowmobiling next season. For the three state area the economical impact factor is over two hundred and twelve million dollars."

Quoting Lewis P. Bissell, Extension Forester, University of Maine, "The Social and Political Impact of Snowmobiles":

"There do not seem to be any lukewarm, middle-of-the-road feelings about snowmobiles and their effects. On the plus side, the machines are fun to drive for they provide the thrills and exhilaration of skiing and they get people out in the winter weather for the benefit of their health and general well being. There are also business opportunities to be gained from the machines and their use. On the other hand, snowmobiles are noisy, dangerous, smelly toys which have the capacity to cause real damage to growing plants, wildlife, and to people.

"Before I go further, I should note that the information and opinions presented in this paper are the result of my involvement on several sides of the snowmobile situation. In the first place, I have worked for a number of years in the area of conservation education of the general public and in the more technical aspects of growing trees as a crop for Christmas trees, pulpwood, lumber, and a host of other purposes. In addition, I am a landowner in both Maine and New Hampshire and an enthusiastic user of snowmobiles. In fact, my wife and I drove two snowmobiles nearly a thousand miles each during the past winter.

"Where does the truth lie in all the thousands of words uttered about snowmobiles

and their problems in recent winters? My purpose here is to point out some of the problems and some solutions, and along the way stir discussion to help other people think about what is happening and what we can do about it.

"To be specific about the social and political impact of snowmobiles, I have already noted that the popularity of these machines has made many people active again in winter with real benefits to their health and an outlet for their energies. In our own family, my wife and I had skied for many years up until recently when for various reasons we were unable to ski and ended up pretty much hibernating during the winter. Shortly after buying not one but two snowmobiles in the fall of 1969, we found enough snow to use them and promptly were hooked on the pleasures of these machines. The benefits of the snow machines are all balanced by some disadvantages, one of course being the hazards to life and limb in driving the machines. I would remind the makers and in particular the advertising agencies for the snowmobile companies that they themselves have contributed to a part of the needlessly fast and reckless driving which we see from time-to-time. I hope that the mis-leading advertising will be toned down soon.

One of the real benefits and a social impact of the machines has been for people to get out in the open and meet new people. With a very few exceptions, the people we have met on the mountain trails in northern New Hampshire have been responsible citizens out enjoying the winter as we were doing. There are some users of the machines who do not act responsible and these are the type of people that I hope this Congress can help bring under some kind of control. In general, on the trails on which we rode, people were staying to the unused public roads and logging roads and were not causing damage to plants, wildlife, or any other resource. Perhaps the most flagrant problem was that of littering, although I realize there are other problems of vandalism on occasion.

Another impact on the public is that of the possibility of various businesses in selling and servicing machines and in providing lodgings and other camp facilities in snowmobile areas. The possibilities are many, but this is not my field and I will not comment further.

"Most important impact of all in my way of thinking is that a great many people have gotten out of the house and out in the woods to see at first-hand many things which they were not aware of before. This is in the area of my own professional activity of conservation education. Such observations can point out some of the land use problems and the problems in managing natural resources. I hope that you are familiar with the term multiple use of forest land. Multiple use simply means using the forest lands for timber crops, the production of wildlife, the protection of watersheds, and for recreation. Under good management, all of these purposes can be met in the same land. By this I do not mean that all purposes may be carried out on the same acre. In the same watershed, however, all are quite compatible. Remember that conservation should be a wise use of resources today plus saving for the future. Preservation of forest resources is not possible for the forest is dynamic, and is ever changing whether we use it or not.

"At this point, I have gotten into environmental problems and may be repeating what has been said earlier. It is not possible, however, to separate environment problems from people problems and people problems from politics. If you aren't involved in all three and learning something of the interactions of all three, you certainly should be.

"As far as political impact of snowmobiles is concerned, I am using this in its broadest sense. At the local level, this may mean trespass problems on land of another; or noise

problems of people driving too late at night; or theft problems of machines and equipment. If any of these problems get out of hand, they can have very great impact at the local level between citizens and police.

"In larger regions such as counties or states, the problems are bigger because they may include conflicts between the snowmobile people and the landowner's interests. In Maine for example, more than 95 per cent of the forest land is privately owned by more than 70,000 individuals, forest industries, and family trusts. These ownerships range from a very few acres to that of one paper company which exceeds two million acres under one management. In general, the management of this land has been good for many, many years. We have a number of ownerships which have rather good management practices well documented back to 1900 and in some cases for more than a century. Maine has a so-called wilderness and an abundance of benefits of the forest because of private ownership which has protected and managed the forest. There is a vigorous forest resource to maintain forest industries which are the backbone of the state's economy. The recreation business in all its phases now provides what has been estimated to be the second highest income source through hunters, fishermen, tourists, and such people as snowmobilers."

For those of you who read (and possibly agreed with) the story in *Sports Illustrated* in 1970, I'd like to quote from a S.I. letter to me (in reply to my retort):

"... Certainly there are merits to snowmobiling as well as competent snowmobilers and organizations interested in maintaining high safety standards. Mr. Olsen's story presents one side of the snowmobile story, but we do not dispute that there is a dissenting opinion to his case. That our article raises controversy is important for it is our desire to expose the sport of snowmobiling for further study..."

Which to me was an admission that they showed the one side they wished to show. Part of my letter to them had stated:

"It seems these little machines arrived on the scene just in time to bear the brunt of mistakes which had their beginnings many years ago. Snowmobiles have a great many good things going for them. If you list only the 'against's', why not also try for further regulation and control on automobiles (which kill many more deer than even archers in Wisconsin alone), jet planes, with sonic booms (that probably disturb hibernation, pregnancy and well-being of all game far more frequently than mechanized winter vehicles), outboard motors (leaving slick on lakes, with some operators who also run down duck hatches, etc.) and a myriad of other 'jack-nasties' that appear whenever progress rears its magnificent (?) head?

"If we were to single out specific items in our current way of life causing the mass of ecological and environmental problems, we would have to include everything from A to Z—automobiles to even zoo's."

"The possible solution? Education. Until a problem is recognized, it cannot be faced, let alone conquered."

"Perhaps the arrival of the snowmobile one-sided to my way of thinking, why not condemn it—as a singular item—as being responsible for ecological upsets. It is a new and vital industry, one of many in the new swing towards mechanized recreation. The industry itself recognizes its shortcomings and is taking steps to sophisticate the product. The industry cannot, however, sophisticate the operators."

"Rather than write as you did, somewhat one-sided to my way of thinking, why not embark on an education program to include the hazards of mechanization and progress as a whole? When you turn to the evils of golf carts and the erosion they may cause on courses, listen to the heart patients who need their convenience. When you cover privately

owned airplanes and the pollution they may bring to specific areas surrounding future airports, listen to the economical impact they will reflect on operators and users. When you cover air-cushion units (for land or sea) and the havoc they may wreak on wildlife and fish, listen to the statistics on safety and possible economy. When you cover the Olympics and amateur standings, listen to the statistics on income of European athletes."

"And, when you cover snowmobiles again, look to the foresters who use them to save tax dollars, to the Park Rescue teams trained in first aid, to the patrol services utilizing them for security purposes, to the utility companies, to the Clubs asking their legislatures for regulations—and the million plus owners who do use them properly and sanely."

In conclusion, just because the snowmobile has turned into such a popular "necessary luxury" and it may seem the countryside is over-run with them—don't panic.

Outboard motor boats went through this same phase and, with proper legislation and public education, they have managed to survive with the row boat and canoe.

Improper and unfair restrictions would not be a solution. Time, and the common sense inherent in human beings will bring snowmobiling to become something that everyone can live with.

The industry, associations and individuals connected with the sport cannot be condemned for the "outlaws" in their midst. All connected with snowmobiling are working toward goals that will make the machine safer, quieter—and for laws that will be obeyed—let us see that these laws are fair.

To re-emphasize, I quote again—the possible solution? Education. Until a problem is recognized, it cannot be faced, let alone conquered.

ALCOA VICE PRESIDENT DR. ERIC WALKER SPEAKS ON HIGHER EDUCATION CRISIS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech before the Traffic Club of Pittsburgh, Dr. Eric Walker, vice president of science and technology for the Aluminum Co. of America, called on an informed public to ally with college presidents to save our universities from financial disaster.

Dr. Walker, a retired president of Pennsylvania State University—and one who should know—cited schedule constraints, irrelevant credit systems, lack of recognition of student learning rates, poorly organized classrooms, as some reasons why money is not always being used wisely.

Stating that "education is too important to be left to the educators," Dr. Walker asked the opinion leaders to lend their ideas and support as well as their dollars to keep our universities from bankruptcy. I include his timely remarks at this point in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

HIGHER EDUCATION FACES REAL DISASTER

I am very happy to have been asked to talk to you tonight because I have something to say which I think is important. It needs to be said for the good of the country and for the good of higher education, as

well as the entire system of education in America.

You might ask why should I talk about education to the Traffic Club of Pittsburgh—a group whose primary interest is in the transportation industry, and an audience which has little or no responsibility for the education industry. There are two reasons: First, I will paraphrase Winston Churchill, who once said that war is too important to be left to generals, by saying that education is too important to be left to educators. Secondly, I believe that many of you are trustees of universities, members of school boards, or are at least interested in getting sons or grandsons into and out of college. But most important, you are opinion formers; people listen to you and, therefore—indirectly—you may be able to do something about these problems.

I am not going to talk about student unrest or the disturbances and confrontations in our colleges. Most of that is over. It reached a peak last spring with the disasters at Kent State and Wisconsin. The radicals went too far. The uncommitted and mildly committed students could no longer follow them. The average student saw that such tactics made conditions worse rather than better; that the radicals were guilty of all the sins they decried in the establishment. Since then the disrupters, the SDS and the Weathermen can no longer find followers.

UNIVERSITIES ARE GOING BANKRUPT

Only indirectly will I mention that other great student complaint, that many universities have forgotten their primary function, which is to teach. For while people have been talking about these student troubles, the universities have been plunging into other difficulties which will be much longer lasting than students breaking windows or presidents lowering the bars to permit something euphemistically called "coeducational living."

The real trouble is that many of our universities—and many of the most honored ones—are going bankrupt, not academically, but financially. Let me cite some of the publicly acknowledged evidence:

The University of California, which for many years has been the leader in spending money and raising salaries, has now put a freeze on hiring and is cutting the budget of most of its departments. To many universities this is a blessing, for now they can retain their own best faculty members. The Carnegie Commission on higher education, of which Clark Kerr is the chairman, says that 450 colleges and universities which enroll 21 percent of the students in higher education are already in financial difficulty. This list includes Stanford, Harvard, Chicago, Michigan, Minnesota, among others. Yale predicts a \$2 million deficit for this current academic year; Princeton predicts a \$2.4 million deficit; and Columbia, which is reducing or eliminating 28 departments, expects to go still further into the red.

One must pause and ask why is this happening? Why isn't the educational establishment better managed? All one needs to do to find an answer is to look back at the changes in the public attitude toward higher education during the past 40 years. Somehow or other the people of this country have become enamored with higher education. Everyone must get as much education as he can because "education is good for you." So parents send their offspring to college, many of whom will not benefit by it, because it is the thing to do. The number of college students grew from 1.5 million to 6.5 million between 1940 and 1967. Most people seem to feel any system with that growth must be in good shape. Few have questioned the soundness of the system.

Let me cite a few figures to give you the flavor of the problem. In 1940, there were

about 150,000 faculty members in higher education. Today there are 640,000. In 1940, 150,000 faculty serviced about 1,500,000 students, a ratio of about 10 students per faculty member. In 1966, the 640,000 faculty members serviced 6,500,000 students, still giving a ratio of students to faculty of about 10 to 1. But in this period of time, the average professorial salary for a selection of private colleges increased from \$6,000 to about \$17,500, an increase of about three to one. But the charges to the students went up from \$330 per year to about \$1,675—an increase of more than five to one. These same schools are now talking of tuitions of \$2,400 to \$2,700 per year. More significantly, we see the cost as a percentage of our Gross National Product increasing. In 1940, about 0.8 of 1 percent of our Gross National Product went into higher education; now it takes about 2½ percent.

SPENDING IS RISING FASTER THAN INCOME

Now I don't want to imply that all of this is bad, but as costs go up university presidents appeal to the alumni, industry, legislators and the federal government for more and more financial support. Every sector has been generous, and as more money is obtained, more is spent. Unfortunately, spending is still rising faster than income. Educators rarely ask how money can be saved and how costs can be lowered, how the system can become more efficient, how it can deliver more education per dollar spent. One has to ask if rising costs are inevitable. My opinion is they are not. It will take a quick turn-around to save our education system from a violent shake-up in which many small and less endowed schools will close. And this may well include some with excellent reputations and some that are good academically.

The key is efficiency; efficiency in education, efficiency in teaching, and the reduction of costs which modern technology makes possible. But in a university community, efficiency is almost a dirty word. Indeed, by some strange logic followed in educational circles, it is believed that one cannot have quality and still be efficient. Some educators even feel that a poor utilization of faculty—a low ratio of students to professors—is a *guarantee* of high quality education!

Some farsighted businessmen are worried about these trends. Pat Haggerty, chairman of the board of Texas Instruments, discussed the nation's productivity before the National Academy of Engineering and pointed out the service industries were not keeping pace with farming and manufacturing in improving their productivity. He said our farmers reduced their manpower from 17 to 4 percent of the total available between 1940 and 1967 while feeding and clothing Americans better than any other people in the world. Manufacturing has decreased its percentage from 40 to 36 percent, and has produced many more goods. By way of comparison, the service industries have increased their manpower usage and probably produced fewer services. The point is that this trend cannot continue if we are going to shorten the workweek and still get more goods and services. What Mr. Haggerty did not point out was that education is one of our biggest service industries. He might have noted that costs of educating people in this country have been rising steadily for the past 30 years, in both dollars and percentage of national effort. This rise cannot continue forever.

When one asks college presidents what will happen in the next few years, they invariably predict higher tuitions and higher costs for all segments of education. The real question, of course, is—will the public stand for it? Will the money be available?

Early in December in an article in *The Wall Street Journal*, Leo L. Cornfeld said, "Universities must recognize the urgency of deciding what their unique role in society is. They must determine how they are going to perform that role, and then convey their

identity and mission to satisfy their constituencies inside and outside the institution. If they fail to act, they may eventually find that others are deciding their futures for them."

Mr. Cornfeld went on to discuss the campus as a management problem, and he talked about the difficulty of reconciling the goals of the trustees, administration, faculty, students, alumni and the community. But it is not the goals that confuse as much as how we reach those goals. If teaching is our goal, the important question is how do we teach our students? The first and major goal of a university faculty is to teach, and I believe that universities have not yet learned how to do this effectively and efficiently.

STUDENTS ARE NUMBERS ON A CARD

Students complain about the relevancy of their education. They say that they are numbers on a punched card, that they never see a real professor, that they are taught by graduate students, and that they cannot find anyone to talk to. Yet in spite of all this, the ratio country-wide of students to faculty is the lowest it has ever been. One would expect that if there are only 10 students for each faculty member, certainly the professor can find time to talk to the 10 students who are allotted to him. The trouble is that although universities have helped create new knowledge and put science and technology into industry, the teaching profession has never thoroughly analyzed its own machine and its effectiveness. Only sporadically has it tried to take advantage of its own creations in doing its own business.

We all admit that Socrates discussing problems in the streets was a great teacher, and the best school is the professor on one end of the log and the student on the other. But we haven't the money or manpower to do it that way. We must look around for other systems and mechanisms. Certainly all teaching is not done by word of mouth, with the professor orating his wisdom for the benefit of the students. We have better tools than that. The radio has been invented; we have television, tape recorders and computers; and if these are any good at all, they ought to be used effectively and efficiently.

Behind the inefficiency, I believe, is the fact that we are still using many methods that have long since been outmoded. We continue to do this because we have failed to question the fundamental validity of many of our basic concepts of teaching.

I suspect that when movable type was invented and we began to print books, the 16th century version of our teachers' unions complained that books would make professors obsolete. Who would walk a mile to listen to a professor when he could read what he had to say in a book? But books did not make teachers obsolete. When radio came along, many thought it was going to make the best professors available to all students, no matter where they lived; and television, of course, was going to allow us to see them as well as to hear them. We now have audio and video tapes and computer programmed courses, but little use is made of them. Little attempt is made to find the combination of mechanisms that produces the best teaching. One system is piled on top of another, so we use them all probably as inefficiently as possible.

In spite of the multiplicity of methods, we hear a great deal about the students' dissatisfaction with their college experience. This is not surprising. Many of them just don't belong there. They're in college only because their parents insist; because college is the thing to do; because they can avoid the draft, or real life, or work; or because they just have nothing else to do. And colleges do not keep them out because colleges need students, not just to grow as big as possible, but to stay in business.

Other students, however, are dissatisfied for more substantial reasons. They want to

get an education but they feel that they are not being educated—or at least not getting what they conceive education to be. Some want to learn to be physicists and the faculty insists that they take sociology courses; others want to be engineers but are not learning any engineering. For some, the courses are so difficult that the work is over their heads and they're afraid they won't make it. Others find that college is just a repetition of high school; the courses are too simple, too easy, and not challenging enough.

It seems that in spite of our growing recognition of individual differences among human beings—not only in talent, ability and interest, but also in rate of learning—we continue to force our students into a pattern designed for a mythical "average" student.

STUDENTS LEARN AT DIFFERENT RATES

We take four nine-month years to get a bachelor's degree. Is there anything sacrosanct in this schedule? How can we really justify it? In England they use three years, and shorter years at that. Some countries use five years. Students learn at different rates, and they come to college in different stages of advancement. Isn't it time we ask ourselves very seriously whether we are right in trying to tie everybody to a standard four-year curriculum?

Another albatross we have around our necks is the credit system. We seem to think that a student should pass 124 credits of work in one curriculum—say liberal arts—and in some cases 154 credits in engineering to get a degree. The trouble is that the digits we are trying to use for measurement of credits are not the same size—and even if they were, we don't seem to try to equate them anyway. We think that every course has to be measured in numbers of credit hours or courses, or half-courses or units, or quarter hours. And we slave to change courses, stretch out material or shrink it, or leave out something important to fit a calendar which demands a three-credit, four-credit, or two-credit course.

SUCH A SYSTEM RESTRAINS US

It seems to me that all too often such a system restrains us from doing what we really ought to do.

Why do we feel every course ought to consist of fifty-minute lectures? Some brave souls have experimented with thirty-minute lectures and some with seventy-five minute lectures. No one has even demonstrated that a lecture of some particular length is necessary or best, or better than any other length of time. With modern teaching aids such as film strips, television and other audiovisual aids—which can be used or not, as a teacher sees fit—must we force ourselves to stick to lectures of one particular length?

And what about the lecture itself?

Oftentimes lectures are pretty wasteful devices by which symbols are transferred from the notebook of the lecturer to the notebook of the student without leaving much impression in the heads of either one. Because copying machines are generally available, I see no reason why students shouldn't be given copies of the professor's notes. This would avoid the distracting and useless writing by longhand a set of symbols which, because they are brief, are often meaningless anyway.

I have always been suspicious of lectures, especially when the lecturer has written a book on the subject. What can he possibly say that is not already in his book? And if what he has to say is worth saying, why is it not in his book?

One answer is that the student must be offered a chance to ask questions. But if the question is important, it should have been answered in the lecture; and if it is not important, then obviously answering it is a waste of time of both the professor and all the other students in the class. Why should an entire class be held up because

one student is not bright enough, or attentive enough, to get the point? We excuse this sort of thing on the basis that it maintains a dialog, a human relationship, and we insist that human relationships are essential in the learning process.

We seek to avoid regimentation. Yet what regiments students more than forcing them to sit in a room with 100 or 25 or even 10 other students, listening to lectures in exactly the same detail, taking exams in unison, and marching on to the final where each will be given a grade. There is no freedom for the learning process here. And neither freedom nor efficiency can be attained by having the professor devote enough time to the individual student for him to keep his place in rank and column, and still march the class forward at the prescribed pace.

WE ARE CONSTRAINED BY SCHEDULES

Another problem is that we are constrained by schedules, increasing numbers of students and professors must be fitted into a schedule which will provide each of them with a classroom at the proper place and the proper time. Many professors like to do their teaching Monday, Wednesday and Friday between 10 and 12 o'clock. But many students like to do their learning at odd hours, when they are in the mood or when they are thinking about the particular topic they would like to discuss. Is our insistence that a student fit his program into someone else's schedule or to the convenience of a professor really necessary or even desirable? Moreover, scheduling classes and pacing the rate at which the material is presented is designed for the average or somewhat better-than-average student. But students do not progress at the same rate. And the pace of any individual student varies in different courses. Yet the schedule is there and it must be followed. There can be no deviation from it.

The classroom problem is also a burdensome one.

Classrooms must be available in the right size, at the right time and in the right place. The result is that very few colleges and universities are using their classrooms more than 30 percent of the time. Yet many colleges find themselves space-limited, and the investment in classroom space, in spite of the fact that it stands largely idle, is horrendous.

A few months ago Fred Hechinger, education editor of *The New York Times*, reported that there was "much talk but little action on campus reform." He pointed out that faculty administration and students all talk about power and how to let everybody participate in its exercise, and implied that we could expect little action on reform if it involved asking the faculties to do something they really did not want to do. Mr. Hechinger finally asked, "Who is going to take the power and make the decisions?" My guess is that it will have to come from an informed public. Perhaps you, as members of an informed public, through your positions in business and industry and as members of school boards and boards of trustees, can start to demand it.

Now what you can do is start to ask some meaningful questions, the same kind of questions you would ask in your own business, questions about cost and where the money goes. For instance, if a university's major job is to teach, ask how much of the budget each year goes into teaching. Then ask what is spent on the library and the computer center. Ask, too, how much of the computer center is used in the teaching process and how much is used on research—on research for doctoral degrees, on research for industry and on research for the federal government.

Ask, too, how much it costs to teach a student one credit hour of any subject. Ask about the cost of history courses as com-

pared with physics courses. Take the given figure, say \$10 per student credit hour, and multiply it by the 30 credits an average student takes per year to find out how much of his tuition goes into actual teaching costs. The result will certainly surprise you. Ask for instance how much of his time a professor spends in the classroom and add to it, if you will, the amount of time required to prepare a lecture and the time required to correct the papers the students write, and then ask what happens to the remainder of the time. Ask how many of the faculty come in contact with undergraduate students and how many undergraduate students.

COLLEGE PRESIDENTS ARE WITHOUT ALLIES

The answers to questions like these are easily available, but if no one examines them critically, there isn't much point in getting them. It will not annoy a college president if you ask him questions like these. He probably would be glad to share the answers. Remember, college presidents are not trained in business—many cannot balance a balance sheet. They have no stockholders, do not calculate profit, or try to pay dividends. They are at best personnel managers, quality control experts, knowledgeable in one narrow field of scholarship. The once powerful business manager who years ago was the surrogate president has been shorn of power. Presidents, in general, would like to do something about their uncontrollable financial problems, but find it difficult to do so because they are without allies. They feel that no one cares about the efficiency of the operation and no one will provide support if firm and drastic action is taken.

This is where you come in. Your moral help can be even more valuable than your money.

OPPOSE REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House will vote tomorrow on House Resolution 411, a resolution to disapprove the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. I have joined a number of my colleagues in opposition to this plan, and will speak on the floor tomorrow urging disapproval.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the minority report of the Committee on Government Operations, which presents the best arguments I have seen for the defeat of this plan. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MINORITY VIEWS OF HON. JACK BROOKS, HON. JOHN E. MOSS, HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, HON. JOHN C. CULVER, HON. FLOYD V. HICKS, HON. GEORGE W. COLLINS, HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR., HON. BILL ALEXANDER, AND HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

The undersigned Members of Congress are signers of the following Minority Views on the Report of Committee on Government Operations which recommended disapproval of House Resolution 411 (a resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1971):

Reorganization for the purpose of meeting current needs and interests of society is to be applauded and supported. Reorganization for its own sake or reorganization as a substitute for policy must be condemned and opposed.

We believe that the establishment of Action through the merger of the Peace Corps with VISTA, SCORE, ACE, Foster Grandparent, RSVP, and the National Student Volunteer Program is ill conceived, especially with respect to the interests of the poor. It also runs counter to the objectives of those programs to be transferred into the agency.

PURPOSE OF REORGANIZATION

The President has indicated in his message proposing this reorganization that Action is needed in order to develop "a system of volunteer service which uses to the fullest advantage the power of all the American people to serve the purposes of the American Nation."

The President states or implies in his message—and administration spokesmen at the hearings echoed and reechoed this view—that Americans have not exhibited a sufficient spirit of unselfish volunteerism and that programs using volunteers have fallen far short of acceptable goals. This, in our opinion, constitutes an unwarranted, unsupported, and dispiriting indictment of thousands of dedicated and selfless individuals who have given their time and their energies so amply in the past.

How can we substantiate this charge? We do so through the reality of facts.

The President states that Action is needed to (1) encourage local initiative; (2) assign volunteers to assist Federal, State, and local agencies and private sponsors; (3) use part-time volunteers; (4) use skilled craftsmen and professionals; (5) expand testing and development of innovations in voluntary action; and (6) provide increased opportunities for association among younger and older volunteers. As anyone knows who is acquainted with existing operations, those responsibilities are among the many presently being carried on by VISTA, Peace Corps, and the other agencies. For example, the mandate for VISTA in title VIII of the OEO Act of 1964, as amended, provides:

"This title provides for a program of full-time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups, including elderly and retired Americans, to perform meaningful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant workers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement."

Proponents of Action express a desire to expand programs and to provide greater innovation. This is a cruel irony. As described below, the administration intended in 1971 to phase out VISTA, its chief domestic volunteer agency, until political reality struck home. Thereafter, the overall budget for volunteer programs was cut by \$16 million. Only at a late date was a decision made to add \$20 million to raise the annual total \$4 million above the previous year. If this constitutes a bold new thrust, the country is in trouble.

Much is made by the President and his supporters of the need for Action to heighten the visibility of volunteer efforts—presumably to attract more volunteers and make volunteers feel more wanted. Yet every program affected by this reorganization has more applications from potential volunteers than there are available slots to accept them. Those who do volunteer, moreover, generally

do so out of a desire to serve, not because they have a need to be praised and fawned over.

Finally, it is said that the creation of Action will provide for greater efficiency, economy, and effectiveness by centralizing recruitment, selection, and training. The sole justifications, by the way, for using the Reorganization Act to combine agencies—rather than the regular legislative route—are also economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. Thus, if Action cannot be supported on these bases, the reorganization plan must fail. And, no such justification exists. Indeed, this proposed reorganization will cause more harm than good.

DANGERS OF REORGANIZATION

Each program covered under the reorganization—Peace Corps, VISTA, Foster Grandparent, RSVP, SCORE, and ACE—is unique in fulfilling a specific need.

The cultural, social, economic, political, and psychological needs of people in foreign lands are different in kind and degree from those at home. Training to meet these requirements must be sculptured to the peculiarities of the situation. Onsite training is in order and is carried on both by Peace Corps and VISTA. Combined training programs, except to the most limited extent, are just not feasible. To force uniformity here could destroy both programs. The other programs involved do not require or demand the type of training conducted by Peace Corps and VISTA.

These programs are unique in other ways. Foster Grandparent participants, earning the minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour, are involved as much in an employment program for elderly poor as in a volunteer effort. Peace Corps volunteers earn \$4,000 annually, while VISTA volunteers are paid \$2,500 per year. SCORE/ACE members receive no compensation except for expenses. As the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Hon. Carl Perkins, stated when speaking in opposition to this plan:

"It makes absolutely no sense to tie the VISTA volunteer, who works in domestic poverty to help the poor, and the Foster Grandparents program, designed to provide opportunities for the elderly poor to help children, especially institutionalized and needy children—with the Service Corps for Retired Executives (SCORE) and the Action Corps of Executives (ACE), both of which are designed to provide opportunities for businessmen to assist in the development of small businesses, the former using retired businessmen and the latter using active businessmen."

While obtaining quality volunteers is no problem for existing organizations, joint recruiting efforts could seriously undermine one or several programs. Foster grandparents are not attracted by the same methods or under the same conditions as SCORE or VISTA or Peace Corps volunteers. If combined efforts were attempted, the attractiveness of one program or the manner in which recruiting was conducted could cause one program to be overshadowed by another—leaving one deprived and the other surfeited with volunteers.

The testimony, in our opinion, of Mr. Frank Carlucci, Director of OEO, and Mrs. Carol Khosrovi, Director of VISTA, sums up better than we can the lack of any benefits from the proposed merger in recruitment or otherwise:

"Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Carlucci, could you outline some efficiencies that will take place in the new proposal that has been submitted that are not presently being used?

"Mr. CARLUCCI. Well, as has been pointed out, Congressman, it is very difficult at this point to pinpoint efficiencies. I think we would have some benefits of economies of scale. Efficiency is in my judgment perhaps not as important as overall effectiveness of our programs.

"Mr. FUQUA. What about effectiveness then?

"Mr. CARLUCCI. I think the very idea of a national volunteer agency, the commitment of the President to this kind of an agency, the kind of identification that that creates, will serve to attract volunteers of a very high caliber. I think the new agency will be able to develop techniques, as I said earlier, of technical assistance and project development. We would be able to enhance the authority of the agency to make grants at the local level for project development. We have found in OEO that the key to a successful program is to find out what the needs of the local community are, and work back from there in terms of our recruitment, in terms of our training, and in terms of our signing up volunteers. I think the new agency would be better equipped to do this.

"Mr. FUQUA. You're not doing that now?

"Mr. CARLUCCI. We are doing that; yes, sir. This is one of the significant changes that we have made in the past year and a half. Previously the process was one of recruiting volunteers and then trying to find projects in which the volunteers could be placed. We are now looking first at the projects, looking first at the local community needs, trying to develop those needs and working back from there in recruiting and training. And our participation in the task force leads me to believe that the new agency would adopt these concepts.

"Mr. FUQUA. Mrs. Khosrovi, how do you think the training could be improved in the new Action agency?

"Mrs. KHOSROVI. I think, Congressman, if I knew how to improve it, I would. As I said, it's a very difficult problem for VISTA."

The reversed legislative-executive role in reorganization plans must be stressed here. Under these plans the President holds the power of legislation and Congress the power of veto. The burden is upon the administration—as proponent—to persuade on the merits of the merger. So far, no benefits have been uncovered. That in itself is sufficient grounds for defeating the plan. One must not stop there, however, because approval of this reorganization would have a serious detrimental effect upon the welfare of the Nation.

We saw above that joint recruitment and training could cause more harm than good. Far more ludicrous, under the name of economy and efficiency, is the fact that this reorganization proposes that we take SCORE and ACE and chop each in two. If adopted, the Small Business Administration would continue to provide management and technical support for these programs, while Action would plan, evaluate, recruit and issue press releases. To splinter administration and create a hydraheaded bureaucracy under the guise of efficiency is not persuasive. Mr. Walter Channing, Chairman, Planning Committee, SCORE, in opposing the creation of Action ably summarized the deficiencies in the plan: (1) There is no evidence that feasibility studies for including SCORE in Action were made, (2) the necessity for an organization to serve two masters violates good business principles and sound organizational procedures, (3) SCORE members volunteer for a specific purpose, (4) recruitment of SCORE members is handled by local chapters on a selective basis to meet specific needs, (5) SCORE operates entirely through volunteers and sees no need for a new paid staff of Government employees to supervise or handle its operations.

Chairman Wright Patman of the Banking and Currency Committee, in voicing his opposition to the reorganization plan, expressed a common sentiment when stating:

"By placing these programs in Action, it would not appear that any additional benefits would be gained for small businessmen."

Chairman Joe Evins of the Committee on Small Business spoke most eloquently in a similar vein when opposing Action:

"It appears obvious to me that these citizens [SCORE volunteers] can be more than fully occupied by making their services available to the Nation's more than five million small businesses in this country. Attempting to spread their work to other areas will only result in a splintering of their efforts in this vitally needed area. Having one job with one set of administrators and directions is difficult enough. Serving two masters in such a situation would appear to me to court inefficiency and ineffectiveness."

In the same way, this reorganization, while locating Foster Grandparent in Action, intends to have it continue to maintain an essential relationship with the field organization of the Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where it now resides. Secretary Richardson of HEW went so far as to indicate that "the Administration on Aging will continue to be the major guiding force in coordinating these programs and functions" (i.e., Foster Grandparent and RSVP).

This is not all. The organizational structure that Action will itself assume radiates duplication and overlap. The Associate Director for Program Development will apparently duplicate the Associate Director for Domestic Operations in formulating plans, programs and policies. Similarly, the Associate Director for Recruitment and the Associate Director for Domestic Operations both appears to have duties for planning and administering recruitment programs, for selecting volunteers, who establishing recruitment policy and for providing education and vocational counseling. Similar conflicts and duplications seem to exist among Program Development, Personnel, Voluntary Action Liaison and other supportive units, on the one hand, and the major operating units, on the other.

VOLUNTEERISM AS A FUNCTION

Even if the proposed Action agency was to be the epitome of efficiency and economy, however, and even if new responsibility, and authority was to be conferred over that of existing agencies—neither of which has been established to be true—Action would still be detrimental to the welfare of American society.

The reorganization plan is grounded on the concept of volunteerism. That is, the main purpose of the merger of the Peace Corps, VISTA and the other agencies is to group together units which enlist the services of volunteers. Volunteerism is to be the function, purpose, goal and *raison d'être* of Action. The administration's rationale for this course of action is difficult to comprehend. Although proponents of the plan were hardpressed to conceptualize their thinking, it appears the sole basis for creating Action is to stimulate a greater sense of public service and dedication in the Nation. Yet, as anyone conversant with reality will attest, there is no shortage of commitment by people today to those activities considered worthwhile, moral and humane.

As indicated earlier, every one of the programs proposed to be merged into Action has more applicants than openings available. Yet those who have dedicated themselves to helping the poor through VISTA, Peace Corps, Foster Grandparent, SCORE and others are not the same as the immaculately coiffured women in Pucci pantsuits who are planning charity bazaars. Individuals volunteer for one of these agencies because they identify, in a very personal way, the goals of that agency with their own views on social action or their own desires to assist others. They volunteer because they care. They do not volunteer purely out of a sense of noblesse oblige, nor do they volunteer in general. A program to attract volunteers to make lollipops on the French Riviera would not, it is believed, attract the same type of person as those who work with the poor in Harlem.

An organization must itself have a goal and a function that commands respect and dedication before it can attract volunteers. VISTA, by being associated with OEO, offers such attraction. Foster Grandparent, attached to the Administration on Aging, does so likewise. The same goes for SCORE with SBA. To sever these programs from their parental origins and place them in an unreal, sterile organization with no other mission than "volunteerism" is to probably pronounce their death, or at least the elimination of their vitality and relevancy.

Thomas Newberry, chairman, National Steering Committee, National VISTA Alliance, in speaking against this reorganization plan, said it well when he indicated:

"[V]olunteerism is neither a function nor a purpose. It is a means and a resource. The efficient use of this resource depends primarily on its having a purpose and direction in which to channel its energies. Action has no specific mission other than to mistake numbers of volunteers for specific purpose."

In a similar vein, Pablo Eisenberg, associated director, National Urban Coalition—another opponent of this plan—stated:

"There is no more logic in advocating that all volunteers should be assigned to one agency than there is in arguing that all civil servants should work under a super Federal institution just because they are civil servants."

"We believe that the most significant consideration in volunteerism is the work performed. Volunteerism is justified in our opinion only by what it is able to accomplish. Volunteerism for its own sake is an empty exercise; in such form it can be harmful to those on whom it impacts."

In a similar type analogy, our colleague Congressman Rosenthal, who covered all the hearings as a member of the subcommittee, suggested that if the concept of volunteerism makes any sense at all it should encompass the Department of Defense within Action after the country converts to an all-volunteer defense establishment.

The illogic behind the establishment of Action is further highlighted by the fact that it flies in the face of the President's own conception of government organization. Both the Executive Council on Executive Organization (Ash Council) and the President himself in his March 25 reorganization message enunciated the need for and urged the reorganization of the Government along functional lines wherein related activities are grouped together according to the functions and goals to be accomplished. As was seen above, volunteerism is merely an instrument for accomplishing an objective—not the objective itself.

Equally in violation of all sound principles of organization is the fact that none of the volunteer groups or the sponsoring agencies were seriously consulted over the merits of the proposed reorganization. If this had been attempted, the proponents of Action would have quickly learned that all volunteer groups directly involved are opposed to the plan, some quite heatedly. We suggest that sponsoring groups, if also quizzed, would respond the same way.

ABANDONMENT OF THE POOR

This failure to consult, however, should not be too surprising. The administration, much to our sorrow, has increasingly tended to subordinate the needs and interests of people, especially the poor, to organizational interests and to bury one's head in the sand in the hope that the problem, cares and interests of the poor and disaffected will go away.

In the past 3 years, we have witnessed the dismantling of OEO, the focal point of the poor in government. Unemployment has been permitted to climb to record heights. The number of poor in the Nation has risen by

5 percent, reversing a 10-year trend. Nutritional programs have been downgraded. Health and Education appropriations have been cut and vetoed. Billions in priority money appropriated by Congress to fund vital programs has been sequestered. Community Action and Model Cities programs—the one significant effort to involve the poor in controlling their own life and welfare—are to be buried. Equal housing, equal education, equal employment and equal voting rights are feebly enforced or completely abandoned. Legal service programs are emasculated. An effort at further erosion must be prevented.

Action stands for nothing except an empty and misconceived concept of volunteerism. To aid the poor and to engage the commitment to those who wish to help the poor and less fortunate, VISTA, Foster Grandparent, SCORE and related programs must be retained in those agencies where concern has been demonstrated and the role of advocacy exhibited. In the case of VISTA, in particular, this program must be retained in OEO not only because OEO can bolster VISTA's energies but because VISTA can preserve OEO from those who wish to eliminate the commitment to poverty rather than poverty itself. No one has expressed this need to save VISTA and the program to fight poverty better than Congressman Frank Thompson who, in testifying against Action, stated:

"So, Mr. Chairman, although I believe this reorganization plan to be ill-conceived in general, I am particularly disturbed by that portion of it which would remove VISTA from the Office of Economic Opportunity and restructure it in an alarmingly undefined way as part of Action. I have a special feeling for VISTA; I was the principal sponsor of President Kennedy's proposed National Service Corps which subsequently was launched as VISTA by an amendment offered by me in the construction and development of the poverty legislation. This program has meant too much to too many people to see it submerged in a monolithic new agency without well-documented justification, which is totally absent at this point. Yet the implementing of this Reorganization Act would almost certainly have the effect of depriving VISTA, not only of its identification, but of its unique function as the vanguard in the war on poverty. Nowhere in this reorganization plan do I find any assurances that a specified number of volunteers will be committed to antipoverty programs; nor do I see a specified financial commitment to this most critical area. At the present time, the goals of VISTA are clear: to help the poor to help themselves by providing needed skills and necessary motivation. If VISTA is to remain true to these goals, and if it is to attract the same type of highly motivated people it now does, it must maintain the degree of autonomy it now has and maintain its close association with the fight against poverty."

"Doubtless there is much in VISTA that can be improved, as there is in the White House. And this is true of the other agencies involved in the reorganization as well. But such improvements will not happen merely by implementing a plan which confuses organizational shifts and paper shuffling for creative policy change. The way to do that is by a renewed and increasing commitment to the basically sound aims of these programs and to the people they serve."

A final sad irony in this whole affair is that we are being asked to submerge VISTA in a Peace Corps directed operation—which Action will become if the reorganization is approved—at a time when the Director of Minority Affairs for the Peace Corps has just resigned over that agency's lack of commitment.

REQUEST FOR BLANK CHECK

Throughout the hearings, great promises were made over the commitment Action would exhibit toward helping the poor and

toward preserving the independence and integrity of VISTA, SCORE, Foster Grandparent and the other programs to be transferred to Action. Good intentions were uttered over designs for innovation and expansion. Grandiose schemes were unveiled for converting everyone in the country into either a volunteer or a sponsor. Promises of increased efficiency, economy and effectiveness were blithely cast about. In fact, each time an administration proponent of Action was challenged by a deficiency or fault in the proposed plan, new promises or revised proposals were made to plug the loophole even though such might have conflicted with a past statement.

We conclude, however, that Congress is being asked to give a blank check on this plan.

Section 3 of the plan gives the Director of Action total authority to reorganize internally functions, organizations or programs once Action goes into effect. An announced intention to preserve intact VISTA, for example, may give way to more "urgent, compelling" contingencies tomorrow. We must not forget that the Office of Management and Budget proposed the abolition of VISTA only a short few months ago. As it is, VISTA is to be downgraded in status and placed under another layer of bureaucracy if transferred to Action.

Commitments to retain a strong full-time volunteer program, with VISTA actively involved in shaping policies and directions, may also give way to a more advisory type agency. In a recent television interview with Elizabeth Drew, Mr. Blatchford—the indicated director of Action—said that he foresaw domestic volunteer operations in the future primarily as those of individuals who would be trained locally by local organizations while the Federal role "would be much more of a passive one."

Most important of all, perhaps, is the issue of funding Action and its components.

Considerable space could be devoted to the gap that exists between the grandiose promises and proposals that have been made by proponents of this reorganization plan in behalf of what Action is supposed to accomplish and the level of present appropriations of existing volunteer programs. Admittedly, one could argue that the past is not controlling and that creation of Action will prompt the Administration to support sizably increased appropriations. Since we have established, however, that no new authority is being conferred upon Action, this argument seems disingenuous since innovations and greater effort could be attempted now. The fact is, though, that in the proposed 1972 budget, the administration reduced appropriation requests for the constituent agencies involved here by \$16 million. Only when action was proposed did the President recommend an additional \$20 million—bringing the grand total to \$4 million above 1971. If this is dynamic commitment, we would hate to see what the status quo looks like.

There is even more significance to the \$20 million proposal than meets the eye. Examining the history of this figure furnishes additional proof, in our opinion, that Congress can put no real faith in the way Action will be administered if approved.

The President, in his reorganization message, stated that the additional \$20 million would be "directed primarily to finding new ways to use volunteer services." As opposition to Action mounted, however, due to the fear by VISTA supporters that the needs of the poor would be abandoned in such a reorganization, a change developed in the testimony of administration witnesses as to how the \$20 million would be spent.

In a letter from OMB Director, George Shultz to Congressman Horton, on the opening day of the hearing, it was stated:

"No precise distribution of the President's proposed \$20 million authorization for Action

has been made. However, the Administration has indicated its intent to use the \$20 million entirely for new and innovative domestic programs, with the majority of funds to be committed to antipoverty activities."

Then, at the hearing, in explanation of the above letter, Arnold Weber, Associate Director of OMB, sought to clarify the above statement by indicating:

"What the letter indicated is that the President and OMB . . . has made a commitment to provide or to make an additional request for an additional \$20 million to accommodate the R. & D. and innovative aspects of the proposed new agency. The letter also indicates that certainly to the extent that VISTA is a major component of the new agency, to the extent that the focus of volunteer services is community problems, to the extent that community problems are preponderantly the problems of the poor, much of this money will go to VISTA-type operations."

But, as far as VISTA itself is concerned, Weber indicated:

"The position of the administration . . . is that we think VISTA is a program which should be sustained to the extent of the President's budget request."

—which was \$3 million below the previous years level.

Upon his initial appearance before the committee, Mr. Blatchford of the Peace Corps had apparently not gotten the word of the change in signals that had occurred behind the scenes to "promise her anything but get the program approved." He indicated:

"Assuming the availability of an additional \$20 million which will be requested for Action, the new agency will expand its grant support to local sponsors which otherwise would be unable to utilize existing local volunteer resources to deal with such needs in the community."

"The use of financial and technical support has many possible applications to promote the development and expansion of voluntary service. It is important to note, however, that grants would be limited in size and applied to local programs according to sound criteria."

"The unification of Federal volunteer programs and the provision of additional funding capacity has major implications for research and development in the field of volunteer service. A significant portion of Action's new moneys will be devoted to the exploration of new and more effective ways in which to apply volunteers and allied resources to the solution of community problems."

Subsequently, at the last day of the hearings, following many opposition witnesses, Mr. Blatchford stated:

"As I recall, we committed (the \$20 million) to domestic affairs, and it has been committed, the majority of which will go into types of programs that are being operated now."

Thus, it may be seen that the promised \$20 million increase in funds was initially intended for new projects, especially in the R. & D. area; then, as pressures built up over the future of VISTA, a shift developed whereby spending of the \$20 million was committed to "domestic" and "VISTA-type" programs. But, as is obvious, the \$20 million could be spent on R. & D. or other projects which would not directly benefit VISTA. Admittedly, on a couple of occasions, administration witnesses indicated that \$12 million of the \$20 million would be prorated to VISTA, but the references were so general and nonspecific in the overall context of discussions, that the firmness of the commitment is open to question as is the exact purpose for which the funds would be spent. It is our firm conclusion, then, that the commitment to retain and support VISTA is so tenuous and vague that it would be a travesty on the welfare of the poor to approve the reorganization plan.

Even if we had received far more clearcut commitments, however, unalterable doubts remain because of the administration's poor record and unfulfilled commitments to help the poor and also because of clear indications that it wished to abolish VISTA just a few short months ago.

Every Member must remember that funds under Action will be appropriated to the Director of Action, not to VISTA. Under the reorganization plan, the Director will have total discretion to use such funds as he sees fit and to transfer them among various constituent units as the mood strikes him. Do we not have ample evidence already that today's promises are tomorrow's forgotten dreams? Need Congress repeatedly permit itself to be fooled? Must we ignore the further fact that, even if Congress appropriated the additional \$20 million and earmarked it specifically for VISTA, the President can refuse to spend a cent of it as he has in regard to billions in other essential appropriated funds?

CONCLUSION

Congress is being asked to approve a piecemeal program on the basis of a mess of promises and without the slightest assurance that the reorganization will improve present circumstances.

Five conditions support the reorganization proposal: (1) approval of the plan itself; (2) merger of the Teacher Corps into Action; (3) appropriation of the \$20 million and its application to the proper programs; (4) enactment of legislation effectuating essential administrative changes; and (5) merger of the Peace Corps into Action. If any one of these contingencies were to fail, establishment of Action would make no sense even if it otherwise made sense, which it doesn't, as shown above.

We have already discussed conditions (1) and (3) earlier. As far as condition (2) goes, it is no secret that the likelihood of the Teacher Corps being placed in Action willingly is slim, but supporters of an independent corps should be aware that approval of this reorganization plan will be used by the administration as a "bootstrap" to force the Corps into Action on the theory that it would no longer make sense outside. There can be no question in anyone's mind that Teacher Corps legislation—although already drafted—has been deliberately withheld from submission to Congress on the basis of this logic.

Concerning condition (4), there are so many inconsistencies and conflicts among the different programs to be merged into Action involving levels and scales of remuneration, personnel systems, and other administrative matters that, unless homogenized through subsequent legislation, Action would be all but unmanageable. Here again, however, if Congress approves this reorganization, it has in effect bound itself to taking subsequent action without having the foggiest idea what that action will be.

In regard to condition (5), the President has the authority to transfer the Peace Corps to Action by Executive order following the taking effect of Action on July 1. It should be recognized, however, that Congress can through appropriate legislation prevent this merger from occurring. Since the Foreign Affairs Committee would undoubtedly lose its jurisdiction over the Peace Corps if the reorganization takes effect, consideration most likely will be given to preventing the transfer from taking place.

As broad and as important as the resolution of these contingencies is, however, they do not go to the heart of the unknown surrounding the proposed reorganization. As indicated earlier, vast promises and grandiloquent visions have been offered as justification for approval of Action. But, no hard facts and little reality have been forthcoming.

These key questions have not been answered:

1. What are the goals and objectives of volunteer programs?

2. What types of recruitment, training and selection programs are most effective and economical?

3. Should primary emphasis be placed upon full-time or part-time volunteers?

4. Are more effective results obtained through Federal or local direction, training and control?

5. Should the Federal Government assume an active or passive role?

6. Will establishment of Action lead to a national service corps and, if it does, is that good or bad?

7. Which are more effective or more in demand—skilled volunteers or generalists?

In the same way, while proponents of Action have uttered many generalities over what they intend to do, they have failed to speak concisely as to how they intend to accomplish the stated objectives:

1. Increase the capability of existing volunteer programs.

2. Improve the capacity of volunteers to perform more effectively.

3. Attract more volunteers.

4. Provide volunteers where their skills are needed.

5. Stimulate the creation of new programs where volunteers could be effectively utilized.

6. Expand research and development.

7. Expand the use of part-time volunteers.

8. Ways to improve programs to meet the need of the poor.

9. Increase the participation of communities.

10. Increase and improve the utilization of sponsors.

To repeat what was said earlier, the proponents of a reorganization plan must shoulder the burden of establishing that the reorganization is more efficient, economical and effective than existing conditions. We have clearly established, we believe, that the proponents have failed dismally to sustain this burden. For Congress to allow this plan to go into effect in the face of this failure would represent a further abdication of its responsibilities. It would also have to be considered a vote against the welfare and the best interests of the American public, especially the poor.

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.
JOHN E. MOSS.
CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER.
GEORGE W. COLLINS.
JOHN CONYERS, JR.
BELLA S. ABZUG.
FLOYD V. HICKS.
JOHN C. CULVER.
BILL ALEXANDER.
JACK BROOKS.

LEWIS K. UHLER, DIRECTOR CALIFORNIA STATE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, REVEALS LACK OF COMPREHENSION OF PROBLEMS OF POOR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Lewis K. Uhler, present director of the California State Office of Economic Opportunity, and former Birch Society organizer, has sent out to a wide mailing list, an incredible document financed by State and Federal tax moneys attacking the press, attacking the Commission comprised of distinguished jurists appointed by Presi-

dent Nixon to examine Uhler's charges against CRLA, and complaining that the State of California was faced with a choice of accepting "the incredible posture of placing the State of California on an equal basis with the CRLA."

In that last plaintive plea, Mr. Uhler tips his hand. It was his hope that the State of California, represented by his report condemning CRLA, would be in a "superior" position before the tribunal of jurists to the CRLA and that, therefore, the State of California, in the person of Mr. Uhler would not be required to prove his unfounded charges against CRLA.

That CRLA would be considered an "equal" to Mr. Uhler before a legal tribunal examining the facts is an incomprehensible situation to Mr. Uhler.

It is that failure to comprehend that led him to attack CRLA in the first instance; namely, CRLA's insistence that the poor of California, their clients, were "on an equal basis" before the courts with those wealthy growers, those political powers, and those entrenched special interests that they were litigating against.

Mr. Uhler believes the poor "have a place" in society, but that "place" is inferior to the large growers, the political powers, and the special interests who have long been abusing them.

Mr. Uhler again demonstrates his incapacity to head a State agency whose mission is to be supportive of efforts to assist California poor. His philosophy of life does not permit an understanding of or compassion with the poor. Unfortunately, his philosophy is shared by his superior, Governor Reagan, who appointed him in the first place.

I include Mr. Uhler's remarkable document for your inspection:

CALIFORNIA STATE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC
OPPORTUNITY

(By Lewis K. Uhler)

This message concerns the prerogatives and the power of the states in the Federal Government's "War on Poverty". We are sending it to you because of the confusion fomented by a non-objective press and media. Please take a moment and read what follows:

Four months ago the Governor, on our recommendation, vetoed the refunding of California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. (CRLA). The veto was sustained by Federal OEO Chief, Frank Carlucci, and a six-month phase-out grant was authorized. At the same time, Federal and State officials agreed that a commission be appointed to investigate CRLA and report to Federal OEO how delivery of legal services to California's rural poor could be improved. Meanwhile, we indicated we would proceed with plans for a voucher-judicare-type alternative to CRLA, giving eligible recipients freedom to choose their own attorneys.

The Commission was appointed, without conferring with Governor Reagan or myself, and apparently was advised to hold public hearings in politically-safe downtown San Francisco, rather than conduct a thorough investigation in California's rural areas, where CRLA operates. (Incidentally, this Commission has been given unlimited tax dollars to hold these hearings.) The Commission also was advised to hold an adversary-type hearing between CRLA and the State of California, with our now famous 283-page evaluation report covering the ills of CRLA as a subject matter of the proceedings. In

short, the signals were changed without our agreement and without our consent. We are now faced with a Commission that has neither the power to subpoena witnesses nor the ability to file perjury charges. In fact, this Commission is designed to "second guess" Governor Reagan, rather than investigate the facts and consider a constructive alternative to CRLA.

Confronted with a Commission designed as this one is, California has had two choices:

One choice was to accept the incredible posture of placing the State of California on an equal basis with CRLA; to submit to the "new" rules of the Carlucci Commission; and ultimately engage in adversary proceedings on an equal basis with CRLA. As an attorney who enjoys the courtroom, the urge to get in and "mix it up" or "slug it out" with CRLA is a great one, indeed. My desire to do so is constantly increased by CRLA's use of the "big lie" technique. CRLA plausibly claims that there is not a shred of truth in our evaluation report, and that we are afraid to defend it. We trust that the absurdity of this charge will be revealed in the hearings the Commission is to hold in CRLA's service areas. In the meantime, we are sending you a copy of an article that appeared in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune, which we think presents an accurate picture of what has happened.

Our second choice, and the one which the Governor has selected, has been to avoid direct involvement in the hearings as an adversary, but instead to encourage the Commission in every way to adopt proper procedures and devote the time necessary, to complete a thorough and exhaustive investigation. Most important, we have urged the commission to visit each of the nine areas where CRLA operates. In this instance, we scored one small victory. The Commission finally agreed to venture out of San Francisco into the Salinas and El Centro areas.

Beyond that, we feel the Commission is not giving sufficient time to the hearings, having scheduled only two days in Salinas, one day at the Soledad penitentiary, and two days in El Centro. This time is not sufficient for a thorough and deep investigation. In addition, their rigid rules and procedures have seriously limited the ability of our witnesses to be heard, although certain changes will make them more accessible to potential witnesses than we originally thought.

We are seriously concerned about the precedent the CRLA Commission may well set. As presently constituted, this Commission circumvents the Governor's power under Section 242 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and distorts the intent of Congress and the spirit of the law.

In summation, we here at California State OEO are fighting a major battle. Our job is to make sure that tax dollars spent in poverty programs in California get down to the poor. In CRLA's case, we know not only that money has been wasted, but that the poor are not receiving the legal service that OEO is pledged to give them. We proved that in our report, which has been supported by large amounts of information that has come into this office since the report was written. We will not only stand behind the Governor and his veto of the program, in the future we will continue to recommend that he veto programs either that waste tax money, or are not delivering vital services to the poor.

I hope that this "special report" has shed some light on this rather confusing issue. If you have any ideas or thoughts on the report, I would appreciate your sending them to me. You can write to me at 800 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814. You should also send copies of any correspondence from this office to Mr. Frank Carlucci c/o OEO, Washington, D.C., and to the Commission on CRLA, c/o Justice Robert B. Wil-

liamson, 450 Golden Gate Ave., Box 36102, San Francisco, California 94102.

MORE ON HIRSHHORN

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Richard Wilson has written an excellent column on the subject of the proposed Hirshhorn Sculpture Garden. It is certainly worthwhile reading for anyone following the progress of this controversial project. I am also inserting copies of articles from the June 1971, issue of *Antique Monthly* regarding the sculpture garden and the sculpture which it would contain.

Both of these articles were brought to my attention by Mrs. George B. Green. Mrs. Green is a well-recognized expert in this area. She serves on the President's Advisory Committee on the Arts, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and is presently associate editor of *Antique Monthly*.

The articles follow:

JOSEPH THE MAGNIFICENT ELBOWS MIGHTY
ASIDE

(By Richard Wilson)

The many millions who make their pilgrimages to the national shrines in Washington should be more aware of the abomination about to be visited upon the federal city.

A memorial on the grand scale of the Johnson Library in Texas is projected to honor Joseph the Magnificent on the great Mall where now only George Washington and Abraham Lincoln—not even Thomas Jefferson—reign in marble splendor.

The memorial to Joseph the Magnificent would strike envy in Lorenzo il Magnifico, the Medici merchant prince of Florence, himself a poet and patron of the arts.

Joseph the Magnificent is no Medici, though he is bracketed in print with this rapacious family of 15th century Italy, but a Latvian-born former Canadian entrepreneur named Joseph H. Hirshhorn.

If all goes as now planned his name will be handed down to the ages as the only 20th century American worthy of joining Washington and Lincoln on the great greensward between the U.S. Capitol and the Lincoln Memorial which is ranked by many as the only truly magnificent architectural vista in the nation.

The seated, brooding and massive Lincoln can then gaze across the reflecting pool and past the shaft of the Washington Monument into Joe Hirshhorn's sunken sculpture garden, the length of two football fields transsecting the Mall.

Joseph the Magnificent was wholly unknown to the average lawmaker and public official until celebrated by Abe Fortas and Lady Bird and Lyndon Johnson a few years ago in their eagerness to promote the arts. He agreed to convey to the government his art collection, of very considerable value and merit but not to be compared with that of the late Herbert Lehman given to the Metropolitan Museum, provided suitable housing which would memorialize his name were provided in Washington.

One needs to cast his mind back to 1966 when Lyndon and Lady Bird were trying to ingratiate themselves with the artistic and literary community to show that he was not a crude and tasteless cornball from Texas

unfit to walk in the wake of the elegant John F. Kennedy. Hirshhorn with his willingness to contribute his art collection under certain self-satisfying conditions was, with Abe Fortas' help, their artistic hostage and prize.

The patrons produced a dazzling result which must have exceeded Hirshhorn's wildest dreams. Washington is monument-happy but Congress outdid itself in Public Law 89-788 signed by President Johnson in 1966.

This act provided a national monument for the art collection at public expense on the Mall of the U.S. Capitol rivaling those of Washington and Lincoln and in a much better location than the vast marble car barn on the Potomac known as the John F. Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts. Jefferson, meanwhile, remains relegated in a modest rotunda at the south end of the faraway Tidal Basin.

Other journalistic colleagues have dealt with the benefactor's background, his conviction in Canada for illegal money transactions, his arrest for wartime smuggling of U.S. currency across the Canadian border, his identification as promoter of questionable stock schemes.

An editorialist in Washington snubs such disclosures as "imbecilic" in view of the generosity of his gift, admitting that Joseph the Magnificent may be no perfect angel, but neither were the Medici. Neither are the Medici to be memorialized on the Mall with Lincoln and Washington.

Hirshhorn's prospective bequest (he is still hanging onto the art until everything is buttoned down about the memorial) is certainly a desirable one and there are plenty of places it could be suitably housed other than the Mall dedicated to our most famous men and highest ideals.

There are plenty of other ways to handle the collection and make it the nucleus of a great museum of American art other than sanctifying a donor who wishes his name to ring down through history with America's greatest.

If there are those at home who do not relish the idea of bringing their children to Washington to visit the memorials to Washington, Lincoln and Hirshhorn, and thus absorb the flavor of American history, they might ask their congressmen to get interested in the matter.

It is not too late although some work has been started. The sculpture garden, at least, could be moved to a less noxious location. And the whole shebang could be moved to other locations accessible to the art-loving public. The least that could be done is a redesign of the museum so that it would not impinge on the splendor of the Mall and the dignity of American history. Hirshhorn has an opportunity for self-effacement more lasting than his name in bronze. He could just give the art to a country which gave him his opportunity and collect his reward in heaven.

CONTROVERSIAL CAPITOL MALL GARDEN APPROVED

The National Capitol Planning Commission has approved the controversial Hirshhorn sculpture garden located on the Mall at the foot of the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C. The Hirshhorn collection of approximately 5500 works of art—4000 paintings and 1500 pieces of sculpture were offered to the United States Government in 1966 providing the government would furnish a suitable building and sculpture display areas, and name the museum and garden after the donor in perpetuity.

The collection, valued variously between 25 million and 50 million, contains sculpture which includes items dating 600 B.C. Neobabylonian, Renaissance, Pre-columbian,

Egyptian, Greek, Roman, to the 20th century works of Calder.

It boasts 17 works of Auguste Rodin including his famed bust and head of Balzac and the monumental "Burghers of Calais," one of 12 of casts of this work, and one of the most moving sculpture Rodin ever created. It also includes 43 Daumier sculptures, 22 by Degas, 23 by Giacometti, 53 by Sir Henry More, 21 by Matisse, 22 by David Smith, 3 by Brancusi, 12 by Litchitz, and 27 by Manzu.

This was the first of three necessary steps to complete the approval of the plan.

It is proposed to exhibit the sculpture out of doors on a rotating basis displaying around 200 pieces at a time.

CHEMICAL CORROSION DAMAGING: POLLUTION MOVES RODIN'S "THE THINKER"

(By Janet Green)

William Voss Elder, acting director of the Baltimore Museum of Art will relocate the famed bronze statue of Auguste Rodin's "The Thinker" on the advice of conservators who claim that the surface of this monumental-sized cast will no longer withstand further corroding from chemical pollutants found in the Baltimore atmosphere. Joseph Ternbach, noted New York conservator of bronze made the recommendation following work of cleaning and repatination he performed on the famed statue which was sent to his New York studio last December.

Rodino, (1840-1917) the great French Romantic School sculptor, considered himself greater than Michelangelo Buonarroti (and there were none as great in between the two) because as he claimed he had the advantage of knowing Michelangelo's work. Without question, his "The Thinker" is one of his most outstanding works. Until last December this great piece of sculpture has been on the grounds of the Museum. According to the judgments of Mr. Ternbach and a Smithsonian Institution metallurgist, within five to twenty years the statue would return to the poor state it was in before its recent treatment. No one knows of any coating that would assure complete protection from the natural conditions of weather and unnatural conditions of air found in most large cities today.

A piece of bronze placed outside the museum today would be subjected to what amounts to a mild acid bath caused by the combination of pollutants with moisture. The surface of the Rodin now is similar to the way intended by the artists but would not be if allowed to corrode again which would make the bronze still thinner and weaker and the surface modeling more and more blurred.

In a report to the board of trustees it was stated: "The conclusion is that to preserve the sculpture it must be kept indoors. To put it back outside would lead to its disfigurement, first destroying its aesthetically, and ultimately destroying it structurally." The report continued:

Throughout the world, sculpture and even buildings have suddenly begun to disintegrate at an alarming rate. It is hoped that protective measures will be found to use on them, and more importantly that the conditions leading to this speed-up in deterioration will be corrected. In the meantime, the only safeguard we have is to move very valuable art objects inside."

The Rodin sculpture cast is irreplaceable because it was made under the supervision of Rodin himself in a Paris Foundry, according to Mrs. Ellen Landis Kolsky, curator of painting and sculpture at the Museum.

Presently, "The Thinker" has been installed on a temporary base in the Main Sculpture Court, just inside the Museum's

front door where visitors have an opportunity to view the work more closely than previously.

STUDIO CITY'S SISTER CITY PROGRAM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my fellow Members' attention to the outstanding achievements of the Studio City Chamber of Commerce, most especially its women's division, in carrying out a sister city program.

The Studio City, Calif. Chamber of Commerce was one of the first organizations in the United States to adopt a sister city under the people-to-people program established by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. The chamber adopted the community of Ajijic, in the State of Jalisco, Mex., in 1960, and has proven itself especially concerned about its sister city ever since.

In true "hands across the border" fashion, the chamber has inaugurated many reciprocal visits with Ajijic. The first of these visits took place in 1962, under the auspices of the U.S. Department of State.

The women's division of the chamber of commerce has proven, since its establishment, the most effective force in continuing the sister city program, and making it a means of integrating the different facets of both communities. Among the outstanding activities undertaken by the women's division have been:

An international block party, raising funds for sister city programs from the business and residential community;

A breakfast program for the school children of Ajijic;

Provision of funds for refurbishing a well, and the local water supply;

Sponsorship of programs to develop the artistic talent of local children, including training in southern California;

Sponsorship of visits by schoolchildren of Ajijic to Studio City, to aid understanding of the United States and its communities;

Aid in developing an American teaching program in Ajijic; and

Provision of staff and materials to aid in teaching residents of Ajijic English.

By undertaking these varied goodwill projects, the women's division of the Studio City Chamber of Commerce has proven itself an excellent instrument of friendship and public relations, not only for Studio City and Los Angeles, but for the whole United States. I would, therefore, like to commend these fine women, and especially the officers of the women's division: June Cottrell, president; Iona Fellers, first vice president; Mary J. Parlapiano, second vice president; Aldine Osborne, secretary; and Ann Parlapiano, treasurer.

GERMAN OCCUPATION CONTINUES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the face of determination to force immediate withdrawal of our combat troops from their mission in Vietnam, the defeat of Senator MANSFIELD's proposal to set a date certain for partial withdrawal of occupation troops from West Germany points out another double standard in the thinking of some in our country.

One of the arguments offered against troop withdrawal from Germany is that it would make that country vulnerable to Russian intimidation, if not invasion. To support such thinking, Chairman Kosygin of the Soviet Union conveniently effected public hysteria by calling for U.S. troop reduction in Europe at a Moscow luncheon honoring Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau. The timing was perfect—as if Trudeau carried the message and acted as “an honest broker” between the great powers.

The inconsistency of the position taken on withdrawal of troops from Germany when considered with such a vote as the Cooper-Church amendment on Vietnam withdrawal is borne out when one understands that it is the Russians our men and allies are fighting in Vietnam—the Vietcong and North Vietnamese but supply the real estate and cannon fodder. Conservatively, 80 percent of the military arms and equipment used by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong are estimated to be supplied by Russia. Yet we are to believe that it is morally right to disengage our troops from combat with Russia's allies, but morally wrong not to maintain our occupation forces in West Germany to prevent further Russian aggression.

If our fighting men in Vietnam are denied victory, of what value are occupation troops in Germany? It is only reasonable to assume that under Russian attack they would also be denied the offensive authority to win. Germany would become Vietnam all over again. East Germany would serve as the sanctuary and the West German communists, by guerrilla action, would take the place of the Vietcong and National Liberation Front.

At most, the U.S. military force in Germany offers a false sense of security to the German people and our NATO allies. Other than the economic benefits provided the Germans by American military pay checks and spending and the show-of-force which American men provide, the U.S. military presence is but a political pawn to German politicians. The Germans would be much better off without the false security front furnished by U.S. military forces. Denied our manpower, they would be forced into recruiting their own men and defending themselves against Soviet threats.

With leaders of the United States and Kosygin of the U.S.S.R. now talking about negotiating troop strength in Europe, it should be obvious to the West German

leadership that the underlying significance of the vote on the Mansfield amendment was not concern for German freedom and independence, but rather Germany's proximity to the Middle East. The vote was most relevant to the political philosophy of those who are doves on Vietnam but hawks on the Middle East.

After all, U.S. troops in Germany are in close proximity to the Middle East. Their continued presence does not incite any new fears or tensions that might be roused by U.S. troops sent to back up the Middle East situation.

As the United States and Soviets prepare to negotiate away German security, the German leaders would seem to be in position to demand reunification of their country rather than make additional compromises to try to retain the false security of U.S. mercenary troops.

After all, if the only reason for continuing to quarter U.S. troops in Germany is to deter Soviet advancement, then why should not the Germans reunify their nation, develop their own nuclear deterrent, and raise and support their own standing army.

Maintaining a security force of occupation by drafting American youth 26 years after the end of World War II is unrealistic.

We cannot justify occupying or defending Germany forever. Considering the conventional military might of the Warsaw Pact nations, it is highly questionable whether the NATO power constitutes a relevant deterrent. Nowhere in the world does Germany constitute any threat to free people. Therefore, if she is not a power and does not constitute a threat, continued U.S. occupation must be for reasons other than preventing a recurrence of Germany as any threat to world peace.

I insert several related newsclippings following my remarks:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, May 18, 1971]

UNITED STATES SUGGESTS RUSSIA DISCUSS EUROPE ARMS

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

Moscow.—Ambassador Jacob D. Beam Monday told Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko that the United States believes it shares the same views as the Soviet Union on the desirability of starting arms limitation talks for central Europe.

Informed sources said Beam, acting on instructions from Washington, asked for an immediate meeting with Gromyko to indicate President Nixon's receptivity to the proposal made by Leonid I. Brezhnev, the Communist party leader, three days ago, that talks be started to explore the possibilities of reductions in central Europe.

After the half-hour session, U.S. officials said they gained the impression Russia is flexible on the reduction issue and has no hard and firm demands on the “modalities” or framework for the talks. It is assumed now that both the United States and the Soviet Union will consult with their allies and then make proposals on how to get the talks started.

U.S. officials did not deny that the promptness with which Beam was instructed to see Gromyko was due in large measure to President Nixon's desire to begin a “dialogue” with Moscow on mutual reduction and thus undercut the stand of Senate majority leader — who is seeking a unilateral 50 percent cut in American forces in Europe.

The Soviet position on force reductions is expected to be expounded in coming days by Premier Alexi N. Kosygin when he meets with Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, who arrived Monday for an official visit. Trudeau and his young bride were met at the airport by Kosygin, who is a widower, and his daughter, Mrs. Lyudmila Gvishiani, as well as other officials.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 19, 1971]

MOSCOW ASSAILS OPPOSITION TO CUT IN NATO TROOPS

Moscow.—The Soviet Defense Ministry said today that American opposition to send — troop reduction proposal is “farfetched and transparent.”

A commentary in Krasnaya Zvezda, Red Star, the Defense Ministry's newspaper, said Washington fears that troop reductions will “encourage anti-militarist moods among its European allies.”

The Europeans “understand that preserving and increasing forces and armaments in Europe leads to a dangerous increase of tensions in this area,” the article said.

“Secondly, Washington feels concerned over the growing tendency in certain European capitalist countries to establish closer and normal relations with Socialist countries in Europe.

It is not hard to see how transparent in the first case and how farfetched in the other are the reasons for which the United States does not want to agree on detente in Europe.”

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 19, 1971]

KOSYGIN PLEDGES READINESS TO DISCUSS CUTS IN EUROPE

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

Moscow.—Premier Alexei N. Kosygin says that the Soviet Union would do “everything possible” to reach an agreement on reduction of forces in Europe if the Western powers “display real readiness to take practical steps in this direction.”

In a Kremlin speech given at a luncheon yesterday in honor of the visiting Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau, Kosygin alluded to the stepped up interest in the United States on the question and said “much attention is paid today to the problem of troop and arms reductions.”

Kosygin continued: “In certain countries, animated discussions are going on on this score.”

BREZHNEV REMARKS NOTED

He said the Soviet position in favor of such talks remains the same as was stated last Friday by Leonid I. Brezhnev, the party leader, whose remarks evoked a positive response from the White House. The U.S. administration is seeking to block an effort by Senate Majority Leader — to force a unilateral cut in half of the 310,000 American troops in Europe.

Western diplomats said Kosygin apparently drew attention to the troop-reduction issue in his speech to keep alive the momentum for such talks. The diplomats said that the Kremlin may be surprised at the quick support its idea has received abroad.

United States Ambassador Jacob D. Beam told Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko Monday that the United States believed the two sides share the same view on the desirability of starting such talks and that both countries should consult with their allies and draft concrete proposals for starting such talks.

COSTS CITED

Canadian officials said that in the meeting yesterday which lasted two hours and 45 minutes, Kosygin told Trudeau that it was expensive for all powers to maintain forces at high levels and it was therefore desirable for all sides to seek a way of cut-

ting down these costs and using the money for peaceful purposes.

The officials said that Kosygin did not go into any new details on how he envisaged such troop-reduction talks might take place, but addressed himself to the broad questions involved. The Soviet vagueness on how to begin negotiations has led to private probing by Western countries.

In his speech, Kosygin said that the attainment of detente and peace in Europe "is quite within the limits of what is possible."

"As the result of many years' efforts by the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries, actions of peace-loving and realistically-minded forces in Western Europe, the general situation on the continent has become more hopeful and favorable for essential changes for the better."

Referring to the troop-reduction question, he said: "If the West displays real readiness to take practical steps in this direction, we will do everything possible to reach agreement."

Trudeau, the first Canadian prime minister to visit the Soviet Union, told Kosygin during their private session—attended also by officials from both nations—that he had long supported the idea of balanced force reductions and hoped that there could be discussions leading to them.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 19, 1971]

NIXON BACKED IN KEY TEST IN SENATE, 63 TO 26

(By James Doyle)

The Senate today overwhelmingly rejected a compromise proposal which would have cut U.S. NATO forces in half by June of 1974.

The vote was 63 to 26. It came on a weakened version of Majority Leader ——— proposal which was offered by ———, D-Wis.

——— had given up and thrown his support behind the weaker ——— amendment at the last minute.

The result appeared to signal a clearcut victory for the Nixon administration's intensive efforts to head off any proposal calling for a NATO troop cut.

A number of other compromise amendments were being voted on, but the Nelson amendment appeared to be a barometer of Senate sentiment on the whole question of unilateral reductions of North American Treaty Organization forces.

THE PROPOSALS

——— proposal would have cut the 300,000-troop U.S. force in Europe in half by years' end.

The ——— proposal would have cut 50,000 troops a year for three years and only if East-West negotiations on a mutual reduction were not undertaken by the end of this year.

The administration waged one of its most intensive lobbying efforts in an attempt to defeat both the ——— proposal and all compromise proposals.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, a Democrat who served under President Truman, headed the lobbying efforts for Nixon.

Two former Democratic presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson and Harry S. Truman, publicly supported Nixon and 24 top officials from four previous administrations did so as well.

CANDIDATES SPLIT

Four potential Democratic presidential candidates voted against the ——— amendment. They were Sens. ——— of Massachusetts, ——— of Minnesota, ——— of Washington and ——— of Maine.

Three others considered in the presidential sweepstakes voted in favor. They were ——— of Indiana, ——— of Iowa and ——— of South Dakota.

The administration continued to reject any compromise and was fighting to defeat a

half-dozen "perfecting amendments" and substitutes.

Each while far less exacting than ——— proposal, would put the Senate on record in favor of cutting the U.S. force in Europe at a time when the administration is moving toward bilateral negotiations on the subject with the Soviet Union.

——— called the ——— amendment "a most proper exercise of the constitutional authority of the Congress" although he said he still felt deeper cuts could be made now "without doing violence in any way to our commitment to the Atlantic Treaty or the opportunities for a negotiated detente."

He added that the administration appeared ready "after years of reticence" to enter negotiations with the Communists for a mutual reduction of troops.

And, in a clear signal that he may try again if he falls today, ——— said passage of the ——— compromise "would not inhibit the Congress from so subsequently moving up the deadline if future circumstances should so indicate."

——— stressed his own proposal was clearly in keeping with congressional responsibilities. "I am somewhat perturbed by the cavalier treatment of this fundamental constitutional distinction" of legislative and executive prerogatives during the past few days.

This was a reference to the intense White House lobbying effort.

PREVIOUS VOTES

——— has sought NATO troop reductions for several years, but never before in the form of legislation. With past "sense of the Senate" resolutions he succeeded in gaining a majority of senators.

But some were wavering in the face of heavy lobbying by the State Department—including the personal intervention of Secretary of State William P. Rogers—and by Nixon.

And both sides agreed ——— proposal was hurt by a statement Thursday by Russian party chief Leonid Brezhnev which invited negotiations toward mutual force reductions.

Several senators cited the Brezhnev statement as their reason for not forcing the troop reduction at this time.

It appeared likely that ——— if he lost today, will wait until after the June NATO ministers meeting to see whether negotiations begin on force reductions.

——— said he would have voted for the ——— amendment but offered his compromise because of Brezhnev's proposal. "In view of this it seems much wiser to try to negotiate a mutual troop reduction before we begin a unilateral troop reduction," he said.

STENNIS' OPPOSITION

Opposing ——— proposal, ———, D-Miss., chairman of the Armed Services Committee, charged "it just totally disarms this government."

"We would be putting it in the hands of the Soviets to force us to withdraw 50,000 a year by their merely refusing to begin negotiations," he warned.

Among other proposals also to be voted on today was one by ———, D-Ind., which called for talks between the U.S. and the European nations to have them assume a greater share of both costs and personnel in NATO. It would provide for a gradual troop reduction over the next 18 months.

———, R-Ill., proposed that the Western European nations be given a year to assume the \$1.8 billion balance-of-payments deficit the U.S. incurs annually because of its troops in Europe. If they fail to do so the ——— amendment provided only that the President "take whatever action is necessary" to end the deficit.

Sen. ———, R-Md., joined Sen. ———, R-N.Y. and Democrats ——— of Minnesota and ——— of Illinois in a proposal urging East-West negotiations on troop cuts and calling

for a presidential report to Congress on progress on Sept. 15 and every six months thereafter.

The weakest proposal was one by Sen. ———, R-Colo., which would put the Senate on record in favor of troop reductions but leave the President with complete freedom to work his own will. The administration opposed this as well.

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 1971]

BONN LINKS EUROPEAN TROOP CUTS TO BERLIN SETTLEMENT

(By John M. Goshko)

BONN.—Chancellor Willy Brandt's government indicated today that it wants any negotiations on mutual East-West force reductions within Europe tied to a solution of the Berlin problem.

Brandt's official spokesman, Conrad Ahlers, said today that Bonn leans to the view that such talks "could not be independent of the negotiations over Berlin."

His words were a direct contradiction of what U.S. officials have been saying about force reduction negotiations during the past week. Washington has made plain its belief that force reduction negotiations can get under way independently of the four-power talks on Berlin.

In an apparent attempt to smooth over this conflict, Ahlers stressed that Bonn will not do anything to prejudice a joint stance by the member countries of NATO in replying to the Soviet offer.

But he said that NATO had not yet adopted a common position. Consultations by the NATO foreign ministers will take place in Lisbon June 3 and 4.

Ahlers implied that West Germany will argue that force reduction negotiations should not begin until there has been substantial progress toward a Berlin agreement.

Ahler's statement was the most direct and official acknowledgment so far that the Brandt government has serious reservations about the wisdom of NATO jumping into force reduction talks with the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies.

For the past three days, other Bonn officials have been saying the same thing in private. Defense Minister Helmut Schmidt, referring to force reductions Tuesday, said he thought that a "solution for the presently unresolved question of Berlin should come first."

The proposal for negotiations on reducing troop levels and armaments in central Europe was first advanced by NATO in 1968. After lying dormant for a long time, it was revived last week when Soviet Communist Party leader Leonid Brezhnev challenged the West to start exploratory talks immediately. Brezhnev's offer was credited with playing a role in the Nixon administration's victory this week over Congressional opponents of a large U.S. troops presence in Europe. Wednesday, the Senate defeated a move to unilaterally withdraw half the 300,000-man American NATO force within Europe.

However, many senators who supported the Administration made clear that they are unhappy about the United States carrying so large a share of the NATO burden and that they expect the President to explore seriously the possibility of negotiating mutual reductions with the Warsaw Pact.

LINGERING TALKS

But, to tie such negotiations to progress on Berlin would make it virtually impossible even to get balanced force reduction talks started in the near future. The Berlin talks, in progress since March 1970, are deadlocked and there is no sign that the impasse will be broken soon.

In December, NATO attempted to give the Berlin negotiations a prod by stating that an agreement on the city would be a precondition to holding the European security conference sought by the Soviet Union.

Some Western sources think Brezhnev's sudden willingness to start force reduction talks results from a Soviet hope that this will provide a new avenue toward a security conference. If that is the case, they point out, the implication is that Moscow does not force a Berlin agreement soon and is trying to outflank the precondition laid down by NATO. In President Nixon's view, the pressure exerted by the Congress make it desirable to get force reduction talks started as soon as ground rules and safeguards acceptable to the West are agreed upon.

EAST GERMANY

The Brandt government, on the other hand, is under strong domestic pressure to get an acceptable agreement on Berlin. Bonn apparently views the possibility of tying force reduction talks to the Berlin question as a means of putting new pressure on Moscow.

In addition, force reduction talks would require the participation of Communist East Germany. This would create additional problems for Bonn, which has been unable to get the East Germans to negotiate on other questions.

As a result, Brandt government sources say they oppose not the idea of force reduction talks but the timing. In elaborating on Ahler's statement, they said Bonn does not feel that a Berlin agreement must be a precondition to force reduction negotiations.

Instead, such talks should proceed as part of an "orderly sequence related to other negotiations already in progress." As one high-level Bonn official said, "The proper time for multilateral consultations on force reduction to take place is when we have seen results in other areas—in particular when we see the light on Berlin."

However, the impression is that the West Germans will find themselves in a minority when they try to press this view at the NATO conference.

Officials from East and West Germany today discussed a traffic agreement between the two countries at a six-hour meeting described as "very businesslike."

[Chief Bonn negotiator Egon Bahr said the two sides agreed to meet again June 8 in Bonn. But Bahr told reporters that the two delegations were still talking only about the principles of a general traffic agreement, and had not reached the stage of discussing technical details.]

NADER TASK FORCE LOOKS AT CALIFORNIA WATER PROJECT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the State of California's mammoth water project have some reason to look forward to the next few weeks.

At that time, a new and vitally important publication will be released by the Center for Study of Responsive Law. This organization, headed by Ralph Nader, has spent more than a year studying land use and water use in California.

The report has been titled "Power and Land in California." I have been assured that the "power" in the title does not refer to electrical power.

Mr. Speaker, those in "power" in the administration of Gov. Ronald Reagan most likely have good reasons to dread the release of the Nader report.

Early revelations indicate that it will contain factual data concerning the overly generous subsidy of private interests with public funds, especially water supplied private interests through publicly financed water projects.

In a recent interview, the chief coordinator for the Nader study, Robert Fellmuth, said:

The key principle we are seeking to implement is this: when someone receives a benefit from public money he should pay according to the cost of that benefit.

If this principle was followed, California taxes would be cut in half.

Mr. Speaker, the tax burden now facing the taxpayers of California is enormous. If present trends continue, that burden will increase unless the public subsidy of private interests is curtailed—quickly and finally.

One observing the activities of the present administration in Sacramento cannot help but interpret the steady attack upon the poor of the State as a device aimed at diverting the attention of the taxpayers of California from the real welfare scandal—that involving those who are benefitting from subsidized land and subsidized water.

Mr. Speaker, one section of the new Nader report has already been published. This section, devoted to the California water project, was prepared by Mr. Keith Roberts, a San Francisco attorney who has devoted a great deal of scholarship and research to the water project and to its very apparent deficiencies.

Mr. Roberts, as might be expected, has been criticized by proponents of the State water project for inaccuracies and distortions.

I am delighted to see this criticism as it demonstrates the weakness of the State's position. William R. Gianelli, director of the State Department of Water Resources, has chosen not to respond to the specific charges made by Mr. Roberts in his excellent article. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that he has any intention of addressing himself to the real issues raised.

Those in power in California are fearful of the revelations of the new report and of how water supplied to agriculture favors the giant corporations, hurts the smaller growers, and jeopardizes the price structure of the State's No. 1 industry; and of how the State's land and water resources have been exploited and mismanaged.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that every person in the State of California reads "Power and Land in California" it could very well be one of the most important documents to be published in recent years.

I would like to take this opportunity to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excerpt of the Nader report written by Keith Roberts which has appeared in a recent edition of the conservation publication, Clear Creek.

The article follows:

THE CALIFORNIA STATE WATER PROJECT

(By Keith Roberts)

fraud (frod), n., I. a) deceit; trickery; cheating. b) in law, intentional deception to cause a person to give up property or some lawful right.—Webster's New World Dictionary.)

Five hundred dollars for every man, woman, and child buys California a giant plumbing scheme to transfer fresh water from San Francisco Bay and North Coastal rivers to areas south. This scheme, the California State Water Project, benefits a few corporate farms in the San Joaquin Valley, a handful of landowners, speculators, developers, and water-using industries in Southern California—and the Project builders. Economists who have analyzed the Project's benefits and costs claim it will return barely fifty cents in benefit for each dollar of cost. And that counts economic cost alone; the Project threatens to destroy the San Francisco Bay Delta estuary—the largest in California, and one of the most important spawning and feeding grounds for fish and fowl on the West Coast—and may destroy the wild nature of California last free-flowing rivers.

Fortunately, the decisions which would trigger the Project's severest environmental damage have yet to be made. But already, the Project has cost the people of California billions of unnecessary dollars and has set in motion forces which are driving thousands of small farmers from the land.

The history of the State Water Project illustrates a far-reaching problem of modern American society. The Project is typical of vast, technical undertakings by governmental and corporate interests (such as the ABM, the Vietnam War, the highway system, dams and powerplants, the SST, etc.)—projects whose impact, only the experts and technicians can predict. Decisions about these projects depend completely on expert advice; yet, as the making and selling of the State Water Project shows, the idea of "objective expertise" is a myth. Indeed, the systematic prostitution of engineering to venality and convenience is the major cause of the Project's existence. Fortunately, to understand how water experts have fallen to their state of easy virtue is to perceive some important steps toward rehabilitation, both for water experts, and for their brethren who sell other wonders of the technological age.

THE CALIFORNIA WATER PROJECT AS A CURE FOR DROUGHT, FAMINE, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND THE 160 ACRE LIMITATION BLUES

Californians never voted for the present Project. The Burns-Porter Act, which the legislature passed and Governor Brown signed in 1959, did not authorize it. The \$1.75 billion general obligation water bond which the voters approved in 1960 was not meant to finance it. And the voters who, in June 1970, agreed to raise the permissible interest rate so the rest of the loan could be obtained on today's market did not vote for this Project. What Californians did authorize and approve was something quite different.

The approved project has the same physical characteristics as the one actually being built: a dam at Oroville to stop the frequent floods on the Feather River and impound a million acre-feet¹ which would otherwise flow out to sea each year; the Delta Pumping Works, to pump fresh water from the San Francisco Bay Delta into the California Aqueduct; the Aqueduct itself, a concrete-lined ditch running from Tracy, in the Delta, along the San Joaquin Valley's West Side to the Tehachapi Mountains 200 miles south; the San Luis reservoir on the West Side near Los Banos; Tehachapi Pumping Plant, to pump the water 2000 feet up and over those mountains; a network of canals feeding all this water into various areas and cities en route—Sonoma and Napa County north of the Bay; Alameda and Santa Clara Counties south of it; Santa Barbara; Los Angeles; San Diego; and the Mojave Desert southeast to

¹ An acre-foot, the amount of water needed to cover one acre one foot deep, contains 325,851 gallons. A flow of one cubic foot per second (cfs) equals 1.98 acre-feet per day.

Barstow—and a drain, to take waste water from the San Joaquin Valley back to the Bay and out to sea. These physical works deliver fresh water, which has flowed down the Sacramento River and its tributaries to the Delta, to 32 local water agencies which have contracted to buy it.

Californians thought they were buying a \$2 billion project, but the real cost, as the experts knew, will be closer to \$10 billion. The Project would save Southern California from a rapidly approaching water famine, according to the experts; but in fact no shortage of cheaper, local sources was in prospect until at least 1990, by which time desalinization would very likely prove practical. The experts also claimed that the Project would cost taxpayers virtually nothing. In reality, however, they will pay about half its cost as power users and as Federal, State, and local property tax payers—without counting the cost of generally higher bond interest rates owing to the Project's erosion of California's credit.² The experts proved equally deceptive about other important aspects of the Project—about its benefits and about its costs; about who would benefit, and about who would pay. This is what they did:

THE COST SHELL GAME

The agency which created, promoted, and now constructs the Water Project, California's Department of Water Resources, claimed in 1960 that the Project would cost \$2 billion, a figure presently adjusted to \$2.8 billion. One reason for the claim was that, when Governor Edmund G. Brown took office in January, 1959, his finely-honed political instincts told him the voters of California wouldn't accept anything costing more than \$2 billion. According to his Special Water Assistant, Ralph Brody, the Governor therefore told the Department of Water Resources to present a specific project at that cost. As an analyst for the Senate Water Committee later pointed out, however, the Project submitted by the DWR actually cost more than \$2 billion. It was trimmed to an acceptable figure only by ignoring the quarter of a billion dollars which the DWR had calculated for inflation. Harvey Banks, Director of the DWR at the time, claims that this omission was by Governor Brown's orders.

Another omission which slims down the Project's apparent cost is the proposed Eel River Development, which the DWR presently estimates will cost \$680 million of State money. Since the costs of other projected but as-yet unauthorized units are included, there is no justification for the Eel River omission.

But these omissions amount to peanuts next to the main item which the DWR blandly neglects in its "cost" estimates—interest. It is axiomatic that the largest expense in any major construction project is neither the labor nor the materials, but the cost of the money needed to finance it. That is why, for example, housing construction drops when interest rates rise, and vice-versa. The same holds true for the State Water Project. By the DWR's own calculations, it will be paying \$2.7 billion in interest on the \$1.75 billion it had to borrow to construct the Project. On that basis, it would pay an additional \$2 billion for the money California intends to loan the Project—except that California will make the loan interest-free (so that the cost of the loan is

charged to the State, not the Project). But nowhere in the DWR's public statements about the Project's costs do those figures appear! The engineers have simply ignored them. According to Harvey Banks, the reason is that there is an "engineer's definition" of cost—quite standard among engineers—which ignores interest. But regardless of what engineers think cost is, the interpretation of cost which the Governor, the Legislature, and the public acted upon was obviously quite different—cost as what the State would ultimately pay for this Project. And that amounts to anything from \$8 billion on up.³

THE WATER FAMINE HOAX

In 1904, some San Fernando Valley landowners, together with Los Angeles' water supply "experts," created public consternation by predicting an imminent "water famine," and thereby obtained money to build the Owens River Aqueduct. Since the actual need for that water didn't materialize until several decades later, Los Angeles couldn't sell its new supply, and had to virtually give it away—to the San Fernando Valley landowners, as it turned out. In 1928, Los Angeles and their neighbors again learned that a "water famine" was nigh. The solution, their experts said, was Colorado River water, and the experts—this time the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) of Southern California—assured the public that they would be using 400 cubic feet per second in 1940. By 1969, the original members of the MWD had just about reached that 400 cfs level—but meanwhile, they had subsidized the development of San Diego and the Irvine Ranch's Orange County.

What worked twice worked again in 1959, only this time the flim-flam came from the Department of Water Resources, and this time the experts should have known better. The fault lies less with their population estimates, which have turned out to be grossly overstated, than with their disregard for available alternatives. In addition, of course, the rhetoric somewhat distorted even the DWR's absurd estimates.

The Department approached the problem from two ends. It calculated the water available to Southern California, and it calculated the area's "requirements." But in calculating the water available, the Department took absolutely no account of various existing sources—recycled wastewater, estimated at the time to be worth 200,000 acre-feet a year (and now admitted by the DWR itself to be worth 600,000 acre-feet!); groundwater reserves beyond the amount replenished each year (100 million acre-feet, by latest estimate); more efficient canals—a Bureau of Reclamation spokesman estimated that lining just one canal in Southern California would save 300,000 acre-feet per year on the purchase of water being used for agriculture—an omission which, according to the Bain, Caves and Margolis economic study of *Northern California's Water Industry* "resulted at the extreme in valuing Project-supplied urban water in a desert area at \$150 per acre-foot . . . when abundant irrigation water in the area could be transferred to urban use

³ If you want to get economically sophisticated, and talk about "opportunity costs," the actual Project cost becomes several billion higher. It works this way: once you have calculated the amount you will spend for the Project, you ask yourself whether you could invest this money elsewhere at a higher rate of return. The difference is the "opportunity cost." For example, if the Water Project merely breaks even, providing no beneficial return on your money (economists think it actually loses, in terms of benefits), but at the same time you could invest at 5% interest, your opportunity costs is the 5% interest on your money—a staggering amount over the Project's 50 year repayment period.

at . . . cost of no more than \$30 per acre-foot without significantly affecting the supply of irrigation water." Nor did the Department consider that desalinization would very likely be available at tolerable cost by 1990.

Probably the least excusable problem with the Department's estimates, however, stems from what economists know sardonically as the "requirements" philosophy, the Department's method of predicting the demand for water. This philosophy determines how much water will be needed without referring to price. Nineteen-ninety "requirements" are calculated by projecting present numbers of users and amounts of use to 1990, even though water in 1990 will cost much more and people will presumably buy less. But the Department's experts assume that the same pattern of use will prevail—that people will want just as much \$90 water as they now want \$20 water. As another economist, Professor Jack Hershleifer of UCLA, comments, "There is a shortage of new Cadillacs at a price of \$500, except that desires for Cadillacs are usually not dignified by the term 'needs' or 'requirements'." Even the Department itself, in a suppressed 1968 report, has admitted that price will significantly affect demand—so much so, that by including price in the calculation, the DWR's own report concludes the project was started at least ten years too soon. But they knew that in 1960, too.

One of the DWR's truly astounding deceptions has been its frequent claim that "Project customers will repay about 90 percent of the total project costs." The statement is false as it stands, and false in its implications. As it stands, the statement ignores the fact that State taxpayers will pay a large portion of the Project's cost. They do so by making an interest-free loan to the Project of \$1.1 billion from the Tideland oil and gas revenues. Since the Project doesn't pay interest on the loan, the taxpayers do. The tideland money, and the interest it could earn, is diverted to the Project from schools and other social programs. To make up that diversion the State must raise the money elsewhere. At present market rates, this costs substantially more than \$2 billion.

Even on the DWR's own terms, its statement that "Project customers repay about 90 percent of the total project costs" is grossly misleading. To the untutored eye, "Project customers" reads like "water users," especially since the DWR uses the statement to rebut charges that taxpayers will pay for the Project. But in fact, Project "customers" are not water users: they are purchasers of electric power, who will pay about 100% of the costs, and 32 water agencies, many of which are supported by local property taxes. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which will buy about half the Project's water, presently pays more than half its water costs from property taxes. The Kern County Water Agency, which will buy about a third of the Project water, was formed expressly to let its agricultural water users draw on the Bakersfield tax base, and it expects to meet one third of its payments through property taxes. All told, taxpayers and power users will pay between 49 and 65% of Project costs, depending on the future taxing policies of local water agencies—not quite what is suggested when the DWR says Project customers will pay 90% of the costs.

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES TABLE DWR says

Cost: \$2.8 billion.
State Pays: \$280 Million.
Other Taxpayers: Pay: \$74 Million (Federal Flood Control).
Benefits: \$2 per \$1 of cost.
Environmental Effects: Improvement of water quality, more recreation.

² According to A. Alan Post, the State's Legislative Analyst, California pays approximately 1/2% more interest on its borrowings because of the Water Project—a difference amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars for the towns, cities, school districts, and other governmental units that rely heavily on bond issues. The Project also may have totally prevented some areas from selling bonds.

DWR data says

Cost: \$8 to 11 Billion.
 State Pays: \$2.38 Billion.
 Other Taxpayers: \$3 Billion.
 Benefits: \$.59 per \$1 of cost.
 Environmental Effects: Disaster for S.F. Bay and North Coast.

CONSULTANT SPEAK WITH FORKED TONGUE

While the Project was being formulated and considered, the DWR used a whole covey of "independent consultants" to check its work and convince the sceptical. But on examination, these consultants prove nearly as dishonest as the Department. Nearly all, deep within the bowels of their jargon-laden reports, disapprove the Project; but with the bright exception of one member of one team of consultants, Professor Adolph Ackerman, the consultants kept their reservations quiet, and allowed the public to gain from their reports the false impression that they approved. The most remarkable example of such skulduggery was supplied by the Charles T. Main Co., an eastern engineering firm. After Department hired Main to evaluate the Project's "economic feasibility"—meaning, whether its benefits would outweigh the costs. Main released its report just before the public voted on the Project in 1960. The Los Angeles Times, a Project promoter, headlined "Project Gets Sound Rating"; the San Francisco Chronicle, an opponent, said the opposite: State Water Plan Called Impossible. What happened was that Main said both. The firm's report declared, in clear and forthright terms, that "On the basis of the previously cited definition of economic feasibility, the project . . . could pay back all costs. . . ." The LA Times, the DWR, and the Project's other supporters sized upon that statement. But Main had also defined "economic feasibility" in a very strange way, to mean whether or not the State could raise the money. By this definition, it might be "economically feasible" to throw a billion silver dollars into San Francisco Bay—but that isn't what Main was asked, and that isn't what everyone understood by "economic feasibility" when the report was issued. Furthermore, the rest of Main's jargon-infested report goes on to say, in effect, that anyone would be crazy to build such a Project. But, of course, reporters, politicians, and the general public don't usually wade through such fine print. (Charles T. Main, Inc., Final Report, "General Evaluation of the Proposed Program for Financing and Constructing the State Water Resources Development System," October 1960.) There are several reasons why supposedly reputable professionals engage in this type of conduct. Each practice, fallacious, misleading, or unjustifiable as it is, falls within an area of generally accepted professional principles. When we asked the DWR's 1959 Director, Harvey Banks, why the statement of costs omitted interest, he explained that engineers always defined "cost" in this way. The omission of \$250,000,000 inflation cost from the original cost estimates, he explained, was at Governor Brown's request, and was done merely by stating costs in terms of 1959 dollars.

The Department's failure to consider alternatives other than the State Water Project in studying the need for water in Southern California was "justified" by the fact that such alternatives could be assumed (by whom?) politically unfeasible—the farmers would complain about people taking their water, people wouldn't want to drink waste water, etc. Banks noted that the "requirements" approach, mistakenly, assuming that price would not affect demand, was assuming a "standard" engineering practice sanctioned in several textbooks, and by general usage, 35% "interest" rate, for costs, rather than the higher one all economists agree should be used, was justified on two grounds: the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation was using the same low rate, and anyway, the economists can't agree on any one rate that should be

used. The statements about "Project customers," of course, are technically accurate if one defines cost as the engineers do: the engineers can't help it if people think "Project customers" means "water users," can they? As to the consultants, Mr. Banks did concede that they had been pretty deceptive, but he noted that Charles T. Main, Inc. had never done a water project before. It perhaps epitomizes the state of engineering standards that Mr. Banks could say, when we asked him why the DWR thought benefits of the Project would outweigh costs, "You tell me what benefit-cost ratio you want, and I'll get it for you, without straining my conscience."

THE RICH GET WATER AND THE POOR GET SOAKED

Legally, the Project is a scheme for selling water. The State sells it to 32 local water agencies, who in turn retail it to users like farmers, residents, factories, hotels, etc., or sell it to yet smaller water agencies. While many people ultimately receive this water, the only ones who actually benefit from the State Water Project are those who receive substantially more or substantially cheaper water than they would get without the Project. This leaves out the average resident in Southern California. He uses, at most, one-fifth of an acre-foot of water per year—a high rate, but still too little for the Project to affect. As already noted, he would be assured of water for the foreseeable future without the Project. But even assuming that his only supply would be desalinized water costing \$150 an acre-foot, the extra cost over the Project's \$60 per acre-foot water would be only \$18 per year. If the small user owns a \$10,000 house, he pays that in taxes to the Metropolitan Water District anyway. So the Project does not really benefit the average Southern Californian.

But the Project does benefit two classes which use large amounts of water: large landowners, and water-using businesses. For one thing, they will be receiving most of the water the Project delivers; for another, the Project, through an extremely subtle and clever trick, makes this water available to them for much less than they would otherwise have to pay.

While certain large landowners in Southern California, such as the Irvine Ranch (80,000 acres), Tejon Ranch (10,000 acres, partly owned by the Chandlers, who own the Los Angeles Times), Newhall Ranch (48,000 acres), and Rancho California (50,000 acres, jointly owned by Kaiser and Penn-Central), will obviously profit by the Water Project, the major beneficiaries are the corporate farms of the San Joaquin Valley. More than half of all the water delivered by the Project between 1970 and 1990 will go to the San Joaquin Valley. The lands in the Valley which will receive Project water have been mapped by the California Labor Federation and the Young Democrats. According to their 1959 survey, 64% of these lands are owned by about 100 persons! Of the remaining land within the Project service area, a substantial amount belonged to local governments.

LAND OWNERSHIP IN THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREAS SERVED BY THE STATE WATER PROJECT

Owner	Acreage	Percent of total
Tenneco, Inc. (Kern County Land Co.)	348, 026.46	8.7
Standard Oil of California	218, 485.48	5.5
Other oil companies	264, 678.64	6.6
Southern Pacific RR.	201, 851.75	5.1
Tejon Ranch ¹	168, 531.07	4.2
Boston Ranch (JG Boswell)	37, 555.58	.9
Total owned by approximately 15 firms	1, 238, 228.98	31.0
Other private holdings over 1,000 acres per person	1, 323, 821.57	33.3
	2, 562, 050.55	64.1

Footnote at end of table.

Owner	Acreage	Percent of total
U.S. Government	192, 762.13	4.8
Owners of less than 1,000 acres per person, including city, county, and State	1, 240, 648.24	31.1

¹ Does not include acreage owned by Tejon Ranch in southern California.

Note: Table from Ballis, "Land Ownership in the San Joaquin Valley" 105 Congressional Record, pt. 6, p. 7677 (1959).

In Kern County, which will receive by far the largest share of San Joaquin Valley water, 78% of the land to actually receive State water belongs to owners of more than 160 acres.

These large landowners are the single most important class of beneficiaries from the State Water Project. Indeed, they hatched the whole idea for the Project, and provided the major lobbying muscle which pushed it through. Much of their land, prior to the Project, lay fallow; the huge Federal Central Valley Project supplied farms to the north and east of them, but did not reach the southwestern section of the San Joaquin Valley. Moreover, what groundwater they had was rapidly receding due to overuse. To farm or otherwise develop their land, these landowners had to import water. The most logical alternative, of course, was to extend the Central Valley Project. This would provide water and, in addition, the huge Federal subsidy that goes with Bureau of Reclamation irrigation projects. Unfortunately for the landowners, however, reclamation water comes with a condition attached, based on a long-standing Federal policy of encouraging small farms and limiting the amount of irrigation subsidy any one farmer may receive. This condition, the 160-acre limitation, requires anyone receiving reclamation water on more than 160 acres to sell that "excess" land within ten years, at pre-water prices. The large landowners would have none of that, of course, and fought for many years to have the legislature repeal the limitation, the courts nullify it, or the Bureau of Reclamation ignore it. According to most observers, it was their failure to gain any of these objectives which finally made them turn to the State. California, of course, has no 160-acre limitation policies.

So the Water Project brings them much-needed water, without imposing conditions on its use. But it also supplies the water with a considerable subsidy. Take Kern County as an example.

Kern County has contracted to buy a maximum of 1.15 million acre-feet per year from the State. The State has set the price of this contract water to cover all costs of constructing the system and delivering the water to Kern County—that is, all costs allocated to "water users". Presently, the State charges Kern County an average of \$21 per acre-foot. But this charge does not include costs borne by those who buy electric power from the Project, nor the real but unstated costs assumed by the State through its interest-free loan to the Project. It probably costs California closer to \$35 an acre-foot to deliver water to Kern County, so right there the landowners receive \$14 per acre-foot subsidy.

Kern County has also established the Kern County Water Agency, with the sole function of buying the water and selling it to local water districts. This intermediary exists for one purpose: to help pay for the water through a county-wide property tax. Taxes in Kern County now pay approximately \$6 towards every acre-foot the Agency buys, raising the total direct subsidy for contract water going to Kern County's landowners to \$20 an acre-foot.

But between now and 1990, Kern County expects to receive more water than it has firmly contracted for. The additional water is known as "surplus" water, the State charges

merely the cost of transportation—\$4 an acre-foot in Kern County. Obviously, whatever "surplus" water Kern County can obtain amounts to a tremendous windfall. If, as now predicted, it receives nearly as much "surplus" water as contract water, the average price of its water will be lowered from \$21 per acre-foot to \$12.50 per acre-foot.

The DWR justifies its give-away rates for surplus water on the ground that delivery is unreliable, since it cannot guarantee the water's availability after the contractual obligations have been met in a drought year. That makes sense, until one notices that the Project's contractual obligations are so low that plentiful "surplus" water will be available in any year except one as dry as the driest year recorded in California, which came after a seven year drought. Even then, "surplus" should be available until the year's supplies reach their maximum contractual level—1990.

In addition to the tax and "surplus" water subsidies, large landowners receive yet another bonus from the State Water Project: increases in land value. In California, land without water is worthless; water gives it value. Indeed, water can raise prices \$1000 an acre or more. A study in 1968, before water deliveries had begun, showed that an isolated tract of Kern County land rose by over \$100 an acre in assessed valuation, merely in anticipation of water coming to nearby acreage. Should the Water Project ultimately increase land values in the Service Area by \$300 an acre—a conservative guess—the big landowners will have received a capital gain (taxable at a lower rate than ordinary income, such as wages) of \$780,000,000.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the farmers bagging these huge subsidies feed at the trough of public welfare elsewhere. JG Boswell, owner of the huge Boston Ranch, received over \$5 million in 1970 from the Federal Government in crop subsidies. Boswell is the nation's leader in income for NOT growing crops, but the other State Water Project beneficiaries are right up there with him. Both Tenneco and the Tejon Ranch, for example, received several hundred thousand dollars too.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA: SUCKING OUT THE SURPLUS

At first glance, Southern California's eagerness for the State Water Project seems hard to understand. Its agriculture does not need State water. Its residents do not need State water. Even the real estate interests—the builders, dealers and speculators—gain nothing from State Water since cheaper local sources will sustain any foreseeable demand for development. Despite the views of some conservationists, Southern California's population growth is demonstrably unrelated to the State Water Project. Another explanation for Southern California's eagerness—its reputed desire to secure legal rights to Northern water before others did, since in California rights go to those who first use the water also seems doubtful. With adequate local water for a significant period of time, Southern California's best strategy would be to wait for desalinization, which in time will surely be cheaper than water imported from the North. Thus, Southern California has no pressing need to secure rights to the Northern water.

But a closer examination yields explanations for the southland's undoubted fervor on behalf of the water project. First, and not to be under-rated, is the fact that most Southern Californians, including most builders, developers, and speculators, know no more about the area's water needs than any other ordinary citizen. They, too, depend upon the experts. The experts all told them the Project was desperately needed. So of course they supported it.

Southern Californians can look to others aside from the Department of Water Resources for expertise. For example, they can

look to Southern California's premier water agency, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), which supplies water to more than 10 million people. But this agency, which has contracted to buy half the Project's deliveries, has embarked on a billion dollar building program of its own to distribute the water, and consequently has a very solid self-interest in seeing the Project come to fruition. Moreover, the agency's history, and the recent remarks of its leaders, show a persistent incompetence perhaps unrivaled by any other agency in California's history. The sad story of the Colorado River Aqueduct has already been mentioned; by 1969, the original members of the District still had not reached the level of use which the MWD had predicted for 1940. The District's recent General Manager and present chief advisor, Robert Skinner, showed his economic acumen and sense of monetary responsibility when he told a State Senate Committee in 1962:

"I find myself, you might say, way out of bounds with the professional economists, because the tendency among the economists is to say you have to prove economic need before you spend the money, and when we say we ought to oversize (water projects), we may be saying that we ought to spend some money before we can prove when the need would arise, but I feel—I can't help but feel the bigger we could make these . . . aqueducts, the better off Southern California would be."—Calif. State Senate, Fact Finding Committee on Water, Hearing, October 18, 1962, San Diego (Water Archives, UC Berkeley).

A few very important interests within Southern California stand to benefit a great deal from this Project.

First, the developers. As noted, developers do not gain from the Project as a group—the same total amount of development will occur, Project or not. But the Project does change the PATTERN of development within Southern California; it enables new towns to spring up on interior sites where, but for the Project, only jackrabbits would roam. Naturally, those owning the benefited land strongly favored the Project. The areas slated to lose development because of the project could not be specifically identified, and their owners therefore mounted no countervailing objections. It appears that the Project will visit its bounty on virtually all the major landholdings in Southern California—the Irvine Ranch, Tejon Ranch, Rancho California, etc.

The second group of specific Southern California beneficiaries consists of water users able to take advantage of the "surplus" water ploy mentioned earlier. In Southern California, this ploy takes a slightly different twist, since the Project itself will deliver California beneficiaries consists of water

The MWD makes up for that, however, by creating "surplus" water of its own. Quite simply, the District has contracted to buy far more water from the State than it can sell at full price. Having placed itself in this ridiculous position, the only "rational" solution will be to sell what it can at full price, and sell the rest—the "surplus"—for whatever it can get. This, of course, is precisely what Los Angeles had to do with the Owens River Aqueduct, and the MWD itself has had to do with the Colorado River Aqueduct.

There is an upper limit to how much water most users will take, even if they get it free. Thus, the only real customers for the MWD's "surplus" water are water districts with a storage capacity—primarily those overlying depleted groundwater basins—known as Water Replenishment Districts. Whereas the MWD intends to sell State water for \$60 an acre-foot to agencies which supply the water directly to their customers, it will sell "replenishment" water for only \$30 an acre-foot. The people living within a Water Replenishment District will be receiving their water for \$30 an acre-foot, plus the nominal

cost of pumping it out of the ground again. The people living within a regular water district, such as those served by the Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power, will be paying \$60 an acre-foot, plus substantial additional fees for distribution costs—all told, in Los Angeles, about \$120 per acre-foot.

Who are the lucky people living in Water Replenishment Districts? Quite simply, the largest water users in Southern California aside from big landowners: various private water companies, and the biggest industries. The following table is based on a survey of two Replenishment Districts in Los Angeles. The subsidy calculation is based simply on the difference (about \$80 per acre-foot) between what these firms pay for their water and what the rest of Los Angeles pays. Only the availability of Project water to supply their groundwater basin keeps them from rapidly depleting it and turning to direct deliveries for a supply. The subsidy calculation does NOT include another very real subsidy many of these firms are receiving: the MWD property tax subsidy. Presently, the District meets half its water payments through funds raised from property taxes. To the extent that a firm uses a larger share of the water than it pays in taxes, it receives a tax subsidy—and most heavy water users would fall into that category.

SUBSIDIES TO SOME LOS ANGELES AREA WATER USERS

Firms	Water pumped per year (acre-feet)	Water project subsidy year
Container Corp. of America.....	1,323 x \$80 =	\$105,840
Fibreboard Paper Products Co.....	1,521	121,680
Firestone Tire & Rubber.....	1,536	122,880
Flintkote Co.....	2,567	205,360
United States Steel.....	1,791	143,280
Gulf Oil Co.....	1,795	143,600
Richfield Oil Corp.....	4,428	354,240
Shell Oil Co.....	4,516	361,280
Union Oil Co.....	2,670	213,600
Texaco.....	3,432	274,560
Standard Oil Co.....	4,542	363,360

Note: Californians never voted for the present project.

The industries do not receive the full benefit of these phenomenal subsidies. Long before they would have to pay an extra \$100,000 a year or more for water, they would convert to recycling processes consuming vastly less fresh water—processes available to virtually all the industries cited. The \$363,360 subsidy to Standard Oil merely saves Standard the cost of such conversion—a saving of perhaps \$30,000 a year. Thus, these subsidies are not only outrageously large, they are outrageously inefficient. The same holds true for the subsidies being supplied through the Water Project to the farmers in the San Joaquin Valley. The total actual benefit those farmers receive can be measured by the amount their land increases in value—perhaps \$780 million. But the cost to the State of supplying that benefit, the amount of subsidy it provides by picking up the difference between the real cost and the actual price paid, is several times \$780 million. There are other consequences of providing these enormous subsidies. First, the big farmers are prime customers of the world's largest bank, the Bank of America. Insofar as the State subsidy enables them to extend their business, they borrow more money (for crops and equipment) from the bank, and extend the bank's near-monopoly hold over California agriculture yet further. Second, even with the huge subsidies, State water is so expensive that the only profitable crops these farmers can grow are presently high-priced "specialty" crops—fruits, nuts, etc. But the farmers who now grow these crops are mostly small farmers, who must gain enough income from 160 acres to support themselves. When the San Joaquin agribusinesses weigh in with their crops in the next few years,

prices will plummet, and it is presently expected that thousands of these small farmers will be driven from the land. This has nothing to do with their efficiency, which rivals that of agribusiness in all areas except their ability to obtain credit from the Bank of America, and subsidies from the U.S. Government.

1. The administrative agency which evaluates public projects should not build or administer them since the employment, power, and prestige which follow approval make powerful motives to evaluate favorably. Enact legislation establishing a State agency of Project Evaluation.

2. Require agencies which do evaluate projects to adhere to intellectually valid standards. Appoint a committee to create such standards (such as what the discount rate should be), and set regulations fixing adherence.

3. Create and enforce adequate laws against conflicts of interest, such as Mr. Krieger's. Professional societies, such as engineering associations and bar associations, should try to enforce strict ethical standards, since otherwise the bad drives out the good.

4. Provide the legislative water committees (and other committees) with adequate staff and funds to make their own thorough, independent evaluations of proposals. Neither the Senate nor Assembly Water Committees in 1959 had adequate staffs. Consequently the legislature had to rely on DWR's word, as did the Governor. Independent consultants, who must please their clients if they want further consulting work, aren't much good, as Charles T. Main shows.

THE FUTURE: PERIPHERAL CANAL OR PUBLIC VICTORY

The Project's past is a story of gross injustice and special interest favoritism, of outrageous costs and slim benefits. But the construction now or soon to be completed—Oroville Dam, San Luis Reservoir, pumping facilities, the California Aqueduct, and trunk canals—has had little adverse effect on the environment (save possibly destruction of the salmon run up the Feather River). The future plans, however, threaten environmental disaster. Conservationists, who remained silent in 1960, have since become the leaders in opposition to the Project.

The future at present consists of four related Federal and State proposals, none of which have yet been authorized or funded, all of which can and should be stopped. All relate to the central mechanism by which both the State Water Project and the Central Valley Project operate—the Delta pool. Fresh water flows down the Sacramento River to the Delta, from which both the DWR and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation pump it into their respective canals for transport further south.

The projects relate to each other as follows: The US Bureau of Reclamation's project, termed the East Side Division of the Central Valley Project, would use up present Sacramento River supplies to irrigate yet more land in the San Joaquin Valley. That makes it necessary to augment the Sacramento's flow by diverting into it the nearest as yet untapped river, the Eel—a presently wild river flowing through redwood country to the sea. One of the reasons the San Joaquin Valley wants so much water is that irrigation deposits salts and eventually ruins the soil (e.g. Mesopotamia) unless farmers "flush out" the salts with even more water. The Valley needs a sewer for the "flushed" salts, pesticides, and other assorted poisons, and that's Project No. 3. As presently planned, however, this drain will dump its waste into the Delta, thus polluting the very source of San Joaquin Valley irrigation water. Even without the drain, however, engineers have found that the pumps for the State and Federal irrigation plans will be so powerful that long before they reach full capacity they will be sucking up saline water from the Bay. For these rea-

sons, the Bureau and the DWR propose to build a *Peripheral Canal* to circumvent the Delta altogether and take all the unpolluted water they need directly from the Sacramento River. Without such a canal, it would be impossible to build the East Side Division, and unnecessary to attack the Eel. With the canal, the engineers can suck up ever-increasing amounts of water until they have drained the Eel, the Klamath, the Trinity, and even the Columbia for that matter.

These projects also threaten the Delta and San Francisco Bay itself. The Bay and Delta form one of the major estuary ecosystems on the West Coast, supporting millions of transient and resident birds and providing spawning or maturing ground for innumerable fish and other water beasts. The demands for fresh water now flowing into this estuary, facilitated by the Peripheral Canal, would drastically reduce the inflow. Ecologists present conflicting views on the effects, depending on who pays them (ecologists, too, are "experts"), but only those hired by the State or the Bureau show anything other than grave concern.

DECISIONS YET TO BE MADE

The Peripheral Canal cannot proceed unless three bodies decide in favor of it. The Governor is already on record as favoring it. The State Water Resources Control Board, which decides who has a legal right to the fresh water, is completing lengthy hearings to determine how much water the Delta has a right to "use," and how much the developers can take. Since the Board's appointees are mostly old water-developers themselves, its staff comes largely from the Department of Water Resources, and the law does not favor wildlife preservation as a "use" for fresh water, a decision adverse to the Canal seems most unlikely. The decision-maker most subject to present influence is the United States Congress, which must authorize the Canal and approve funds for it. Congressman Jerome Waldie of Contra Costa County has been leading the fight against the canal. In the House; both of California's Senators remain officially uncommitted.

The East Side Division, which would be the immediate trigger for "development" of California's north coastal rivers, has not yet received even the Governor's approval. In fact, important California water figures, such as Secretary of Resources Norman Livermore and former Director of the DWR Harvey Banks, have expressed opposition to it, so there remains a substantial chance that Governor Reagan will veto it. Should he approve, the proposal would have to receive approval from both the President's Department of Budgetary Analysis and Congress itself.

The Eel River decision has an interesting history. In 1968 the Army Corps of Engineers proposed a dam on the Eel at Dos Rios. The dam would have some minor flood control function—the basis for the Army's interest—but would serve mainly to collect the Eel's water so it could be tunneled through the mountains to the Sacramento. The Corp's plans found some angry conservationists waiting. They didn't like turning one of California's last wild rivers into a dead and turbid lake, destroying one of the few remaining salmon and steelhead runs in the State, drowning a beautiful valley, and displacing its Indian inhabitants in violation of their treaty. The Corps compounded its difficulty by presenting a particularly stupid and dishonest "evaluation" in support of its proposal, which was demolished by Harrison Brown and other economists sought out by the conservationists. The Corps also showed remarkable callousness to the Indians, proposing to trade them worthless mountainside land, from which they could tend tourists, for their Round Valley farms. As if all that were not enough, the Department of Water Resources chipped in with some transparently dishonest estimates of water "requirements" in Southern California, which it used

to justify the development. Of course, the estimates proved transparently dishonest only because the conservationists had obtained a suppressed report, prepared two months earlier by the Department's Southern California staff, which showed requirements far lower than the Department was asserting. Although the Department attempted to discredit the report (and reprimanded its authors), it obviously played a role in Governor Reagan's decision to call for additional studies.

While those additional studies, completed in 1969 by the DWR, again recommended Dos Rios, the Department has since issued its Bulletin 160-70, surveying and predicting all of California's water demands and supplies for the next fifty years. While still full of problems, this document is vastly superior to anything the Department has previously concluded. Most importantly for Dos Rios, it draws upon revised population estimates and the more sophisticated analysis of the suppressed 1968 document to conclude that Southern California won't need any more water for at least ten more years. This is in effect pushing the Eel River decision back several years, and relieves at least the immediate pressure for development. The report's conclusion may have a similar effect on the Peripheral Canal, although the DWR and the Bureau of Reclamation won't admit that. Time is probably working against them, and if they don't get the Peripheral Canal soon, it may never come.

The Drain, once also a hot issue, has subsided for the present because Valley farmers appear unwilling to pay for it until their land becomes more obviously polluted. Some sort of drain eventually will be needed, but the solution to that problem will probably be to remove the salts and poisons in a treatment plant before returning the water to the Delta. The legislature and the Governor will make the primary decisions about the Drain, although the State's water pollution standards, and their enforcement by the Water Resources Control Board, may become important as well. The Peripheral Canal is the time and place to stop the State Water Project. To destroy our environment to enlarge such a con game for already-bloated special interests is a public obscenity. The cost of additional works will be huge. The DWR expects most of that cost to be met, not from Project revenues or bond issues, but from the public treasury, by way of a \$680 million interest-free loan, now projected for use on Dos Rios. By stopping the Project now, the State can save itself the interest on that money—an amount well over a billion dollars. The State's present financial squeeze seems to be due largely to the Project.

What of Southern California's water "needs"? They should, at the very least, be recalculated with sound economic techniques. Bulletin 160-70 is a start. All indications presently suggest that "needs" can be met through available water in the South, at an economic cost comparable to that of Dos Rios or other State Water Project increments.

In conclusion, the prospects for stopping the State Water Project seem excellent. The Peripheral Canal, the East Side Division, and Dos Rios or its equivalent must all receive Congressional approval, and Congress has shown itself increasingly responsive to environmental considerations. Congressman Jerome Waldie has submitted positive legislation to give the Eel, Trinity and Klamath Rivers Wild River status. Should Waldie's bill pass, the Project could not draw upon their waters and would be effectively blocked. In addition, various people are trying to stop the Project through lawsuits. Perhaps one will succeed. Efforts on the State level, while more dubious, may have a better chance once the facts about this Project penetrate the

smog of deception which the DWR pours forth. Most politicians who favor the Project sincerely believe it is good; some, at least, can be persuaded otherwise.

As this study should make clear, the chief losers from the Project are Southern Californians, who must pay for it. Efforts by the Project's opponents to make this a North versus South battle only obscure that point, and of course place a majority of the State's voters firmly on the Project's side. But if the Project doesn't stop now, its continuation will have not only mistaken regional factionalism on its side, but economics as well. For once the basic pipeline from North to South exists, it may well prove cheaper to meet additional demands by damming another river, instead of initiating a whole new water supply system such as desalinization. The State has full plans for this further growth, outlined in a document entitled the California Water Plan. It will take all the remaining rivers of the North Coast—the Klamath, the Trinity, the Van Duzen, the Mad, and the rest of the Eel—with unforeseeable effects on the climate, the beaches, the redwoods, the fish, and the other wildlife.

Steps individuals can take:

1. Write Governor Reagan opposing the East Side Division, and any development of the Eel.
2. Write your congressman and Senators in favor of Wild River status for the Eel, Klamath, and Trinity Rivers, and in opposition to the East Side Division, and Eel River projects, and the Peripheral Canal.
3. Californians should press their Senators, Cranston and Tunney, to take a stand against the Peripheral Canal.
4. Californians, and indeed people in any State, should support legislation designed to divest public works agencies, like the Department of Water Resources, of their planning and evaluation functions, and to place these functions, for all kinds of public works, in one agency especially designed to do that.
5. Join or support organizations working against the State Water Project on the State, Congressional, and Executive levels. The individual hasn't a chance of influencing, say, the Department of Budgetary Analysis, but organizations, if supported, can hire the lawyers and staff who can. These include the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, the Committee of 2 Million To Save the Eel, and the California Planning and Conservation League.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, two students in the fifth grade class at Morgan Park Academy in my district recently received awards in an essay contest sponsored by the Daughters of the American Revolution. The subject matter of the essays was the Constitution of the United States.

As last week was "National Week of the Young Child," I feel it would be particularly apt to include the award-winning essays of these young students in the RECORD. These students display an early grasp of the meaning of the Constitution and, during these days when there is much controversy about liberties guaranteed by the Constitution, it may be well for us to reflect, as these children do, upon the words of the document itself.

The texts of the essays follow:

ESSAY BY HARRY ROSENBERG, JR., GRADE 5
JAMES MADISON AND THE UNITED STATES
CONSTITUTION

What would we have done if no one had signed the Constitution? We might be under the power of the King of England. We might not even be in the United States. I am going to tell you about the Constitution and how James Madison got the name "Father of the Constitution."

James Madison won the title of "Father of the Constitution" because of his speeches, attempts at compromise and by writing the Constitution.

Delegates were considering a plan that would decide the fate of republican government. The task of completing a Constitutional government was filled with indecision. Several times one point of the argument nearly destroyed the Constitution—how to protect large and small states. This issue caused dissent over representation in the national legislature. Small states were partial to the New Jersey plan where all states would have equal representation. Roger Sherman proposed the compromise that broke the deadlock. His plan provided equal representation in one house of Congress and representation according to population in another house. This was the result of the now famous Connecticut Compromise.

Friends of the Constitution were called "Federalists." Federalists tried to get the states to vote for it. The Federalists became the first political party in America.

On May 25, 1787, Madison met in Philadelphia with delegates from all states, except Rhode Island, to draw up a new form of government for the United States. Washington and Madison got together a week before the Convention so that they would have plenty of time to talk about the plan of government which Madison had drawn up before he left home.

At the Convention all were in favor of the plan except Governor Randolph. Madison favored a strong national government with three divisions: legislative, judicial and executive. Madison played an important role in getting the Convention to approve a Constitution providing for these three divisions. The legislative was to make the laws; the executive to carry them out; the judicial to interpret them.

Madison influenced Randolph to vote for the Constitution almost two hundred years ago. Today we still have the same form of government that he helped start with three divisions: legislative, executive, and judicial. Furthermore, the Connecticut Compromise is still in effect today as we have two houses of Congress.

The first Congress met in New York on March 4, 1789. Madison led Congress in proposing twelve amendments to the Constitution by December 15, 1791. Ten out of the twelve became permanent additions to the Constitution. These ten were called the Bill of Rights. The Constitution served the interests of all people in the United States: Northerners, Southerners, the rich, the poor, farmers, and workers. Madison realized the Constitution would have to be amended from time to time. He said, "In framing a system which we wish to last for ages we should not lose sight of the changes which ages will produce."

ESSAY BY FRANK DEVINCENZO, GRADE 5
THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ITS SIGNERS

I looked up the word "constitution" in the dictionary and it said "the basic law or rules of government of a nation, a state, or any organized body, drawn up in written documents or established by long custom." Now I knew what a constitution is, but I didn't know what was so special about our United States Constitution. Then I started to read

about the history of our Constitution. I read about the men who wrote it and signed it and found out what it means to me.

I was surprised to find out that England, the country we were fighting against to get our freedom, did not have a written constitution. The English had a lot of laws and a document called the "Magna Carta" which said the King couldn't take away certain rights. I guess that is constitution "established by long custom."

The thirteen colonies had their own constitutions and these were still their constitutions when they became thirteen states. They said they were United States but they were not very united. They had "Articles of Confederation" during the American Revolution but they did not follow these very much when they had won the war. They had gotten free from England and they didn't want anybody else telling them what to do.

They had a convention to fix up the "articles" and some men from Virginia presented "The Virginia Plan" which was a new constitution. The delegates had to decide if they wanted to be a group of states who had a bunch of agreements or if they wanted to be a nation with one main government.

The man who is called "Father of the Constitution" was James Madison from Virginia. He went to New Jersey College (later Princeton) so he learned about how people felt in a different part of the country. When Mr. Madison was thirty-six he was a delegate to the convention that made the constitution. He wrote the Virginia Plan and he divided the government into three parts: legislative, executive, and judicial. He worked hard and said at the end, "We left no stone unturned. We enumerated the powers forbidden to the national government and those forbidden to the states."

Later Mr. Madison made the Bill of Rights amendments. These rights mean that I can go to church where I want to, carry a gun, and have a fair trial if I'm arrested for a crime. And any rights that the United States government did not get from the Constitution do not belong to the government. These rights belong to me and to all people who live in the United States. I think we are lucky people to have our written Constitution.

EIGHT CITATIONS FOR CHURCH WORLD

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of State-felt pride that I bring to the attention of my colleagues notice of the recognition earned by one of Maine's many excellent weekly newspapers at the recent 1970 Catholic Press Association's awards ceremonies.

The Church World, published by the Church World Publishing Co., Portland, Maine, was the worthy recipient of a first-place award for the best human interest story, second place awards for the best news story and the best campaign in the public interest, and honorable mention citations for general excellence, best photo story, best editorial, best editorial page, and best example of circulation promotion.

The Church World's excellent staff includes Editor Henry V. Gosselin, General Manager Thomas H. Fahey, Jr., Associate Editor Martha Bull, Feature Editor Rev. William K. McDonough, Ad-

vertising Manager Paul V. Fahey, Circulation Manager Peter J. Turner, and Ecclesiastical Adviser Rev. Msgr. Vicent A. Tatarczuk.

Descriptions of the Church World's eight citations follows:

EIGHT CITATIONS FOR CHURCH WORLD

BEST HUMAN INTEREST FEATURE STORY

If the human interest features entered in the competition are representative, then let it be said once more than the quality of writing in the Catholic Press must be rated highly commendable. Even the routine, conventional human interest stories among the entries were as worthy as, or better than, what one observes in the secular press, while the winners and others cited seemed quite superior in imagination and approach to the standard product. In them one also senses a special quality of sincerity that raises them above the level of competent-but-routine work.

First place goes to "Giving Birth to a New Style of Living" by Sister Beverly Galyean in the Church World of Portland, Maine. Sister Beverly may not be a professional journalist but her story seems so unusual, so clear in its exposition and so close to what even a Protestant observer takes to be the spirit of the Catholic press that in the end there could be no real alternative to naming her winner. A special word of praise must be extended to the editor who laid out the pages on which Sister's story appears; they are typographically excellent and set out this remarkable story, as it properly deserves to be.

BEST NEWS STORY

Among the many entries in the "Best News Story originating with the Paper" category this year, two newspapers really stand out—the *Beacon* of Paterson, N.J., for its informative, broad-gauge writing and its careful organization of an important story; and the Church World of Portland, Maine for a unique presentation of a facts-and-figures report that makes attractive and readable a mass of data that would be deadly dull as just plain words. The Church World earned a loud hurrah for ingenious presentation of the diocesan financial report, setting the scene with charts (prepared by Clarence McKay, Diocesan Information Officer) and pictures—and just enough words—to lead readers through the maze. How down-to-earth it is to let stand, front and center, in the one picture showing the bishop, a thoroughly empty Martini glass! (front page). A suggestion: use larger type, whenever feasible, within the pie charts; it would be helpful for eyes no longer young.

BEST CAMPAIGN IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The Best Campaign in the Public Interest entry of the Church World, in second place, was very close to first place. Its campaign on drug abuse was presented in dramatic style, offering full coverage all the way down to the nitty-gritty of a 16-year-old addict's plea for help. The Church World also had its detractors. One reader, asking that his subscription not be renewed, protested: "Too much is said about the hippies and dope, and not enough about the Knights of Columbus." The evil of drug abuse was played in interviews by Peter J. Turner, (then associate editor), first-hand accounts from addicts, and very dramatically played photos. One picture, distributed by The Advertising Council, shows a pitifully-thin hand nailed to the arm of a wooden cross by a hypodermic needle and syringe. A letter from an 18-year-old addict pleaded with all youths not to get hooked; he ended his own travail with a shotgun.

GENERAL EXCELLENCE

Considerable attention is being given to makeup and layout these days in the Catholic press, imparting a quality and dignity to Catholic newspapers and at the same time

contributing to the vigor of the news presentation. The winners in this category do have news punch. Use and variety of photos, as well as handling of line art and cartoons, merit special commendation. Editors seem not afraid to blow up good illustrative material.

(It should be noted that General Excellence reflects upon the entire newspaper—the editorial, advertising, circulation and production departments; reflecting the efforts of the general managers, Thomas Fahey, Jr., the entire staff, and the production crew under the direction of Richard Fahey.)

BEST PHOTO STORY

A special citation is due the photo feature in the Church World, whose feature editor (Father William K. McDonough) undertook the monumental task of publishing, in conjunction with Pope Paul's jubilee, the pictures of priests in the diocese celebrating their 25th, 40th, 45th, 50th and 65th anniversaries—along with their ordination pictures. Readers undoubtedly had a lot of fun trying to match them up. We're certain it was the most popular example of a photo feature in the paper in 1970.

BEST EDITORIAL

Reading and appraising the magnificent editorials entered in this category must indeed be considered a privilege for any newspaper editor serving as judge. Yet because the level of competency is so high among so many, the task of determining winners is difficult. As so often happens, it is, in many cases, judging pears against peaches.

"A desperate plea for help" in the Church World, written by Editor Henry V. Gosselin, is more than an editorial; it is an episode in which a lonely 16-year-old victimized by drugs was rescued because of the publication of his appeal. The lad's letter to Gosselin three weeks later is as poignant as the editorial: "I've found someone—someone to care, to hear, to hold on to . . ."

BEST EDITORIAL PAGE

Although all five editorial pages or sections cited as winners in this year's competition were highly regarded by each member of the judges' panel, there was little unanimity as to how they should be ranked. The panel, as usual, consisted of the five editorial writers of a leading U.S. daily; the selections are thus consensus decisions. Noteworthy editorial pages were those of the Church World, never lacking in the power of its editorials, which, after all, are the heart of the editorial page.

BEST OF EXAMPLE OF CIRCULATION PROMOTION

The Church World deserves mention in the "Best Example of Circulation Promotion" category for its many different house ads (designed by Peter J. Turner, circulation); and for the clever way in which it capitalized on awards won at last year's CPA convention.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARDINAL O'BOYLE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 21, Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, was honored in St. Matthew's Cathedral, on the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

For 23 years Cardinal O'Boyle has led the Archdiocese of Washington, D.C. He became the city's first resident arch-

bishop in January 1948 and was installed in the College of Cardinals by Pope Paul in June 1967.

Cardinal O'Boyle has dedicated his life to the church during a period of much turmoil and vast change. Racial tensions, urban ills, clerical celibacy, birth control, and abortion are only a few of the modern crises which Cardinal O'Boyle has faced unflinchingly.

Under the cardinal's direction, desegregation was begun in the District's Catholic schools in 1948. Because of his constant attention to the need for school expansion, over 130 new schools have been built with many other major, new additions.

Orphans, senior citizens, and the sick have all received the compassion and care of Cardinal O'Boyle through his establishment of various institutions to meet their special needs.

The cardinal has long been a leader in interfaith and racial equality activities and has recently begun a renovation and rehabilitation project in the inner city.

In his constant fight against abortion, Cardinal O'Boyle has indeed emerged as a leader. His efforts to preserve the sanctity of human life have greatly aided in the nationwide fight against liberalized abortion policies.

Cardinal O'Boyle is a deeply devout man of God and he is also a fighter—a fighter for those things in which he believes and against those injustices which cannot be tolerated.

His many awards document his life of service and the courageous stands he has taken. Cardinal O'Boyle's reputation is worldwide and deservedly so.

It is both an honor and an inspiration to have this great man amongst us, and as a small token of my deep admiration for Cardinal O'Boyle, I commend the work of this church leader to my colleagues' attention.

THE DOLLAR: ACTIONS ABROAD

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, when one lives beyond his means, there always comes a time when the creditors call a halt, and demand, at least in part, a settlement of past due accounts.

Such a reckoning took place, in part, in Europe recently, when several countries revalued their currencies.

This had the effect of devaluing the American dollar and bringing it more nearly in line with its decreasing value.

I recently read an enlightening editorial in the Christian Science Monitor, which, I believe, is worthy of consideration by every Member of Congress.

Because some of the Members may have missed it, with your permission, I would like to insert it in the RECORD:

THE DOLLAR: ACTIONS ABROAD

By revaluing upward the Swiss franc and Austrian schilling, and by setting afloat the value of the West German mark and Dutch guilder, Europe has done for the American

dollar what Washington has been unwilling to do.

The Europeans, at cost of considerable strain on their own delicate international relationships, have in effect devalued the dollar.

Henceforth it will cost Americans more to buy European goods. Conversely, it will cost Europeans less to import American goods. This will help the United States right its imbalance of payments on the trade end, but not on the overseas investment and military spending ends—which is where the dollar outflow really occurs.

This is a messy way to seek a more realistic equilibrium between the dollar, which is the Western international key currency, and other Western European currencies. It has caused severe strains not only between Europe and the United States, but between France and West Germany and other members of the Common Market, at a time when they are trying to work out a common monetary union alongside their trading union.

Some adjustment was inevitable. In the last couple of years United States liquid reserves have gone down to about \$14.3 billion against European credits estimated as high as \$60 billion. West Germany, which alone holds more credits against the dollar than there are U.S. reserves available, just happened to be the nation that got hit by the "hot" dollar speculative rush last week. But the weekend decision by the Swiss, Austrians and Dutch to revalue or set afloat their currencies was proof that the stabilizing mechanism set up by the Bretton Woods Agreement after World War II was not working.

The fault in last week's debacle was not Washington's alone. West Germany had failed to stem the speculative inflow of dollars which were attracted by higher interest rates and the expectation of a revaluation. This resulted in an expansion of the money supply by a staggering 22 percent this year.

This said, the dollar continues to be the key currency. And the United States continues to be the world's leading industrialized nation. It therefore falls to the United States to demonstrate exemplary posture in its custodial role as keeper of the international standard currency. This starts but does not end with two key responsibilities: curbing inflation at home, and stanching the outflow of dollars in the national balance of payments.

The responsibility is not one-sided. Europeans must demonstrate their own willingness to cooperate and coordinate in a process of continual readjustment that recognizes the internal stresses as well as the external responsibilities of each country. The goodwill and good sense manifested more than two decades ago at Bretton Woods must prevail again. There may have to be changes of tactics—such as allowing for more flexibility in the rather narrow margin within which currencies have been allowed to fluctuate.

But self-discipline at home and responsible use of credit abroad will continue to be the soundest basis for a workable international monetary system.

AND CORRECTIONS AT HOME

There may be many other contributing reasons behind the drop in the value of the dollar, but only one is really important. The political leadership in Washington has for six years tried to run a very expensive war "on the cuff" like the family that lives beyond it means.

The fault has been bipartisan. It was committed in the first case by Lyndon Johnson. In 1965 his economic and congressional leaders advised him to raise taxes and pay for the war as he went along. He refused, on the comforting theory that the overwhelming might of the American military machine

would win the war before the cost began to hurt.

Richard Nixon promised his backers of 1968 that if elected he could cut taxes. Unlike some presidents who have put embarrassing campaign promises aside on getting to the White House, Mr. Nixon insisted on dropping the income surtax.

It is merely coincidental that Washington's European creditors chose to close down on easy credit (buying more dollars than they want or need at the old official rate) at the same time that Congress begins debate on extension of the so-called "selective service" system, and an Army staff sergeant goes on trial for making a fortune out of Army PXs. But there is a connection among all these things.

Corrupt staff sergeants are just another surface manifestation of living beyond one's means.

The American Army is the most over-stuffed in history. Thanks to the draft, it has become accustomed to more manpower than it ever needed. It lives extravagantly, in every way. Its greatest single extravagance has been to keep long-term volunteers largely in safe occupations while sending the drafted men into combat. Roughly nine out of ten combat riflemen in Vietnam have been draftees.

The Vietnam war was itself a luxury possible only because the draft existed.

The Army has been living high, on unlimited manpower. The Government has been living high, on fighting faraway frontier wars without enough taxation to carry them. And it all comes together in a day of reckoning. It's always like this sooner or later, for those who live beyond their means. The time comes when creditors cut off credit. That is precisely what the European bankers have done to Uncle Sam.

One way to prevent a recurrence will be to make sure that no president ever again commits half a million Americans to a faraway war as easily as President Johnson was allowed to do it.

And one way for Congress to do that will be to take a very careful look at the draft. Perhaps it has to be extended for another year or two; but it need not be extended indefinitely, nor need a president be able to use it at his discretion for wars beyond the country's resources.

AMERICA'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM: BUCKING THE HEADWINDS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Mr. W. M. Allen, chairman of the board, the Boeing Co., was the recipient of the 22d annual National Transportation Award. The trophy was presented Friday morning by Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW.

It was a richly deserved award, Mr. Speaker, as evidenced by the remarks Mr. Allen made at a luncheon later in the day. The views of a man of such high ability and knowledge are vital to all of us as we face a transportation crisis in this country. So that my colleagues can share the wisdom and advice of Mr. Allen, I am inserting his speech at this point in the RECORD:

BUCKING THE HEADWINDS

(By W. M. Allen)

As I stated in the ceremony this morning, I feel greatly honored to be named as recipi-

ent of the National Transportation Award, but, of course, I think of myself only as having been in a position to receive it in behalf of a large number of people who should share any credit that may be forthcoming. For example, to the extent that the award is prompted by the development of the 747 airplane, the credit must go not only to a great many direct participants in Boeing but also to our airline customers, the government agencies we have worked with, and a large number of subcontractors and suppliers who were an integral part of the program.

Certainly I have no special claim to wisdom on the subject of transportation—I am sure there are many here today who are far better qualified. However, I do have a sincere interest in both transportation and national defense, and in the interrelationship of the two. This interest goes back over a considerable period of time.

No doubt we all have a great variety of memories involving the transportation business. I shall refer to one which is pertinent to my short message to you today. In the early 30's we were climbing out of Cheyenne heading west toward Sherman Hill. The means of conveyance—a Boeing trimotor bi-plane with a cruising speed in still air of just over 80 miles an hour.

As we climbed in the direction of the bald hill and I looked down through the big square windows, I was aware of an odd sensation. The three motors were droning away but the hill was drifting forward instead of backward under us. It was obvious that we were never going to get there. We had to turn around and go back.

We were learning in those days that if you couldn't buck the headwinds, you had to have stronger engines, or you had to cut down on the drag; otherwise you were not going to get to your destination.

I wonder if the transportation industry—a large part of it—is in that position today. Several modes of public transportation are in trouble. Even the private automobile, which is everybody's favorite, is running out of street and highway space and is encountering environmental and pollution barriers. Many people are choosing foreign-made cars in preference to American products.

Let us proceed from the premise that a healthy transportation industry and a balanced system in all areas—water, air, land—highways and railways—is essential to the well-being of this nation. I doubt if I have to justify that premise before this audience. To a large degree, transportation is the life blood of the economy. Business is activity, and activity depends on mobility. The commercial role of transportation goes hand in hand with its role in national defense; it is a large factor in national power—in our overall economic strength.

It was in recognition of these aspects of transportation's importance to our country that the Department of Transportation was established. We have a national policy of fostering transportation development.

How are we doing? Not too well right now. Our maritime shipping, our railroads and most recently our airlines have encountered serious difficulties.

As we all know, the headwinds I refer to are a combination of factors: the economic downturn; the high costs resulting from inflation; in particular the high cost of manpower in today's market place, with the overwhelming strength of organized labor at the bargaining table. In my opinion, some remedial steps must be taken with respect to this last named problem, if our country is to maintain the economic position it has enjoyed during this century.

I suppose the transportation industry would have to list government regulation as another headwind—yet regulation is necessary to protect the interests of the public. What we desire is an enlightened policy that will place emphasis on efficient management

and permit the greatest possible freedom from government domination consistent with the public interest. This is a hard nut to crack—striking the right balance between free enterprise and necessary government regulation. But it is a nut that we have to crack. I would hope that we do not come to nationalization.

From the private industry standpoint, what resources do we require to buck the headwinds I have mentioned, including the effects of economic slowdown? To name a few: Technology; management efficiency in cost cutting, operational improvements and traffic generation; adequate financing; labor-management cooperation; government-industry cooperation, and a recognition by the public that public transportation is a national asset which must be developed and encouraged.

I would put technology near the head of the list. Traditionally the application of technology has been one of our principal means of overcoming rising costs and at the same time increasing the attractiveness of the service, so that the market will grow. Unfortunately today, technology appears to have encountered its own headwind in the form of public distrust. We are stopped or at least very much slowed down, from taking the steps that judgment says we should take.

The problem is not new. A case in point is a letter which Martin Van Buren wrote to President Andrew Jackson opposing the development of railroads. Van Buren was governor of New York at the time, and it would appear that he was speaking more for the ears of his political constituency, and in defense of the local interest in canals, than from any careful weighing of facts. Said Mr. Van Buren:

"The government should create an interstate Commerce commission to protect the American people from the evils of railroads and to preserve the canals for posterity.

"As you may know, Mr. President, railroad carriages are pulled at the enormous speed of 15 miles per hour by engines, which, in addition to endangering life and limb of passengers, roar and snort their way through the countryside, setting fire to the crops, scaring the live stock, and frightening women and children. The almighty certainly never intended that people should travel at such breakneck speed."

That was in 1829. I feel that the attitude expressed then has its parallel in 1971, as evidenced in the case of the SST. Opposition of this same type succeeded in cancelling the prototype development program, although there has been the new move in Congress to try to revive it. Sooner or later the supersonic transport will take its place as a means of increasing productivity in international air transportation. There are two ways of accomplishing this. One is by carrying more seats and thus getting more seat-miles per airplane and per labor hour. The latter means will become more important as labor costs continue to rise.

This is the sort of gain that technology makes possible. In the same way we must look to technology to provide the solutions to our environmental problems, not only in transportation but in other areas. But it is still our view that the prospect of a future American SST reentering the competition with foreign-made products will rest on the requirement for some form of public financial backing. Certainly it will depend upon public support in the form of good-will and a desire to see transportation progress.

To regain and retain our position, we must approach the whole field of transportation with a view of its ultimate importance to the nation. We must have new and fresh thinking that will give rise to continued advances. We must stay in the forefront in technology—not let other nations take the lead away from us. On the management side, there must be a never-ending search for new ef-

iciencies. Often these come in combination with equipment advances.

One highly desirable objective, I feel sure, can be shared by land, sea and air transport interests alike. I refer to the need for greater integration of all the elements of transportation—viewing the whole trip as a unit, whether it be for a passenger or a commodity. Efficiency is gained only by attention to all the segments of the trip and to all of the obstacles along the way.

We have an excellent example of improvement in the recent trend to containerization of freight. The large 8x8 foot containers are moving now both by sea and by land, and the 747 freighter will soon be handling these same containers by air. The remaining need is for facilities for the transfer of these containers between the different transportation modes.

There are many other forms of integration yet to be achieved, especially at the urban-metropolitan area level.

The problem that concerns me greatly at present is our ability to meet international competition, both as manufacturers and operators. We long claimed the luxury, in this country, of being able to pay substantially higher wages and salaries than our competitors in other countries by virtue of our superior technology, larger quantity production and greater management capability. I believe that any remaining claim to this national advantage, if it still exists, is likely to be shortlived. Europe and Japan are forging ahead on every industrial and technical front, not to mention the parallel progress in the Soviet Union. The European countries, working together, now constitute a market that approaches the American market in size. It can therefore provide the large production runs which American industry has claimed as its own unique advantage.

Consider the European Airbus which is now approaching production—the A300B. The industries of four countries are joining forces to build this airplane—France, Germany, England and the Netherlands. A common specification has been drawn for the airlines in the European Atlas group—Air France, Lufthansa of Germany, Sabena of Belgium and Alitalia of Italy. British European Airways is another prime prospect. The joint enterprise has high hopes of obtaining the U.S. airline market for this size aircraft. European banks are expected to provide 80 percent financing for buyers of the aircraft on a long term basis. U.S. Export-Import Bank financing is being sought for the remaining 20 percent, representing the portion of the product that is American made—engines, avionics and instruments.

Referring again to the SST, the supersonic Concorde which is being jointly financed by the British and French governments is moving ahead. It is more limited in speed and seating capacity than the airplane we would have offered, but the present model can be followed by larger ones to fill the world market. The Soviet SST has a similar opportunity.

Let us consider the development of the air freight business on a global basis. The 747 airplane was designed in part to permit substantial new economies in the air freight operations. Our present customers and our principal prospective customers for the 747 Air Freighter today are European and Japanese airlines. These countries would like to do in the air what they have done in surface shipping—become dominant in the field.

As a sidelight, our Boeing sales engineers were recently discussing with the Europeans how their manufacturing industry as a whole handles sales in time of recession. Their philosophy is, when domestic business is down, you intensify efforts on exports.

But much of American industry is not oriented toward export business. An increas-

ing number of American products are no longer competitive in the world market. The aerospace industry has tried to remain competitive. Boeing would be crippled today were it not for its continuing export business. The United States balance of payments would be in much more difficult shape were it not for aerospace exports in the past several years.

Let us hope that we can maintain this position. But let us not take it for granted.

The question is, overall, are Americans still competitive in spirit, or are we of a mind to relax, to look to our own creature comforts, and let other countries pass us by? Are we counting, as a country, on past reputation rather than on present performance? What is our objective—a vital, hard-working nation or do we place a higher value on leisure, with less work and more pay?

To be competitive, our productivity per dollar must match or exceed that of the other countries, where those nations can produce goods or perform services of the same quality. If others can excel by those standards, they will take over the field.

In my view, the great need at this time is to rekindle the Yankee spirit of forging ahead. We must not turn our backs on progress, but foster it. Resolve to meet the competition, and enjoy in running of the race. Keep our technology edge sharp.

Let us not forget that one of the most important elements in our leadership as a nation is our leadership in the transportation field. The requirement of the times is not to slip backward because the going is tough, but to move forward. In the transportation business, there is no other way to go.

AN "EXCURSION" INTO FORESTRY, ECOLOGY, AND NATURAL RESOURCES IN ALABAMA

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. Speaker, a great chapter was written in Alabama this month when the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co., ran a "Forestry Special" train from Montgomery to Banks in Pike County, where a cooperative field program concerned with forestry, ecology, and natural resources was held. This was the largest and most effective public relations affair that has even been held in Alabama and I am proud that it took place in my district, the Second, in the southeastern area of the State.

Alabama welcomes industry and I can think of no better way to let business and industrial leaders know that the "welcome mat" is always out to them in my State.

On May 13, a special train from Montgomery to Banks carried the Governor, members of the cabinet, members of the State legislature, educators, and business and industrial leaders to a field program where accent was placed on "Quality Environment for the Seventies." This was held on the W. J. Sorrell property.

The guest list, which included top leaders of industry, represented more than 120 businesses and industries from some 25 States and read like a "Who's Who" in American enterprise.

W. Thomas Rice, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the

Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co., served as host for this great event.

Upon arrival of the train at the site on this festive occasion, the Troy State University Band beat out a spirited welcome and the program opened with the playing of the National Anthem.

Many local mayors, city councilmen, chamber of commerce officials, local business leaders, farmers and members of the Future Farmers of America were on hand to greet the train and get acquainted with the visiting industrialists.

It was my pleasure to be the congressional sponsor for the occasion—and the man most responsible for the overwhelming success of the program was Robert N. "Bob" Hoskins, assistant vice president—Forestry and Special projects, Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co., who was the master of ceremonies and overall director of the program which incidentally ran right on schedule. This was a feat in itself, with over 150 business, industrial, and political leaders to be recognized during the 4-hour program. Everyone had a profitable and enjoyable time.

In order to acquaint you with the nature and scope of the subject matter, following is a complete rundown on the program which included men of ability and experience who handled their discussions expertly:

QUALITY ENVIRONMENT FOR THE SEVENTIES,
A COOPERATIVE FIELD PROGRAM CONCERNED
WITH FORESTRY, ECOLOGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES, MAY 13, 1971, BANKS, ALA.,
SPONSORED BY SEABOARD COAST LINE RAIL-
ROAD CO.

QUALITY ENVIRONMENT FOR THE SEVENTIES
A Cooperative Field Program Concerned
with Forestry, Ecology, and Natural Re-
sources, May 13, 1971.

Location: On W. L. Sorrell property, south
edge of Banks, Ala., on State Route 93, along
the seaboard Coast Line Railroad.

Time: 9:45 a.m.—Arrival of "Forestry Spe-
cial" Train from Montgomery.

Introductory Remarks: Robert N. Hoskins,
Assistant Vice President, Seaboard Coast
Line Railroad Company.

Introduction of Governor: W. Thomas
Rice, Chairman of the Board and Chief Exec-
utive Officer, Seaboard Coast Line Railroad
Company.

Address of Welcome: The Honorable
George C. Wallace, Governor of Alabama.

Address: William E. Galbraith, Deputy
Under Secretary of Agriculture, Washington,
D.C.

Address: C. William Moody, State Forester
of Alabama, Montgomery.

Address: Fred Stines, Chairman, Sponsoring
Committee, National FFA Foundation,
Inc., and publisher, *Successful Farming*, Des
Moines, Iowa.

Special Presentations: Bill Cofield, Presi-
dent, Alabama FFA Association, Wetmore.

Introduction of Local Guests and Distinguished
Visitors: R. N. "Bob" Hoskins.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Demonstrations: Stations 1 through 8,
10:45 a.m.

Station 1: *Forest Research Pays Off*—Dr.
Barry F. Malac, Manager, Woodlands Re-
search, Union Camp Corporation, Savannah,
Ga. *Pesticides and Herbicides—The Good,
The Bad, The Ugly*—Dr. Roland Laning,
Manager, Herbicide Field Research & Devel-
opment, Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.

Station 2: *Fire—Enemy and Friend*—C.
William Moody, State Forester, Alabama For-
estry Commission, Montgomery, Ala. *The
Small Woodland Owner Must Produce!*—Jim
Renfro, Area Manager, Paper Mill Division,

Container Corporation of America, Brewton,
Ala.

Station 3: *The Truth About Clearcut-
ting*—F. E. Stabler, Woods Manager, South-
ern Operations, Scott Paper Company, Mo-
bile, Ala. *Site Preparation and Tree Plant-
ing*—Donald T. Sonnen, District Manager,
Woodlands, Alabama Kraft Co., Maht, Ala.

Station 4: *Logging Today and Tomorrow*—
B. M. Davis, Director, Logging and Equip-
ment Engineering, Southern Kraft Division,
International Paper Company, Mobile, Ala.

Station 5: *Low Cost Housing—Now!*—Dr.
Richard F. Blomquist, Project Leader, Hous-
ing Research, Forest Service, U.S.D.A., Athens,
Ga.

Station 6: *What's Going On In:*
Air Pollution Control—William J. Scheff-
el, Manager, Industrial Gas Cleaning De-
partment, Metal Products Division, Koppers
Company, Inc., Baltimore, Md.

Water Pollution Control—William Haase,
Director of Marketing, Monsanto Biodize
Systems, Inc., Great Neck, N.Y.

Station 7: *Chemical Products From Trees*—
Dr. John S. Autenreth, Manager Technical
Service, Hercules Incorporated, Wilmington,
Del.

The Booming Market in Disposables—Ivan
Miglaw, Marketing Services Manager, Kim-
berly-Clark Corporation, Neenah, Wis.

Station 8: *Railroading for a Cleaner Amer-
ica*—Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Company,
Jacksonville, Fla.

*Wildlife and Outdoor Recreation on Pri-
vate Lands*—H. Ray Redmond, Chief, Game
Management, Gulf States Paper Corporation,
Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Introduction of Distinguished Visitors:
12:35 p.m.—R. N. "Bob" Hoskins
Introduction of Principal Speaker: W.
Thomas Rice

Address: Henry G. Van der Eb, President
and Chief Executive Officer, Container Cor-
poration of America, Chicago, Illinois

Introduction of Congressional Host: W.
Thomas Rice

Address: The Honorable William L. Dick-
inson, U.S. Representative, Second Con-
gressional District of Alabama, Washington, D.C.

Luncheon: 1:20 p.m.—Courtesy Seaboard
Coast Line Railroad Company

Special Events During Lunch: *Aerial Fer-
tilization Demonstration*—Bartlett Tree Im-
provement Company and U.S.S. Agri-Chem-
icals, Division of U.S. Steel Corporation

Environmental Air Evaluation Unit, South-
eastern Area, State and Private Forestry, For-
est Service, U.S.D.A.

Harvesting Display—International Paper
Company

Conclusion: 2:15 p.m.—Departure of Spe-
cial Train for Montgomery

3:45 p.m.—Arrival of "Forestry Special,"
Montgomery

COOPERATING COMPANIES, ORGANIZATIONS,
AND INDIVIDUALS

Alabama Association, Future Farmers of
America

Alabama Forest Products Assn.

Alabama Forestry Commission

Alabama Kraft Co.

Bartlett Tree Improvement Co.

Container Corporation of America

Dow Chemical Co.

Forest Service, U.S.D.A.

Gulf States Paper Corp.

Hercules Incorporated

International Paper Co.

Kimberly-Clark Corp.

Koppers Co., Inc.

Men of Montgomery

Monsanto Co.

Montgomery Chamber of Commerce

National FFA Foundation—Sponsoring
Committee

Scott Paper Co.

Southern Forest Institute

Troy Bank and Trust Co.

Troy Chamber of Commerce

Troy State University
Troy State University Band
U.S. Department of Agriculture
U.S.S. Agri-Chemical Division of U.S. Steel
Corporation
Union Camp Corporation
W. J. Sorrell

With the expertise of a ringmaster,
Hoskins got the program off to a fast
smooth clip at a pace to be sustained
with precision for the next 4 hours. In
his opening remarks he sounded the key-
note, setting the stage for the program
to follow. At the conclusion he presented
the official host, W. Thomas Rice. Prime
F. Osborn, III, president of the Seaboard
Coast Line Railroad, in turn, introduced
the Honorable George C. Wallace, Gov-
ernor of Alabama.

COMMENTARY ON "QUALITY ENVIRONMENT FOR THE SEVENTIES"

(By: Robert N. Hoskins, Assistant Vice Presi-
dent—Forestry and Special Projects, Sea-
board Coast Line Railroad Co., Richmond,
Va.)

Today the quality of our environment is
uppermost in our minds and the means of
bettering it in our time has become an obses-
sion with us. The obstacles are of our own
creation largely, since the surrounding air,
water and land seemed to have an inexhaus-
tible capacity for absorbing waste without
noticeably bad effects. All of us, consciously
or unconsciously, have contributed to the
pollution problems that can no longer be
ignored. Some enterprising research has
brought about a whole new approach. We
now regard the air we breathe, the water we
use and the lands around us as so essential
to our well being that they must be main-
tained at their highest level if we are to
survive. Upon taking a new look at these
basic elements of our environment, we must
face up to the need for closer cooperation
among ourselves, for better communication
to help us understand our problems and
work together for a better way of life. All
right-thinking people acknowledge the in-
visible bond that links together the dead,
the living and the yet unborn. Our best ef-
forts today which spell action, coupled with
faith in the future, will lead to a better to-
morrow. If we anticipate success, and work
at it, progress is inevitable.

Our Cooperative Field Conference today
places great emphasis on "Quality Environ-
ment For The Seventies" and is a tangible
evidence of our company's concern for the
finer aspects of our existence through an ex-
amination of the facts. Again, as in the past,
we are most fortunate in having top talent
assisting us in today's presentation, repre-
senting leadership from business and indus-
try as well as the State and Federal govern-
ment. This marks the twenty-seventh con-
secutive year that our company has pio-
neered in sponsoring these field programs.

The host for our program today is well
known in the field of Transportation
throughout our country. He is a native of
Virginia and a graduate of Virginia Poly-
technic Institute. Wherever he begins, he al-
ways rises to the top. He has, in fact, served
as President of three railroads—including
Seaboard Coast Line Railroad, where he is
now Chairman of the Board and Chief Exec-
utive Officer. In addition, he is a Major Gen-
eral in the U.S. Army Reserve. He is not only
an outstanding leader, but one who is held
in high esteem by all who know him. He
takes an active interest in youth programs
and has been honored by Junior Achieve-
ment, the Future Farmers of America and
the Boy Scouts of America. Recently he was
called on to serve on the White House Con-
ference on Youth.

It is a privilege for me to present to you
at this time—your friend and mine—W.
Thomas Rice.

Following the Governor's outstanding Address of Welcome, several noteworthy presentations were made—three of which are as follows:

First, by William E. Galbraith, Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture:

REMARKS MADE BY WILLIAM E. GALBRAITH, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO., COOPERATIVE FIELD PROGRAM, MAY 13, 1971, BANKS, ALA.

Governor Wallace, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: I am indeed honored to represent Secretary Hardin at this field program sponsored by the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Company. We in the Department are dedicated to the proposition that public and private cooperation—as exemplified by this program today—is essential to meet the needs and desires and aspirations of all our people. Mr. Rice, we congratulate you and your company for the leadership you have displayed and are showing to make America a better place in which to live.

I would feel remiss if I did not also congratulate the State of Alabama and its people for outstanding progress in developing and protecting its forest resource.

Forest industry is very important in Alabama. It ranks as the second largest industry in the State. It contributes over a billion dollars annually to the State's economy. It provides over 100,000 jobs.

Alabama ranks second in the South in pulpwood production. It is the home of 14 pulpwood mills, 17 papermills, 5 pine plywood mills, and countless sawmills and other wood using industries.

To support these forest-related enterprises, Alabama has nearly 21 million acres of commercial forest lands. It is in a leadership role in fire protection with 100% of its State and private forest lands under protection. Alabama's forest nurseries have a capacity of producing well over 100 million seedlings per year.

These figures are impressive. They indicate what can be done when industry and private landowners and the State and Federal governments work together. They are exemplary of the relationships that this Administration stands squarely behind.

Forestry is also a major responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. The Forest Service, in addition to managing the National Forest System, works through the State Foresters to provide many kinds of assistance in the protection and development of State and private forests. It also engages in a broad program of forestry research.

Against this background, the Department of Agriculture does become involved with timber and forestry problems in a major way. I am told that the interest in this area, in the President's office, in the executive agencies, and in the Congress, is greater now than at any time this Century.

Much of this interest concerns timber supply versus anticipated demand.

Much of it also revolves around our increasing commitments to restore and enhance our environment. These two aspects are indeed interrelated. Our country faces a monumental task during this decade in building homes and cities, and replacing or rebuilding much which we now have. During this same period, the forest industries will encounter increasing competition from non-timber uses of forest lands.

Major opportunities to meet timber demands in the immediate future may be found in the National Forests as well as opportunities to meet other needs. But in the long run, the Nation will have to rely on private timber ownerships more and more to meet its timber requirements. We must not delay in the aggressive development of these private holdings. This is especially important in the South, with its preponderance of private woodland holdings.

The President has directed Secretary Hardin to develop plans to increase the production and harvesting of timber on State and private lands, consistent with the maintenance of environmental quality. We will put our best talent and effort towards meeting his directive.

Finally, I would also be remiss if I did not mention the Administration's Great Goals for the Nation, specifically those which deeply involve forestry. The first of these is governmental reorganization. Among other changes, the President has proposed a Department of Natural Resources which would include the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and several research elements now housed in USDA, as well as agencies from other Departments whose missions are natural resource oriented.

In another Great Goal, the President has proposed a special revenue sharing program for rural community development. Categorical programs involving cooperation with State forestry agencies, the Rural Environmental Assistance Program, and several other conservation programs would be combined into a single package.

In making these proposals, the President anticipated opposition. But he feels strongly that these changes must be made to meet the needs in the years ahead.

I urge that you evaluate the President's proposals with care, that you discuss them thoroughly with others, that you consider the needs of our Nation rather than viewing these changes purely from the viewpoint of constituency groups. The President has asked that this be done. And as you study these proposals and the other Great Goals, I think you will reach the same conclusion I have—that President Nixon has laid the basis for a rekindling and refiring of the spirit of America that has served us as a Nation so well for nearly 200 years.

Second, by C. William Moody, State Forester of Alabama:

REMARKS MADE BY C. WILLIAM MOODY, STATE FORESTER, MONTGOMERY, ALA., SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO., COOPERATIVE FIELD PROGRAM, MAY 13, 1971, BANKS, ALA.

Governor Wallace, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: In the late 20's and early 30's, the hills and valleys of Alabama lay bare and eroding—our streams ran red with silt and mud.

Alabama was the victim of a cut-out, get-out policy—the prevailing policy at the time. Private landowners could no longer afford to own and pay taxes on this barren land. Much of the land reverted to the Government in lieu of taxes.

Today, two out of every three acres in Alabama are covered by forests which bind the land together and diminish the detrimental effects of wind and water on our countryside.

These forests benefit Alabamians in many ways:

They recharge underground water supplies. They control erosion on our hillsides and prevent silting of our streams.

They contribute clean unpolluted water to our tremendous water supply.

They provide outdoor recreation for millions of our citizens and visitors.

They contribute to the quality of the environment by providing beauty in our countryside, by converting carbon dioxide into purified oxygen, and in many other ways.

Our forests support the second most important industry in Alabama. This industry generates over one billion dollars' worth of business annually and provides jobs for close to 100,000 Alabamians.

The picture that forestry in Alabama presents today did not happen by accident. Many factors have contributed to this evolution.

Federal co-operative programs sponsored by the Department of Agriculture such as the soil bank, ACP program and now the REAP program have helped.

The political leadership in Alabama has been a very significant factor. During Governor Wallace's former administration, a substantial part, if my figures are correct, Governor, over one-half billion dollars' worth of the forest industry we have now come to Alabama.

Co-operating agencies such as the extension service, SCS, USFS have contributed.

Forest industry has helped by properly managing their lands, by providing technical advice and assistance to landowners and by providing a market for small landowners' products.

Our fine transportation system which includes our good highway and a good rail system have made a substantial contribution.

The Forestry Commission and its predecessor, the Division of Forestry in the Department of Conservation, has helped by coordinating fire protection and providing management assistance to small landowners.

We must not rest on our laurels. We must plan for the future. Products needs from Alabama's forests will double in the next thirty years. Recreational needs will increase many fold. Environmental demands will become increasingly important.

We are still having 10,000 wildfires burning 150,000 acres annually in Alabama with a loss of 55 million dollars potential business generated. Damage to the environment, watersheds, recreation and wildlife cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Non-forest-industry, non-government owners who own 18 of the 22 million acres of forest land in Alabama are producing only about one-half the forest products they are capable of producing. There must be a substantial increase in the contribution these owners make in the production of products as well as contributions to environmental quality, recreation, wildlife, etc.

The Forestry Commission is charged by law with the responsibility of representing the people in the establishing, protecting and developing of her forest resource. Within this charge, we suppress fires and serve the needs of the private landowners to the maximum of our ability with the resources available to us.

An investment in forestry in Alabama is an investment in her future. We, in the Forestry Commission, pledge to utilize all resources available to us now and in the future to the maximum in helping to insure that Alabama's forests realize their potential. This potential when realized will double the size of the present industry and serve all the needs of the forests by our citizens and visitors now and for generations to come.

Third, by Henry G. Van der Eb, president and chief executive officer, Container Corporation of America, who delivered the principal address:

REMARKS OF HENRY G. VAN DER EB, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, CONTAINER CORPORATION OF AMERICA, AT COOPERATIVE FIELD PROGRAM, "QUALITY ENVIRONMENT FOR THE SEVENTIES," SPONSORED BY SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD, MAY 13, 1971

It is both a pleasure and a privilege to be here with you today to share this unique and interesting environmental experience. It's a pleasure because the beauty, productivity, and utility which characterize the environment you have fostered here, stand in such marked contrast to the problems associated with so much of the rest of our environment. It is also pleasant to be here as the guest of such a gracious host as the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad—and I'd like to thank Tom Rice and his associates for providing this rare opportunity for the representatives of government and business to get together, and for the occasion to meet Governor Wallace, so many state government officials, and members of the Alabama Legislature.

Part of the reason meetings like this don't happen often enough probably stems from the way business and government regard each other. Businessmen tend to regard government as a partner in their business enterprise—a partner that is privileged to share the profits without having to share the losses.

In the eyes of government, on the other hand, business leaders always seem to be looking for ways to get more business in government and less government in business. The late Will Rogers probably defined the problem more precisely when he said that "the business of government is to keep the government out of business—unless business needs government aid."

Another reason I feel privileged to be a part of this program is the same reason that our company has felt privileged to be a corporate citizen of Alabama. You have made us feel at home here. You have manifested cooperation and understanding in numerous ways—and you have the unusual faculty of making a guest feel like an honored guest—and an industry feel that it is a welcome part of a community.

This important intangible was a significant factor in our company's decision to build our paperboard mill in Brewton in 1962, to more than double its capacity eight years later, and to invest an additional \$10 million currently to further enhance our production capabilities there.

These same qualities, on a broader scale, explain why our industry, and industry generally, has been attracted to the southeast. It is because we have been able to work together, to plan together, and to progress together.

The principal reason that the south has a thriving paper and forest products industry is that you have encouraged and maintained a climate in which this industry can successfully exist.

Enlightened legislative action has made it possible for the forest products industry, tree farmers, and other private landowners to make the long-term investment which timber growing requires, with a reasonable expectation of earning a return on this investment.

The recent Alabama tax law which exempts growing timber from ad valorem taxes, and bases taxes on land values only, should help encourage additional investment in forest lands. While this kind of positive governmental action is important to the health of the entire forest industry, it is vital to the economic well being of the small landowner.

It complements the activities of companies such as ours, whose corporate policies recognize the importance of the individual landowner, are dedicated to helping him grow and prosper, and provide him with assistance in managing his lands to obtain maximum timber growth and yield. By complementing our efforts in this direction, your governmental actions have made it possible for the small landowner and pulpwood farmer to continue to be a dominant force in the forest products industry.

By recognizing the potential of the contribution that good forest management and the various segments of the forest products industry can make to the economy, in terms of productivity, employment, and tax revenues, the southeastern states have increased the amount of land devoted to growing the nation's only renewable resource.

An area that had once been "written off" because its virgin forests had been timbered, has managed to grow a second forest on these cut over lands.

This forest, as many of you know, is making it possible for Alabama to produce more than a billion board feet of lumber each year and to supply pulpwood to our Brewton mill and a dozen similar operations, which last year together produced some 3½ million tons of pulp and paper products. This same kind of enlightened, cooperative action is making

it possible for us to grow our third forest and to plan for our fourth forest of the future.

A similar level of enlightenment in the area of water quality has fostered a climate in which state authorities have worked very closely with industry in finding solutions to the problems of pollution long before the subject became popular with the press and environmental activists.

Many of the demonstration projects we have seen here this morning provide evidence of the progress which has resulted from our cooperative endeavors—progress in conservation—progress in land and resource management—progress in the direction of multiple use of forest lands.

The timber lands in the southeast are among the most intensively managed lands in the country. These same lands provide valuable watersheds, help control erosion, create a shelter for wildlife, and furnish recreational facilities for our citizenry. All of these are important by-products of the forests—a natural resource which is vital to our economy.

Many of these demonstration projects also serve as a reminder of the potential which exists for future progress—if we can all continue to cooperate, communicate, and move forward together in a rational way. I am confident that we will be able to continue to work together to achieve our common goals. As one reviews the fruits of our past cooperative efforts, it may be difficult to envision how it could be otherwise.

However, the threat exists. It is unreasonable, but it is very real. The threat exists because of the growing tendency of government to respond to the demands of the vocal few at the potential expense of the many.

The threat exists because of the pressure approach and scare tactics being used by special interest groups who delude themselves, and others, into believing that their special interests are consistent with the public interest.

The threat exists because of the tendency of the general public and, understandably, government in particular, to over-react and over-respond to situations which our news media often convert overnight into apparent national crises. This is frequently compounded by those political opportunists who make a habit of climbing on the bandwagon of concern whenever a crisis occurs, proposing simplistic solutions before the problem is thoroughly understood.

In our own industry, we see similar threats being posed by those who perpetuate the myth that it takes forever to grow a new tree, and that any portion of a forest which is harvested by man, instead of by nature, is lost forever.

Potential threats are being posed by various groups which would restrict clear cutting and tree farming and curtail other essential forest management processes, because they do not view these industry practices as being totally consistent with their own particular interests.

While no outdoor enthusiast can subjectively or popularly question the idealism of the wilderness preservationists, there are practical limits to the concept, if we are to attain a reasonable compromise between turning the clock back to Thoreau and meeting the requirements of Twentieth Century society.

In addition to the problems which are peculiar to our own industry, we are receiving our share of the harassment which business in general is experiencing from the exaggerations of ecologists, the complaints of consumerists, and the growing and conflicting demands of our burgeoning bureaucracies.

The technological and ecological problems confronting industry in its attempts to control air and water pollution are of sizeable dimension—these are complicated considerably by changing laws, regulatory agencies often operating at cross purposes, constantly

shifting standards, and the lack of jurisdictional definition.

Industry finds itself in the dilemma of making substantial investments in systems to meet or exceed current air and water quality standards, only to run the risk of facing tougher and expanded new laws which can obsolete these investments prematurely.

Many companies have also discovered that their involvement with air and water quality problems requires them to deal with two separate agencies each at the city, county, and state levels, plus a number of federal agencies.

Industry, of course, is not the only victim of governmental over-regulation. Government is over-regulating itself. In a recent study, conducted by a management consulting firm, on six State of Ohio departments, it was discovered that federal agencies required these departments to submit almost 100 thousand reports each year, and that report preparation time was equivalent to 250 full-time employees at an annual cost of 2.6 million dollars.

Extrapolating these results to all state agencies in fifty states indicates an expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars on cumbersome and often unnecessary paperwork. These numbers are overwhelming, even to those who are fortunate enough to produce the paper used.

The cost and attendant waste, to those of us whose productive efforts are taxed to finance them, are a substantial burden.

Added to the economic burden, is the considerable time and attention that management must devote to responding to the demands of these and other non-productive elements. For example, compliance reporting for the recent wave of social legislation is considerable, and judging from some pending legislation, shows every indication of increasing as time goes on. Meeting the demands of government agencies, and responding to those of ecologists, consumers, and other self-appointed keepers of the corporate conscience, is an endless and very expensive requirement in today's complex economic climate.

Superimposed on these are the inexorable pressures of organized labor in their quest for constantly higher wages, and constantly increased benefits, for fewer people employed, in an era of declining productivity.

These are the problems confronting management of companies in the basic industries. These industries provide the entrepreneurial ingredient and make the risk decisions so vital to the success of our capitalistic system.

These industries are the productive core that supports an ever-expanding bureaucracy and the large non-productive element in society which appears to be growing even more rapidly.

We must recognize the contribution that the producers make to our society. We cannot continue to tax the producing abilities of the few to meet the expanding demands of the many.

The situation is painfully reminiscent of the fable of The Goose with the Golden Eggs. The situation that I am describing, unfortunately, is not a fable, but a real and distressing threat to the continued progress of America.

In our own industry, we are faced with the additional problem posed by a constantly lower rate of return on our investment. At the same time, the pulp and paper industry is growing more capital intensive, as higher levels of investment are required for new production equipment and increasingly more sophisticated pollution control processes.

The cost of mill construction has risen markedly in recent years, partly because of inflation, but primarily because contractors are finding it almost impossible to hire construction workers who are willing to pro-

duce commensurate with their monetary demands and work practices. This high cost of construction has already curtailed and, in the future, could well preclude planned expansion in our industry, unless solutions can be found.

Irresponsible accusations may make news, but they make no provision for progress. As James Roche, chairman of General Motors Corporation, recently stated, and I quote: "The search for scapegoats leads away from personal responsibility and into self-excuses. It is the other fellow who is at fault. It is the government. It is business. It is, in short, 'they', the mysterious 'they' who pollute the air and water, who sell poorly made products, who are guilty of intolerance, indifference, or inaction. It is 'they' who are responsible—never 'I'."

My purpose in enumerating these various areas of common concern is not to carp or complain, despite the fact that this is apparently the successful technique of the day. My aim, rather, is to emphasize the obvious need for the development of a pervading sense of responsibility to replace the disjointed and inconsistent efforts in many areas, and the growing degree of irresponsibility which is at the core of many of the problems which are creating the disunity in our society.

We cannot progress until or unless we recognize that each of us shares the responsibility for solving the social and economic problems facing this country. The "we" that I refer to includes all of us. It includes government, industry, and labor. These are the forces which have been responsible for our past achievements—and together, in our free enterprise system, have enabled us to achieve a standard of living unequaled anywhere. These three must form a "coalition of responsibility" which will enable us to continue to progress. Industry cannot accomplish this by itself. Neither can government. Neither can labor.

We cannot solve our common problems through unilateral action which does not attach sufficient importance to the problems of the others. What is needed is a recognition that the goals, ideals, and aspirations which we share in common are greater than the differences which separate us. What is needed is a sense of mutual responsibility and an application of reason—to replace the irresponsible sniping and unreasonable claims and counterclaims that seem so characteristic of today's climate.

What is needed is a set of priorities for solving our mutual problems with a minimum level of economic waste and confusion.

Each of us can contribute to this "coalition of responsibility." The business sector must be more sensitive to and appreciate the changing tenor of public criticism. We must maintain our perspective, separate, with cool heads, the soundly based from the emotional or unfounded, adopt broader attitudes about our social responsibilities, and must act accordingly.

Through responsible action, we can reestablish the traditional image of the constructive role of business in our society despite the current hostility of many. If we do not, we can expect to see the people looking more and more to the federal government to protect them from the selfish irresponsibilities of some business. We must continue to improve our technological capabilities, increase our efficiencies, and continue to combat inflation in every possible way.

With the heavy representation here today of the pulp and paper and railroad industries, I should like to remind this group of the considerable progress which has been achieved through cooperative programs between these two industries over the past few years.

As an illustration, through willing and con-

sistent effort by the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad, our own company has developed a remarkable record in lowered demurrage and in the achievement of improved loading levels in boxcars. In 1970, we shipped 262,500 tons of paperboard from our Fernandina Beach, Florida mill.

In the past decade, our average weight per car increased from 40 tons in 1960 to 52½ tons in 1970. Through better car utilization resulting from improved scheduling, increased roll diameters, and better load patterns, we saved the equivalent of 1,562 boxcars last year. The Fernandina Beach, Fla., mill has gone four years without paying any demurrage and, while the average boxcar in the U.S. transports 1.3 payloads per month, Fernandina ships 1.8 payloads per month, translating into six additional revenue loads per car per year.

The most recent statistics published by the I.C.C. indicate a national damage cost of 1.92% of railroad gross revenues. Fernandina's per cent of damage to freight revenue paid is only .05%.

There is still much to be done in the areas of better utilization of equipment, faster turn-arounds, more rapid moving of freight, and in the development of more realistic and economical rate schedules, but these accomplishments indicate what can be done through well motivated intelligent cooperation.

The principal contribution which labor leadership can bring to the coalition is constructive and responsible use of its almost monopolistic powers. The exercise of restraint on wage increases beyond the levels of improved productivity is essential to curbing inflation. With labor's help, we must foster an innovative approach to higher productivity generally, and we desperately need to reinfuse in the working force a sense of fulfillment and satisfaction in a job well done, and a sense of pride in the products which it produces. The unskilled, if they are to be absorbed by industry, need training and, by far, the most productive training is on-the-job experience. It is here that the rank and file of organized labor have a responsibility to teach their skills to the new man on the job. Industry cannot bear the total training cost alone.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 was strongly backed by organized labor. The level of safety in any plant is a function of the attitude and commitment of the people involved.

It is not something which can be guaranteed through legislation alone. Here, again, if organized labor will face up cooperatively to the inherent problems in implementing the Act, compliance will be possible. Any other approach can create nothing other than an administrative nightmare for all concerned.

The reduction of waste in the production process is another obvious and critical area for potential industry-labor cooperation.

The principal contribution that government can bring to this coalition is balance between otherwise conflicting elements. The need to preserve the environment, for example, must be balanced with the needs of the people—all of the people. This requires a willingness to work with industry in solving problems, rather than telling us what to do without regard to the practical problems involved with our accomplishing change. It calls for application of the rule of reason to taxation, depreciation, legislation and regulation. It includes the establishment of reasonable deadlines for meeting new or changed regulations.

Most immediately, it calls for a simplification in our relationships with federal, state, and local agencies, not only in regard to pollution, but also in terms of social legislation.

This is a time for understanding. This is a time for reason and responsibility. Now is the time for cooperation.

We all share a common concern about the quality of our environment and about the inequities and injustices which still exist in our system. We all recognize the need for creating more job opportunities, and providing all of our citizens with a level of education, health, welfare, and general well being that is so essential to the quality of life enjoyed by most people in this country. By working together, we can assure continued growth in a healthy direction, if each of us will but keep in mind this observation handed down to us by Daniel Webster: "Nothing will ruin the country if the people themselves will undertake its safety; and nothing can save it if they leave that safety in any hands but their own."

Recognition was given that day to four outstanding leaders by Bill Cofield, president of the Alabama Association of Future Farmers. Those recognized for their efforts in behalf of the rural youth of America were:

First, Fred Stines, chairman, Sponsoring Committee, National FFA Foundation, Inc., and Publisher, Successful Farming, Des Moines, Iowa;

Second, William E. Galbraith, Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.;

Third, Henry G. Van der Eb, president and chief executive officer of the Container Corporation of America, Chicago, Ill.; and

Fourth, Prime F. Osborn III, president, Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co., Jacksonville, Fla.

I would like to take this means to say thank you to all who made this outstanding program possible. The efforts put forth that day point up clearly that our problems can be solved by peaceful demonstrations fulfilling our basic need for communicating with each other. The leadership shown by Mr. W. Thomas Rice and those who cooperated with him in this endeavor is indicative of the type of leadership needed if we are to solve the problems facing us in bringing about "quality environment for the seventies." One railroad's "good neighbor" policy has made a lasting impression.

Cooperating with Seaboard Coast Line Railroad in their all-out efforts in behalf of better living in this decade were: Alabama Association, Future Farmers of America; Alabama Forest Products Association; Alabama Forestry Commission; Alabama Kraft Co.; Bartlett Tree Improvement Co.; Container Corporation of America; Dow Chemical Co.; Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Gulf States Paper Corp.; Hercules Inc.; International Paper Co.; Kimberly-Clark Corp.; Koppers Co., Inc.; Men of Montgomery; Monsanto Co.; Montgomery Chamber of Commerce; National FFA Foundation — Sponsoring Committee; Scott Paper Co.; Southern Forest Institute; Troy Bank & Trust Co.; Troy Chamber of Commerce; Troy State University; Troy State University Band; U.S. Department of Agriculture; U.S.S. Agri-Chemicals Division of United States Steel Corp.; Union Camp Corp.; and W. J. Sorrell, on whose property the program was held.

COMMANDANT U.S. MARINE CORPS
ADDRESSES ARMED FORCES DAY
LUNCHEON, DALLAS, TEX.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the Armed Forces Day luncheon in Dallas, Tex., where Gen. Leonard Chapman, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, delivered the main address. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of General Chapman's remarks:

REMARKS BY GEN. LEONARD F. CHAPMAN, JR.

It's good to be with you today, here in Dallas, here in Texas.

Being a Marine I feel very much at home in Texas. Not that I've ever actually lived here. The closest I've come to the pleasure is the several months I spent in training at the United States Army Field Artillery School up at Fort Sill, in Oklahoma.

Now I want to assure you, I'm not comparing anything outside of Texas with Texas. Marines may claim a tradition of bravery, but we are definitely not foolhardy.

Anyway, my days at Fort Sill were as a young Marine second lieutenant, a very long time ago. So long ago, in fact, I'm not sure that Mister Neiman ever knew Mister Marcus.

No, I don't feel at home in Texas because I've lived here, but because so many Texans have lived as I've lived. I've been a marine for most of my life, and in that time I've known thousands of Marines from Texas. They've all been the very best. In everything they've done they've always set an example of patriotism, courage, and devotion to duty. I think this is because Texans have always been purposeful people, and the Texans I've known as Marines never lost sight of their purpose: service as Marines in the defense of their country.

So this is a good place to be on Armed Forces Day, because I'm here to talk about defense, American defense. And I'm going to talk about service, too; and, ladies and gentlemen, that is our defense.

But in doing this I'm going to try to not talk too much about Texans or Marines, specifically. That would be easy to do. I am a Marine, and it's Marines I know best. You are Texans, and it's Texans you know well. But we share a greater distinction, you and me, and all the people of this land who are the serving and the served. We are Americans. So I'm going to talk about the Americans who serve our defense in all our Armed Forces: the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps. I'm going to talk about the Armed Forces of the United States as a single, effective, and dedicated instrument of American defense. An instrument that is effective, and can remain effective only through dedicated service.

VIETNAM, AN ERA IN HISTORY

To speak of dedicated service in 1971 is to speak of American fighting men in Vietnam. I don't know what historians will say about Vietnam, or how they will say it. But as a Marine, a working member of our American Defense Team, I have seen our team go to Vietnam, I have seen their work, courage, and sacrifice, and I have seen what they have accomplished.

From the coastal sea where both Navy men and Coast Guardsmen served at sea; into the Delta where American Sailors manned and fought their gallant little gunboats and troop carriers, and where American Soldiers fought

an infantry war up to their waists in brown water; to the mountains and plains of the Republic of Vietnam's military Region I, where other American Soldiers and Marines of the III Marine Amphibious Force fought regulars and guerillas alike; and in the sky, where American Airmen flew sortie after sortie—I have seen what these young Americans have accomplished.

Our mission, when we landed there more than six years ago, was to give the people of the Republic of Vietnam the opportunity to determine their own destiny. Our effort in Vietnam was a test, a severe test, to determine the feasibility of halting aggression without the destruction of the aggressor nation. We had no desire to destroy a country. Our mission was to insure that another country would be left to its own determination. This war was an effort to re-establish that self-determination by making it unprofitable for one nation to impose its will on another. But it has taken great restraint and an extremely temperate application of power. The young Americans, through their bravery, dedication, and service have accomplished this.

In 1965 the rivers of the Republic of Vietnam couldn't be fished. The paddies and the fields couldn't be farmed. The outlying communities couldn't be supplied or carry out normal commerce, and the people had three choices: submit, die, or survive in terror.

Most of the time only one of these choices was offered. The blood of thousands of hamlet, village, district, and province leaders ran in the fish-filled rivers. Land, the richest in Asia, lay fallow; denied to the farmers through terror and destruction. Doctors, nurses, teachers, lawyers, and freely elected officials and their families and friends were murdered by the Viet Cong if they showed any promise, or simply as examples in a rule of terror.

The Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam, trying to fight a defensive war within their own boundaries, were at the tactical mercy of an enemy that moved freely back and forth across borders to safe sanctuaries.

But there were no sanctuaries for the people of the Republic of Vietnam. Communities had been cut off. Commerce had stopped moving over roads that were mined and ambushed, or destroyed.

Now, after more than six years of the toughest kind of war—a war fought by strictly one-sided rules—American fighting men are leaving that country. Just as an example of how fast they are leaving: Of a top Marine Corps strength in Vietnam in 1968 of 87,000 Marines; we are now down to 12,000 Marines actually left in that country, and that figure is growing slimmer every day.

And what have we accomplished?

In areas where not long ago combat was a daily occurrence, fishermen ply the rivers, farmers harvest their work, commerce moves, the people speak and vote, and their armed forces defend them.

We call all of this Vietnamization, I don't know what historians will call it.

No, I'm not sure how historians will describe all of this; but of the young Americans who patrolled, flew, guarded, fought, and sacrificed through these six years and more—of these young men they can only say: "They accomplished their mission. They did their duty."

And I'm sure their detractors will also find proper recording.

AFTER VIETNAM, WHAT NEXT

But the war in Vietnam is not yet over. Fighting still goes on, and some American units still do their duty in that country, even though the people of the Republic of Vietnam have taken charge of their destiny.

Now the major issue still stands: And end to armed conflict in Southeast Asia. Well, the quickest path to this hope is successful nego-

tiations in Paris. And every effort is being made there, as elsewhere, to fully begin the President's goal of a generation of peace through meaningful negotiations.

But now, as Vietnamization becomes fact, and work continues toward a truly meaningful dialogue in Paris, we must look to the future. We must look beyond Vietnam.

Since the beginning of our major commitment in Vietnam, more than six years ago, we have seen many changes in our country, and our world. But one thing has not changed, and that's the continuing need for American defense.

Changes in our civilization are not unique to our time. The history of the world is a chronology of change. But history also lists some very realistic facts. In the 5,500 years of recorded history, there have been only 230 years of peace. In the history of our own country, there have not been 20 years in which one of our Armed Forces was not required to be engaged in some military campaign or operation, in the application of American defense.

Recently the National Science Foundation completed a study in the causes of war. The purpose of the study was to develop a thesis for the prevention of armed conflict. The thesis has not yet been developed, but the facts and figures from their study are precise and detailed. In one hundred and fifty years, from 1816 to 1965, there have been 93 international wars. In that same period, counting the Korean War, the United States has had to fight in 6 major wars. At this point I will not make a statement, but will pose a question: What would have happened to our country, and the world, if we had lost any one of those wars?

Because Americans have grown weary of war and the need to defend against armed aggression other nations have not diminished in their power to make war. This is reality.

In facing this reality we must face changes in our country and in our world, but we must also look at what we have done to see clearly what we must do.

Because of our nuclear superiority of the 1950's, we were able to block armed aggression through a strategy of massive retaliation. In the 1960's this was replaced by what was called "assured destruction and flexible response." It was this strategy that gave President Kennedy the ability to make his stand in the Cuban missile crisis. At that time we still had a four or five to one nuclear superiority. And we were unchallenged as the strongest seapower on earth.

But this is the decade of the 1970's. And in this new decade we see neighbors in our uncertain world growing more powerful.

The Soviet Navy challenges our strength at sea in all the corners of the world. And nuclear power for defense is no longer our monopoly. Now, in the 1970's, we need a strategy which can effectively deter not only nuclear war, but all levels of armed conflict. It is this need, faced in the light of reality, that has led our country to adopt *The Strategy of Realistic Deterrence*.

The strategy of the 1970's called realistic because it takes into account all of the major realities facing the United States as a part of a super-modern world. It faces the glaring reality that the United States by itself cannot provide realistic deterrence on a global scale.

The three basic realities that face our Armed Forces in implementing this new strategy are:

Strategic Reality.

Fiscal Reality.

Manpower Reality.

Strategic reality requires taking into full account the tremendous growth in Soviet military and naval strength. From a position of clear inferiority in the early 1960's, to the near parity of today, the Soviet Union has reached a level of armed sophistication in all fields. Primarily a land-based military

force throughout history. Russia now stretches her power in the air, in space, and at sea. This last power is especially significant. Backed up with a full nuclear armory, the new Soviet seapower adds total dimension to Russian influence throughout the world. And in this same area of reality, we must give full value to the emerging nuclear capability of the Peoples Republic of China.

In facing fiscal reality we must accept the fact that American defense costs American dollars. If we are going to fulfill our hope for a full defense and economy, we must be sure we are gaining full quality for every dollar spent.

Manpower reality is the most complex and demanding factor in maintaining our defensive strength. It is a direct result of two things: fiscal reality, and reality of human nature.

On the financial side of manpower we are facing a great deal of expense. In FY 1972, 52 percent of the total defense budget is allocated to military pay and associated recommended pay increases. In the next few years it may well go even higher. By 1974 manpower will take 60¢ of every dollar spent for American defense. This is compared to 43¢ of the defense dollar of 1964.

Even though we are reducing the number of men in uniform, the cost of maintaining a strong, healthy Armed Forces is going up. There is one major reason for this—an end to the draft in the near future.

COUNTING ON VOLUNTEERS

Now speaking strictly as a Marine, an end to the draft does not strike terror among Marines. Marines like their Corps small, though, well disciplined, and certainly all volunteer. In fact the Marine Corps has anxiously awaited the time we could reduce our overall strength. For more than a decade before our commitment in Vietnam, our Corps kept its strength at about 200,000 Marines. The war required that we grow, and grow we did, to a top wartime strength of 317,000. Now we are down to about 212,000 and growing even leaner. And leaner is what we want to be.

We have approval for an eventual tough, lean strength of 206,000 Marines. With this strength we can fully man our three Marine divisions, three Marine aircraft wings, and all supporting units.

With 206,000 active Marines in the three regular Marine divisions and aircraft wings, and 45,000 reserve Marines in the reserve Marine division and aircraft wing, we can keep our fleet Marine Force formations combat ready and still rotate, train, educate, and prepare the individual Marine without sacrificing professional quality. And all Marines know that the key to maintaining professional quality is the individual Marine.

For nearly two centuries we've kept our standards high and our ranks small. We're a tough club to join, a tough team to make. And that's exactly how we're going to keep it. If everyone could be a Marine we wouldn't be "The Marines." We want quality not quantity; we're not looking for a lot of Marines. We want a few good men.

We want men who are proud of their country, and who want to serve it in a proud Corps. We want men who aren't conformists, but who are disciplined individualists who believe in principles because they have made the decision themselves, not followed a fad.

We want good men who know that war isn't a game. We want men who feel that while nobody likes war, or wants war—somebody has to know how to fight to win. We want these good men and we'll make them better.

We're open, and we're looking, for a few good men. And we're finding them.

We're continuing to train Marines the way we've always trained them. No compromises, no shortcuts, no promises except one: They'll be Marines, and all that title bestows. And they'll stand with other men of

that quality, other Marines. And each one will be an individual, one of the few, one of the very finest.

This is the type men we must have in the Marine Corps. By our very nature we must be prepared to fulfill our purpose in the ultimate test of combat. We must be ready to go anywhere, anytime that our Commander in Chief may order. We must be ready to fight anybody in the defense of our country. And we must win.

But as each Armed Force has a separate and distinct mission in the fulfillment of a joint purpose; so too does each service require different qualifications in manpower.

Marines are not insular. You can't hope to be successful in carrying out your tasks in military service if you close yourself to ideas and progress. And the Marine Corps has watched our brother services carefully in their dynamic approach to progressing from a draft oriented manpower pool, to professional volunteers. As a Marine I commend their efforts. They have, each service, carefully inspected their own missions and their own needs. They have systematically and energetically gotten rid of needless habits. And they are building.

What each service builds within itself will no more look like another service than the diverse missions of each Armed Force. We wear different uniforms, we work at different tasks, and we carry out different missions. We are bound to be different in our separate personalities.

DEDICATED SERVICE REQUIRES DEDICATED ATTENTION

Yes, each Armed Force is solving its own problems in its own environment. But there is one area in which we have no control. And that is the oldest, most sacred, and most necessary of all American military traditions. Ladies and Gentlemen, I speak of the good interaction that has always existed between the serving and the served—the dedication of the American fighting man, and his support from the American citizen.

All of the training, discipline, and technical know-how in the universe will not produce an effective Armed Forces without the demonstrated support of the people of this nation. We know that no matter how much we pay, no matter what fringe benefits we offer, we can't buy dedication. If an all-volunteer Armed Force—Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps—is expected to work; it is you and your neighbors all over this land who will make it work, with your respect, with your appreciation, and with your support.

Good service, dedicated service requires constant attention from the served. Service, dedicated service requires constant attention from the served. Service to country is not always treated kindly in our modern America. The same America to which this service is offered. And the young Americans who have given service, who are giving service, and who will give service in the future, must be made to know that their's is a proud calling.

We know that war is still a real and present threat in the 1970's. And we know that positive strength is the basis for *The American Strategy of Realistic Deterrence*. We also know that sure and positive strength can come only through the solidarity of mutual pride and respect. I now ask you for that respect.

There is a short and simple statement that every American repeats when he enters the service of our country. It is this statement, this oath, that begins one side of a pact of service. I know that many of you here have sworn this oath in your own service, but I would like to repeat it here and now:

"I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation

or purpose of evasion; that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties to the office to which assigned; So help me God."

That's the promise of those who serve you. It's a good promise well-kept. I ask you to remember it every time you see a young American in uniform. I ask you to relish his promise to you to accept his service, and to cherish his dedication.

REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, each month our office sends a report to constituents on congressional activities and our May report is included in the *Record* at this point for the record of my colleagues:

BILL SCOTT REPORTS

IMPROVING OUR JUDICIARY

A few weeks ago, I introduced a measure to authorize 6-member juries in both civil and noncapital criminal federal cases. A number of state courts have less than 12 members on the jury and I know of no valid historic reason or magic in the number 12. It appears to have become established in both state and federal systems as a result of the adoption of the common law or legal systems of England in the early days of this country. Reducing the number of jurors would probably reduce court costs, expedite the selection of juries and result in speedier trials. The Supreme Court has upheld the 6-man jury for state courts and 6 members would seem to be able to perform as impartially in determining the guilt or innocence of the accused as 12 members. The Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, personnel of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and others appear to be interested in this measure, and I am hopeful that it will receive early consideration in the Congress. The savings in manpower, money and time seem to merit the adoption of this or a similar measure to improve the administration of justice.

NI RIVER HEARINGS

A number of officials from Spotsylvania County appeared a few days ago before the Subcommittee on Watershed Development of the Committee on Public Works. The Chairman complimented the group on their presentation. This project incorporates both flood control and watershed protection as well as recreation and public water supply. It is expected that the Committee will agree with the county representatives and the Soil Conservation Service to fund the project which is a joint effort by the county and the federal government.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ANNUITY

In October 1969 Congress attempted to strengthen the soundness of the retirement fund for civilian government employees, and revised a provision of existing law for periodic cost of living increases in annuities. Under present law, an employee has to retire prior to the effective date of an increase in order to obtain the benefits of the increase. The House, however, has recently considered and passed a measure to provide that an employee who retires after the effective date of the increase shall not receive a lesser annuity than if he had retired prior to the effective date. At present, the Civil Service Commission has to process a large number of retirement requests on approximately the effective date of the cost of living increase and the gov-

ernment agencies lose large numbers of employees at approximately the same time. It therefore appears to be in the government interest to have retirement dates spread over a longer period of time and employees should benefit by receiving their annuity checks more promptly.

Another provision of the measure requires the new Postal Service, which employs approximately one quarter of all Federal employees, to contribute to the retirement fund amounts similar to those appropriated by Congress for other government employees whenever there is any increase of employee benefits. The importance of this provision can be realized by the fact that eight laws passed since October 1969, require additional government contributions into the fund and total more than \$436 million. Maintaining fiscal soundness of the retirement fund is essential and unless the new Postal Service contributes its fair share, the soundness of the fund will be in jeopardy. Because the Senate passed bill does not include this second provision a conference is necessary and final passage of the bill will be apparently delayed for several weeks.

ABANDONED AUTOMOBILES

In an effort to help remove auto junk yards and relieve the drain on our iron ore reserves, I have cosponsored a bill which would encourage states to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and provide tax incentives for automobile scrap processing. This bill would earmark \$19 million annually to be derived from the Federal auto excise tax, as an aid to the states to finance collection programs. The second feature would be to provide tax benefits to scrap processors who install modern scrap-ping equipment capable of handling a large volume of cars, turning them into high quality scrap without polluting the environment. Through this two-pronged program, it is hoped that the abandoned auto will not remain simply an eyesore, but will become a resource, contributing to new production.

MARCH ON THE CAPITOL

The demonstrators who came to Washington a few weeks ago to close down the government had little success. I talked with a group of high school students and a separate group of college students and was glad to hear their points of views. It is, of course, proper for any citizen to discuss his views with his elected representative, but as pointed out to them, our annual survey gives me a general idea as to the views of most of the people of the District on most matters coming before the Congress. Of course, blocking the entrances to government buildings, destroying property, chanting obscenities, and attempting to prevent employees from going to work, in my opinion, is without justification. Rather than being helpful to government representatives and officials it is disruptive in nature and may give aid and comfort to our enemies. In fact, division in this country and certainly militant activity, may cause the Communist world to believe that the United States is no longer a significant deterrent to its ambitions. It is distressing to see anyone marching on the Capitol carrying the Vietcong flag while we have American troops fighting in Vietnam. Therefore, I have joined with others in introducing a measure to make it a Federal crime to carry the flag of the enemy so long as our troops are involved in the hostilities in Southeast Asia.

BETTER COMMUNICATION

Forty-eight colleagues from both parties have joined me in sponsoring legislation to facilitate direct communications between officers and employees of the Postal Service and Members of Congress. While most people agree that partisan politics should be eliminated from the operation of the Post Office, recent directives by the Postmaster General have prohibited postal employees and officials

from talking with Members of Congress regarding the operation of the Postal Service. This seems inconsistent with Congress overseeing the operation of a government agency employing more than 700,000 people and also appears to be an infringement on the rights of employees and officials as citizens to talk with their elected representatives. Committee hearings are not being held.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Minor bills that have passed the House recently include the following: 1. A measure authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to distribute to the states and territories a pro rata balance of unclaimed postal savings deposits with a provision for retaining a sufficient balance to satisfy future claims; 2. A bill to allow U.S. flag vessels to operate flexibly by permitting foreign flag ships on a reciprocity basis to carry between points within this country export or import cargo which has been transferred between one barge and another; 3. An amendment to the law to increase the outstanding loan ceiling of the Small Business Administration from \$2.2 billion to \$3.1 billion; 4. A bill to increase the ceiling for expenditures of the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse authorization from \$1 million to \$4 million; 5. A measure to create a data system to provide for efficient development and utilization of information to support wise and equitable management of our environment; 6. A measure to make it a criminal offense to shoot birds from aircraft.

PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

Past Supreme Court decisions have been interpreted as banning prayer in public schools, but as far back as 1865, U.S. coins began to be stamped "In God We Trust". By law, all our coins are now so inscribed. And the words "under God" were officially made part of our pledge of allegiance to the flag in 1954 when President Eisenhower signed a Joint Resolution of Congress into law. Because I share with most of you the strong belief that it is fitting for us to acknowledge and reaffirm from time to time our faith and trust in God, I have signed a discharge petition to bring before the House for consideration a proposed amendment to the Constitution to permit nondenominational prayers in schools and other buildings supported by public funds.

SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS

You can note the diversity among the following speaking engagements:

- May 27—Keynote speech at Republican Convention, Front Royal.
- May 28—Fairfax Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars installation dinner.
- May 29—Babe Ruth Baseball League, Springfield.
- May 30—Veterans Day talk at Mt. Zion Methodist Church, Leesburg.
- June 4—Address graduating class, Criminal Investigation Division, Metropolitan Police.
- June 6—Baccalaureate talk at Oakton High School.
- June 10—Graduation speaker at Brentsville District High School.
- June 12—Parade Marshal, Shrine Ceremonial, Manassas.
- June 13—Flag Day Service, Post 139, Arlington American Legion.
- June 15—Ruritan Club talk on Ladies Night, Warsaw.
- June 19—Address state convention of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, Roanoke.

NEW PAMPHLET

The office has received copies of a revised edition of a 45-page pamphlet, "Our American Government, What is it? How does it function?" which might be helpful to students or others desiring to become more familiar with the operation of the Federal government.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

"To inform the minds of the people, and to follow their will, is the chief duty of those placed at their head"—Thomas Jefferson.

TRUDEAU, ANOTHER CASTRO IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American continent is now threatened with a new troika, Trudeau, Castro, and Brezhnev.

As far back as July 9, 1968, I had told this body that Trudeau was a security threat not only to Canada, but to the free world. See also my remarks entitled, "Communist Encirclement of the United States,"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 4201-4207.

The New York communications people and financiers, the same ones that helped enslave Cuba under Castro, just never learn and had to repeat their mistake by misleading the Canadian people into electing Trudeau. Or was it an error?

Now we read reports that Mr. Trudeau is in Moscow collaborating with his fellow socialists, Kosygin and Brezhnev, and entering into blood pacts pledging our Canadian neighbors into the Soviet international bloc to save the world from the "overpowering presence" of the United States.

One can only hope that the press of Canada is free to report to the Canadian people the antics and gyrations of their Prime Minister, the perverted puppet Pierre. If the Canadian people are informed and are concerned about any danger to their culture, economy, and national defense, they know it is not from the United States, but rather from the U.S.S.R., and the latest Castro in the Western Hemisphere.

I think the Canadians will know how to handle little Pierre.

I ask that a newsclipping be inserted at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Friday, May 21, 1971]

TRUDEAU SEEKS SOVIET TIES TO COUNTER U.S. INFLUENCE

(By Anthony Astrachan)

Moscow.—Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau said today that his visit to the Soviet Union was motivated by concern that the "overpowering presence" of the United States posed dangers "to our national identity from a cultural, economic and perhaps even military point of view."

Therefore, he said, Canada sought "to diversify our points of contact with significant powers of the world."

Trudeau signed an agreement yesterday for regular contacts and consultations with the Soviet Union, including once a year on foreign-ministerial level, covering everything from cultural exchange to threats to peace. The protocol establishes a relationship similar to the one between the Soviet Union and France.

The premier told a press conference today that this agreement did not imperil Canada's

membership of the NATO and NORAD alliances. He drew analogies between his own foreign policy, the West German policy of rapprochement with Eastern Europe, and the U.S.-Soviet strategic arms limitation talks.

He said regular contacts with the Soviets "might permit us to arrive at as independent an opinion on world affairs as we can possibly formulate." He compared the contacts to Canada's decision to remain in NATO to order "to discuss a variety of subjects not only with our close neighbor, but with our other friends and allies in NATO."

Trudeau faces a strong wave of anti-Americanism at home. His foreign policy reflects a determination to prove Canada's status in the world despite its closeness to the U.S. and despite the impairment of its old relationship with Britain as the latter enters the Common Market.

The premier acknowledged at the press conference that Canada would "talk to its friends" whenever that might reduce international tensions, but repeated several times that he had no interest in carrying messages or acting as an "honest broker" between the great powers.

Nonetheless Soviet party leader Brezhnev and Premier Kosygin made Trudeau their sounding-board for the theme that it was time for the Western allies to take them up on reduction of armed forces in Central Europe. Brezhnev proposed such reductions in his speech to the 24th party congress March 30 and again in Tbilisi last Friday.

Trudeau said today that Brezhnev, during their meeting yesterday, added little in the way of specifics to his two speeches. Canadian sources said the premier and his chief aides pressed the Soviets for specifics without success.

Brezhnev said "Ways can be found to get negotiations going once general agreement has been reached that they should take place," the sources added.

Trudeau told the press conference that the West could "consider these proposals of the Soviet Union in all earnestness and neglect no avenue at all which might be open toward a halt or reduction in the arms race."

The prime minister asserted Canada's interest in force reductions in its own right. He recalled that Canada has phased out the nuclear role of its aircraft in NATO and withdrawn its troops from Europe, moves he said the Soviet leaders had praised. He said Canada had pushed for "multilateral and balanced force reductions" both in NATO and at the disarmament talks in Geneva and would continue to do so.

Western Communist sources said Brezhnev had decided to meet Trudeau personally after careful perusal of the prime minister's speech at the luncheon Kosygin gave him on Tuesday.

In that speech, Trudeau emphasized the Soviet-Canadian relationship as Arctic neighbors and countries trying to develop their respective northern territories; the fact that both countries included peoples of different races and nationalities, and the two countries "equal" concern with peace and security in Europe.

On the question of northern and Arctic interests, Trudeau told the press conference that Ottawa favored an international conference while Moscow preferred bilateral talks. His conversations here had not changed that.

He said he could not yet assess the value of what Canada could learn from the Soviets in this area, but that he was particularly interested in the Soviet Union's "advanced technology" in running gas and oil pipelines through permafrost.

Trudeau went to Kiev today the first stop

on a tour of five Soviet cities including Norilsk and Murmansk on the Arctic.

NOISE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Organization To Insure a Sound-Controlled Environment—NOISE—was established to combat the growing menace of jet aircraft noise.

NOISE began in Washington, D.C., in October of 1969 when the town of Hempstead, N.Y., and the city of Inglewood, Calif., jointly sponsored a 2-day symposium on the hazards of aircraft noise. This symposium was attended by more than 150 delegates from 23 States. These delegates represented local governments whose citizens suffered the intolerable burden of aircraft noise, political leaders cognizant of the fact that noise is a major environmental hazard facing our Nation, medical groups which were increasingly aware of the severe physical and mental dangers of noise pollution, and wildlife agencies fearing the extinction of certain species of animals as a result of the sterilizing effect of the shrill whine of jet engines.

At the conclusion of this symposium the delegates were agreed that there was great need for the establishment of a national organization dedicated to the control of aircraft noise. Thus, NOISE was formed.

This past January, NOISE held its first national symposium in Los Angeles, Calif., and on May 19, 20, and 21, 1971, returned to the Nation's Capital for its national convention, under the leadership of NOISE president Ralph G. Caso, county executive, Nassau County, N.Y.; Vice President William Goedike; Secretary John Varble, mayor, Bensenville, Ill.; and Treasurer Stanley W. Olson, mayor, Richfield, Minn.

As a Member of Congress long concerned with the problems of noise and its hazards, I am very pleased that I was able to participate in this meeting. The national convention of NOISE passed four resolutions petitioning the Congress to take specific actions to abate aircraft noise. I commend these resolutions to my colleagues for their consideration.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION No. 1

(In re Federal certification of airports with respect to the nature and number of operations and the resultant aircraft noise exposure)

To: The President, the Congress, the Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of the Housing and Urban Development, the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

1. Whereas, Pursuant to enactment of the Aircraft Noise Certification Act of 1968 (P.L.

90-411), the Congress determined that noise occurring due to the operation of jet aircraft constitutes serious derogation of environmental quality in hundreds of communities in the United States, and

2. Whereas, Pursuant to enactment of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, etc., the Congress has established a requirement for the inclusion of relevant environmental factors in the further development of the national airport system, and

3. Whereas, Pursuant to enactment of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, the Congress established the requirement that safety standards be adopted as criterion for civil airport certification, and

4. Whereas, Pursuant to enactment of the Aircraft Noise Certification Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-411), the Congress expressed its desire to provide "both present and future" relief of high aircraft noise levels, and

5. Whereas, The aircraft engine and airplane manufacturers, the NASA and the FAA have developed engine and aircraft designs which are quieter than previous aircraft and have developed and are developing operating procedures for take off and landing which produce less noise under the flight paths than present aircraft, and the benefits of some of these developments have been known for several years and have not been utilized in airline aircraft design and operating procedures.

Therefore, Be it resolved that the Congress be petitioned to amend P.L. 91-258 (the Airport and Airway Act of 1970) by adding to the safety requirements for civil airport certification the requirement that specified aircraft noise exposure forecast (NEF) contours near take off and landing flight paths be limited to locations within specified boundaries, and, further,

Be it resolved that the amendment also require that in the future a scheduled step by step reduction of aircraft NEF levels within the specified boundaries be achieved as a condition for the retention of existing air transportation services.

RESOLUTION No. 2

(In re a Federal Government requirement for jet aircraft operating procedures and other measures necessary for the abatement of noise.)

To: The President, the Congress, the Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, the Secretary of Transportation, the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

1. Whereas, Pursuant to enactment of the Aircraft Noise Certification Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-411), the Congress determined that noise occurring due to the operation of jet aircraft constitutes serious derogation of environmental quality in hundreds of communities in the United States, and

2. Whereas, Pursuant to enactment of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, the Congress has established a requirement for the inclusion of all relevant environmental factors in further development of the national airport system, and

3. Whereas, it has long been established that the manner in which jet aircraft are operated during takeoff and landing has significant effect upon noise exposure heard on

the ground, with such procedures designed for reduced noise not derogating safety, and

4. Whereas, in 1965, the President established the Interagency Aircraft Noise Abatement Program through which aircraft operating procedures, number of day and night jet operations and other measures were identified as having both short and long term benefits in reducing noise exposure upon people in airport communities, and

5. Whereas, the Report of the President's Airport Commission, (Doolittle Commission 1952), together with the report of the Task Force on National Aviation Goals, 1961-70 (Project Horizon), each identified the growing problem of community exposure to high aircraft noise levels and recommended measures needed to reduce existing noise problems as well as prevent their arising in the future, and

6. Whereas, through enactment of Public Law 90-411 in 1968, the Congress expressed its intention that the Federal Aviation Administration would implement measures needed for "present" as well as "future" relief from excessive exposure to aircraft noise, and

7. Whereas, the Federal Aviation Administration is unable to meet its responsibility for "the protection of persons and property on the ground" (Federal Aviation Act of 1958, Section 307(c)) due to its primary and pervasive mission of promoting air commerce resulting in exclusion of considerations of environmental quality, now

Therefore, Be it resolved that Congress is hereby petitioned to authorize and require the Environmental Protection Agency to establish, for the relief of airport neighbors, noise exposure forecast (NEF) contours which must be maintained within specified boundaries near airports, after consulting with the President's Council on Environmental Quality, the Secretaries of the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education and Welfare, Interior, and Transportation and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

RESOLUTION No. 3

(In re acoustic retrofit of existing civil jet aircraft)

To: The President, the Congress, the Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of the Housing and Urban Development, the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

1. Whereas, Pursuant to enactment of the Aircraft Noise Certification Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-411), the Congress determined that noise occurring due to the operation of jet aircraft constitutes serious derogation of environmental quality in hundreds of communities in the United States, and

2. Whereas, Pursuant to enactment of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, the Congress has established a requirement for the inclusion of all relevant environmental factors in further development of the national airport system, and

3. Whereas, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and others have determined the technical and economic feasibility of acoustically retrofitting existing civil aircraft engine nacelles thereby providing substantial noise reduction particularly during approach to landing the most noisy phase of flight, and

4. Whereas, Through investigation of a variety of measures applicable to the resolution

of airport/community's problems arising from high aircraft noise exposure levels, NOISE has determined that no one measure such as acoustic retrofit will in itself resolve the airport/community problems attributable to aircraft noise, now

Therefore, Be it resolved that the Congress be petitioned to authorize and require that the Environmental Protection Agency establish NEF limits in areas near airports with the full recognition of the benefits to be attained through the application of acoustic retrofit, together with other measures which can be taken to reduce aircraft noise, and

Be it further resolved that in recognition of the economic impact of such a program, all methods of financing including a surcharge to be applied directly to the users of air transportation services, be explored by the CAB.

RESOLUTION No. 4

(In re responsibility for the protection of residents from exposure to high aircraft noise levels.)

To: NOISE Membership and other concerned airport/community officials.

Whereas, NOISE was established to investigate and seek implementation

1. Whereas, NOISE was established to investigate and seek implementation of all available measures for the relief of aircraft noise exposure upon airport/community residents, and

2. Whereas, Through investigation of all applicable measures needed to reduce airport/community exposure to high aircraft noise levels, NOISE has determined that controls upon land use development in the vicinity of major airports are essential, and

3. Whereas, NOISE has determined that it is necessary to implement local, regional and statewide land use planning by utilizing zoning, building code ordinances, subdivision regulations, official maps as well as other land use controls, and

4. Whereas, even though municipal, regional and state officials are aware of the existence of derogatory environmental factors associated with aircraft operations near major airports they have been unable to persuade the governing bodies of these local communities to establish zoning, building code ordinances, subdivision regulations, etc., to protect the people in these areas near airports from unacceptable levels of aircraft noise exposure, and

5. Whereas, financial incentives are effective in persuading land owners to accept land use constraints or to make land use conversions thereby removing the barriers to the establishment of the local laws, codes, or ordinances mentioned above, and

6. Whereas, the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970 provides a means whereby funds are obtained from the air transportation system for the improvements and expansion of airports, which will then accommodate increased numbers of aircraft operations which may in turn increase the aircraft noise exposure in areas near these airports, and

7. Whereas, the noise exposure resulting from aircraft operations at many airports is higher than considered acceptable for residential land use, thus imposing a severe burden on those living in these high aircraft noise exposure areas, and

8. Whereas, the policy has been established by the various government agencies, including DOT and HUD that air transportation must be handled as a system with the economic, social and health effects on the community under the take off and approach flight paths being given the same support and protection as the aircraft and airports, now

1. Therefore Be it resolved that Congress be petitioned to amend P.L. 91-258 (the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970) by adding the provision that before any funds be made available for the improvement or expansion of an airport, funds be made available to the communities surrounding the airport to compensate land owners for damages due to high aircraft noise exposure, and further

2. Be it resolved that as a condition of this compensation the local governmental bodies shall establish zoning, building code ordinances, subdivision regulations, etc. which will prohibit the establishment of new non-conforming land uses in areas predicted to be subject to high aircraft noise exposure levels for the foreseeable future and will provide for the gradual conversion of land in the high aircraft noise exposure areas to conforming uses, and, further

3. Be it resolved that (1) a basis for compensation for constraints on the use of land in areas of high aircraft noise exposure levels and, (2) model zoning laws, building codes, ordinances and subdivision regulations be developed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for use in implementing the legislation called for in 1 and 2 above.

ANNUAL PILGRIMAGE TO THE ALAMO

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, each year in my home city of San Antonio there is a celebration in observance of Texas Independence in April.

In connection with this celebration there is an annual pilgrimage to the Alamo, the shrine of Texas independence, which is located in downtown San Antonio.

At the ceremonies at this year's pilgrimage, Lt. Gen. G. V. Underwood, Jr., Commanding General, 4th U.S. Army, gave an address which I feel members of this body will appreciate my sharing with them. General Underwood's address is as follows:

ANNUAL PILGRIMAGE TO THE ALAMO

I am delighted indeed to have the opportunity to represent the Armed Forces in this colorful observance of the Pilgrimage to the Alamo.

This is certainly an exemplary way to commemorate the matchless valor of those courageous defenders of the Alamo who wrote with their own blood a timeless, three-fold message for all Americans. First, the Alamo is a stirring reminder that those who wish to be free have a right to be free. Secondly, the Alamo reminds us that a nation frequently depends upon its soldiers for its safety and survival. Finally, the willingness of these brave men to fight to the finish in the cause of freedom is a grim reminder that freedom is not a self-preserving entity—that, instead, the preservation of freedom requires constant devotion, alertness to ever-present threats, and readiness to defend it at all costs against all comers.

I can think of no more appropriate place to reflect upon these truths than the Alamo, the hallowed spot where resolute men backed their belief in freedom with their very lives. I can think of no more appropriate

time for such reflection because the validity of these truths is being directly challenged by some frustrated or misguided segments of our society. And so, although there are few such Americans in Texas, I choose this place and this occasion to comment upon the need to revive that reverence for freedom and patriotism that characterized America through so many, great years of its history.

In our land today basic concepts of patriotism are flaunted arrogantly by those who contemptuously burn the flag. The value of national service is attacked symbolically by those who surreptitiously evade military duty. The worth of our way of life and system of government is sullied by those who insist upon the right to elevate self-interest above national interest. And the fundamental belief in law and order which has been a guiding precept of this nation is challenged outright by some who claim the right to burn, bomb, and loot with immunity as a means of redressing real or imagined grievances.

Fortunately, those who feel and act in this fashion are still in the minority. But I suggest that the time has come for those who really care to wake up and speak up in support of the old and still valid virtues of patriotism, devotion to country and respect for the rights and property of others.

This is an ideal day and a suitable place to spark the rebirth of faith in America and support of those who serve it selflessly, decently and constructively. Let me therefore suggest a set of deeply-held personal beliefs that I know are embraced and endorsed by so many Texans.

I, for one, am not ashamed of my country's historic concern for the right of other nations to be free, sovereign and independent. I, for one, do not apologize for my country's long-standing belief that people who wish to be free have a right to be free. And I will not attack my country for having answered muster when freedom's frontiers were challenged by aggressors and subverters. Moreover, I will not lose faith in our system of government because of manifest imperfections. Instead, I will remember Winston Churchill's observation that: "Democracy is the worst form of government except all others."

I will make excuses to no man for the thrill I feel when the Stars and Stripes are unfurled. And, I will applaud openly that many Americans who willingly serve their country whenever or wherever it calls them to duty. At the same time, I will reject those who are more charitable with the enemy than with their own government. Finally, I will salute those whose concern for America is expressed in constructive proposals rather than destructive outbursts.

In expressing these views, I believe I reflect the thinking of most Americans. But quiet thoughts are not enough if we are to sustain the values and ideals for which men like Travis, Bowie, Crockett, and Bonham have fought through the years and which are under subtle attack in some noisy quarters today. The right to organize and sound off is not limited to those who wish to dissent or protest. So the point I would make is that the need is great and the time is past due for Americans to reassert their faith in America, their pride in America's accomplishments, and their devotion to the principles of patriotism, loyalty and unity. To do so would be a truly meaningful way of keeping faith with the bright example of the Alamo.

Before closing, I wish to comment candidly on a related subject, one which concerns the American serviceman of today more than many Americans realize and more than most soldiers care to reveal. I refer to

the disturbing anti-military trend which is developing in our society.

Before doing so, I want to emphasize that the concerns I am expressing today are not directed at this audience, for your very presence here today bespeaks your interest in freedom and those who are dedicated to safeguarding the nation. I really am looking beyond this audience and out of this state to other people and other places where the situation is quite different. I offer my thoughts to this audience in the hope that you will find them appealing and useful.

I hope, too, that you will not consider me out-of-order for discussing anti-militarism in the shadow of the Alamo. As we commemorate those who fought with such unforgettable valor in the name of freedom in 1836, I think it wholly consistent to contemplate briefly the need of the Armed Forces for assurance that their efforts to serve the nation in the cause of freedom are still valued and supported by their countrymen in 1971.

My concern arises from the fact that it is becoming fashionable to criticize the Armed Forces for many of the problems which beset the nation, such as the vexing war in Vietnam, the heavy draft, and the onerous budget. As part of the process, the military is attacked regularly but vaguely as a conspiring member of an industry-military complex that is supposedly seeking to manipulate the economy and the government for selfish purposes.

I do not accept for one moment that these criticisms represent the true feeling of the typical American citizen about his Armed Forces. To a certain extent these anti-military outbursts represent perhaps the subconscious need of our society for a whipping boy. And lashing the military is turning out to be a convenient way for some Americans to work off their frustrations over the war, the draft, taxes, or whatever.

I raise this subject not because of any naive belief that the Armed Forces should be immune from the kind of healthy criticism that purifies and strengthens a democratic society. Rather, I raise this subject because of my concern that the Armed Forces in general and the Army in particular may be damaged to the detriment of the nation by the uncharitable, anti-military attitudes that are developing in our time.

Speaking of the Army, which I know best, an Army is conditioned by the society it represents. A good Army is one that can attract men of quality to adopt military careers as a means of serving their nation honorably. But how, I ask, can men of quality and dedication be drawn into a Volunteer Army, if that Army is belittled and ridiculed by increasing numbers of fellow-Americans? I do not say we are at that point, but I caution that the anti-militarism which is building could in time, if unchecked, undermine the very incentive for military service—and if that ever happens, a priceless national asset will go down the drain and the country will indeed be in trouble.

I am speaking out today because I think it is time someone spoke up for the soldier, the Army, and the Armed Forces. I think it is high time that we be reminded, for example, that the Army has served this nation well for 195 years in time of war and in peacetime emergencies. This is an Army that has never failed the nation in a crisis, an Army that has lived faithfully by its exacting motto of Duty, Honor, Country. This is an Army that has produced great leaders when they were needed most—men like Pershing, MacArthur, Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley, Taylor, Ridgway, Lemnitzer, Wheeler, Johnson, Westmoreland, and Abrams. This is an Army that has shown great forbearance and commendable restraint and patience in performing

painful, domestic disturbance duty. This is an Army that has maintained its morale, its cohesiveness and its sense of purpose in spite of the harsh divisiveness within our society. And this is an Army which knows the meaning of sacrifice in the spirit of the great heroes of the Alamo.

My suggestion, therefore, is that criticism of the military be tempered with appreciation of their sacrifices and accomplishments on behalf of the nation. My plea is that the militaryman be recognized for what he is—a meritorious individual who by and large is doing his best and doing it quite selflessly. My hope is that in the midst of the mounting anti-militarism we will not lose sight of the continuing need of the nation for strong Armed Forces that can attract wholesome men of quality who will carry on the military heritage of service to the nation.

In short and in summary, let the zeal for noisy dissent and criticism which is so rampant in our national life be restrained by quiet acknowledgment of the national asset which our Armed Forces represent. Certainly, this would be a realistic way to demonstrate that Americans do indeed "Remember the Alamo."

NEW YORK CITY POLICEMEN SAVAGELY ATTACKED

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night two New York City patrolmen—one black, one white—were shot from behind and killed in a savage, unprovoked attack.

This incident was one of four armed attacks on policemen in 3 days.

Thus far this year, seven New York City policemen have been killed and 30 wounded. The number killed has, in 5 months, exceeded the number killed in all of 1970 and the number wounded is two-thirds of the number wounded in that same year.

This madness must stop. No civilized community can long endure if savage attacks of this kind continue.

Whether the attacks which occurred last week were part of an organized plot or whether they were simply coincidental is not the point. The point is that attacks upon policemen are becoming ever more frequent and bold and they are contributing to the fear and terror which grips citizens living in urban areas. The attacks represent one more contribution to the decline of our cities.

New York City commissioner of police, Patrick V. Murphy, has responded to the attacks in a meaningful and hopefully effective manner.

The Federal Government must do its part.

We must reexamine our gun control laws in order to keep guns out of the hands of the criminally insane, the mentally deranged, and the ordinary criminal.

We must consider the use of the Federal criminal law to bring the full power of the Federal Government to bear against punks and hoodlums who attack

local policemen, as well as firemen and sanitation workers.

We must continue to conduct research into the best means of engaging the community on the side of the police. We must utilize better technology to give our police on the beat and in the patrol cars the kind of gun detection and alarm devices now used at airports.

The National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in the Department of Justice must be given funds now to meet the problem of wanton and unprovoked attacks on police, firemen, and sanitation workers.

The time for breast beating and hand wringing is over.

BIG BUS BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the following report of the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety on its Safety Bus Inspection program is the one to which I referred in my 1-minute speech earlier today:

[Annual report calendar year 1970]

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS—SAFETY BUS INSPECTION PROGRAM

FOREWORD

In the summer of 1970, following a number of severe accidents involving buses in interstate operation, the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety sharply increased its bus inspection activities. A total of 5,902 buses engaged in interstate passenger service had been inspected by the end of the year, and each of these inspections was covered by an individual detailed report. More than 90 percent of the year's inspections were made after the late summer decision to accelerate the inspection program.

A brief interim report dealing with buses removed from service because of hazardous defective conditions, was released late in November 1970. The present report covers all bus inspections made during 1970, in much greater detail.

Vehicles inspected in this program were not chosen on a selective basis. The inspections were made at bus terminals, at resort areas, and at various points of special interest where passengers were discharged and the vehicles parked for a substantial period, or at the end of a run. These vehicles either had been, or were at the time of inspection, committed to specific over-the-road movements carrying passengers. However, by inspecting at these locations, any inconvenience to passengers was held to a minimum. These buses, therefore, comprise an unselected sample of the interstate bus industry of the country.

The bus inspection, and road-check programs are integral parts of the Bureau's continuing effort to achieve greater safety of interstate commercial motor carrier operations. Factual information, such as found in this report, provides guidance for the Bureau's activities designed to keep the safety regulations relevant to current needs, and to achieve a high degree of compliance with them. These reports also should be used by carriers in developing and administering their own maintenance and other safety programs, and by designers and manufacturers of equipment used by carriers.

Detailed tables report the numbers of inspections and the results of those inspections, for scheduled and for chartered buses in each of the nine Motor Carrier Regions, and for the country as a whole. Data are given on defects and out-of-service defects in each specific equipment area. The textual portion of the report is based on these tables and on the individual reports from which they were developed.

ROBERT A. KAYE,

Director, Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety.

SPECIAL TERMS DEFINED

The tables and text of this report use a number of common terms to convey special meanings, as follows:

Brake Application System. A service brake application system (on a bus with air brakes) comprises the air compressor, metal tubing and flexible hoses with their fittings and couplings, compressed air tanks, valves of various kinds, gauges, wheel brake chambers, and closely related parts including devices for mounting and protecting the entire system. Corresponding components comprise vacuum and hydraulic brake application systems.

Foundation Brakes. This term is used to denote all mechanical parts of the brake system, from the slack adjusters to the brake drums, including cams, shoes, and linings, and closely associated parts.

Out-of-Service Defect. This is a defect of such type and degree as to render a vehicle imminently hazardous to operate until repaired. More than one such defect may be reported for a single vehicle.

All Defects. This term includes both out-of-service defects and lesser defects which do not result in vehicles being removed from service.

The heading "Per 100 Buses" is used with Out-of-Service Defects to mean "per 100 buses ordered out of service", and with All Defects to mean "per 100 buses inspected" or "per 100 buses ordered out of service", as apparent from the context.

Tire defects have been classified as *Shallow-tread* when wear has removed a substantial part of the skid-resistant tread configuration, or a *Structural Damage* when the structural strength of the tire has been substantially reduced by cuts, impact, excessive wear, etc.

The term *Wheel Proper* denotes the basic wheel, comprising rim, "spokes" and hubs, as contrasted with such associated parts as lugs, stud-bolts, wheel bearings, etc.

Bus body defects have been classified as either *condition* defects, inadequate maintenance of the usual body features including doors, windows (broken glass), floors, seats, etc., or defective body safety features, which embrace jammed push-out windows, lack of a standee line with appropriate sign, windshield wipers, etc.

"Accessories for Safety and Emergencies" relates to certain kinds of equipment not part of the vehicle itself, such as fire extinguishers and fire axe, tire chains, first-aid kits, emergency warning devices for stopped vehicles, etc.

SAFETY BUS INSPECTION PROGRAM—CALENDAR YEAR 1970

During 1970, investigators of the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety inspected 5,902 buses engaged in interstate transportation of passengers, and ordered that 688 (11.6 percent) of them be taken out of service on the spot because of defects which, it has been determined, render a vehicle imminently hazardous to operate. These defects were required to be repaired before the buses left the check point. Other, less hazardous defects were required to be repaired, and certification of this to be submitted by the carrier within 15 days.

Buses were inspected at terminals and also at points of historic, scenic, recreational and other kinds of special interest, where many chartered vehicles had discharged their passengers and were waiting to resume their runs. Those engaged in regular scheduled operations comprised 64.8 percent of all buses inspected, and 67.7 percent of those ordered out of service. Chartered buses accounted for the remaining 35.2 percent of vehicles inspected and 32.6 percent of those removed from service.

In 182 instances it was reported that no defect was found on an inspected bus. This was at the rate of 13.9 defect-free buses per 100 inspected. The corresponding rate for scheduled buses was 4.7 without defects per 100 and, for chartered buses, 30.9 per 100.

Defects of all kinds totaled 11,726, or 198.1 per 100 buses. The total defect rate for scheduled buses was 185.2 per 100 and for charter operations, 218.0 per 100 buses. These comparisons are more clearly depicted in the following brief table.

	All buses	Scheduled	Chartered
Buses inspected:			
Number	5,902	3,894	2,078
Percent	100.0	64.8	35.2
Buses out of service:			
Total number	688	462	226
Number per 100 inspected	11.7	12.1	10.9
Defects reported:			
Total number	11,726	7,195	4,531
Number per 100 buses	198.7	185.2	218.0
Buses with no defect:			
Total number	821	179	642
Number per 100 inspected	13.9	4.7	30.9

Detailed information about the check results is carried in 20 pages of tables with 2 pages devoted to data for each of the 9 regions, and 2 to combined data for all regions. Each of these tables has 3 sections, one for scheduled operations, one for chartered operations, and one for the combined total. In addition to data on vehicle and other equipment defects, these tables list driver violations reported by our investigators. These driver violations, combined in a single column of the tables, includes such offenses as driving without a doctor's certificate of physical fitness, driving or remaining on duty beyond the maximum permissible hours, not keeping a daily log as required, making false entries on daily logs, not preparing vehicle condition reports as required, etc.

Among the areas in which large numbers of defects were reported, was the system of application of service brakes. Total defects in this area were 1,794 (15.3 percent of all equipment defects found). And within this area 394 defects were deemed of such serious character as to warrant removing the vehicle from operation until repaired. These 394 out-of-service defects comprised 47.1 percent of the 836 out-of-service defect total. Brake application system defects include air leaks in flexible hoses, and tubes, and in valves and fittings, etc. Also under this heading are faulty low air pressure warning devices.

In contrast, of 2,101 instances of defective safety features of bus bodies, which comprised 17.9 percent of all reported defects, only 2 were out-of-service defects. This amounted to .2 percent of the out-of-service total. These safety features consist of such things as the standee line and an explanatory sign, push-out window mechanisms and posted instructions for opening such windows in an emergency, a red light over the emergency door, windshield wipers, etc.

A comparison of total defects with out-of-service defects, for each defect area, is made in the list on the following page.

Kind of defect	All defects		Out-of-service-defects		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent of all defects
Total.....	11,726	100.0	836	100.0	7.1
Brake application system.....	1,794	15.3	394	47.1	22.0
Foundation brakes.....	17	.1	7	.8	41.2
Parking brakes.....	87	.7	40	4.8	46.0
Shallow tire tread.....	557	4.8	7	.8	1.3
Structural tire damage.....	327	2.8	36	4.3	11.0
Wheel proper damage.....	137	1.2	73	8.7	53.3
Lugs, studs, etc.....	305	2.6	18	2.2	5.9
Steering system.....	128	1.1	25	3.0	19.5

Kind of defect	All defects		Out-of-service-defects		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent of all defects
Suspension system.....	45	0.4	3	0.4	7.0
Exhaust system.....	218	1.9	102	12.2	46.8
Engine (starting).....	50	.4	43	5.1	86.0
Fuel system.....	33	.3	18	2.2	54.5
Stop lamps.....	270	2.3	61	7.3	22.6
All other lamps.....	1,466	12.5	1	.1	.07
Body condition.....	1,066	9.1	2	.2	.2
Body safety features.....	2,101	17.9	2	.2	.1
Other vehicle areas.....	1,130	9.6	4	.5	.4
Accessories for safety.....	1,995	17.0			

This listing clearly shows that some defects which occur frequently do not ordinarily pose imminent threats of accident, while others found less often are threatening in a large proportion of the cases. For instance, 1,066 body defects such as broken window and windshield glass, loose seats, holes in the floor, etc. resulted in but two buses taken out of service. However, 17 foundation brake defects were of out-of-service severity in seven instances. Exhaust and fuel system defects, damaged wheels and faulty parking brakes, all are serious conditions in a large proportion of total occurrences.

The percentage of buses ordered out-of-service varied substantially from region to region, from a low point of 8.4 percent out-of-service in Region 7, to a high of 18.0 in Region 5. The following listing shows this variation in greater detail:

Region	Buses inspected		Buses out of service	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All regions.....	5,902	688	11.7	
1.....	1,346	132	9.8	
2.....	870	113	13.0	
3.....	1,017	131	12.9	
4.....	750	64	8.5	
5.....	484	87	18.0	
6.....	452	53	11.7	
7.....	383	32	8.4	
8.....	265	35	13.2	
9.....	335	41	12.2	

The out-of-service bus is not simply a fleet unit which, in the course of a run, developed mechanical trouble which chanced to fall in one of the areas which affect safety most imminently. On the contrary, it clearly is a vehicle which has been less adequately maintained over a period of time, and has developed a multiplicity of defects in addition to that which rendered it unfit to be operated beyond the check point. Below are listed

figures taken from the regional tables of this report, showing the numbers of defects of all kinds per hundred vehicles inspected, compared with the number of such defects per hundred buses ordered out of service. In every region defects on out-of-service buses were substantially more numerous than on the generality of buses inspected.

Region number	All defects found	
	Per hundred inspections	Per hundred buses out of service
All regions.....	198.7	340.1
1.....	232.3	369.7
2.....	216.5	353.1
3.....	214.1	390.1
4.....	214.8	314.1
5.....	200.8	278.2
6.....	152.9	356.6
7.....	112.5	234.4
8.....	222.5	322.9
9.....	193.4	297.6

BUSES INSPECTED, SHOWING NUMBER ORDERED OUT OF SERVICE AND NUMBER OF DEFECTS BY TYPE OF OPERATION AND KIND OF DEFECT—CALENDAR YEAR 1970

	Equipment defects												
	Buses Involved	Brakes				Tires		Wheels			Steering systems	Suspension systems	Exhaust systems
		Total	Service		Parking	Shallow tread	Structural damage	Wheel proper	Lugs, studs, etc.				
			Application systems	Founda- tion									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Buses inspected.....	304												
All defects (number).....		549	67		8	29	17	10	17		2	14	
Per 100 buses.....		180.6	22.0		2.6	9.5	5.6	3.3	5.6		.7	4.6	
Buses out of service.....	36												
All defects (number).....		121	23		6	2	4	4	2		1	11	
Per 100 buses.....		336.1	63.9		16.7	5.6	11.1	11.1	5.6		3.1	30.6	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		40	14		6	3	2	2	2			10	
Per 100 buses.....		111.1	38.9		16.7	8.3	5.6	5.6	5.6			27.8	
CHARTERED SERVICE													
Buses inspected.....	2,078												
All defects (number).....		4,531	539	7	21	233	125	32	127	67	18	98	
Per 100 buses.....		218.0	25.9	.3	1.0	11.2	6.0	1.5	6.1	3.2	.9	4.7	
Buses out of service.....	226												
All defects (number).....		810	179	3	12	49	20	22	26	21	6	45	
Per 100 buses.....		358.4	79.2	1.3	5.3	21.7	8.8	9.7	11.5	9.3	2.7	19.9	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		278	125	3	12	5	8	21	7	16	1	40	
Per 100 buses.....		123.0	55.3	1.3	5.3	2.2	3.5	9.3	3.1	7.1	.4	17.7	
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED													
Buses inspected.....	5,902												
All defects (number).....		11,726	1,794	17	87	557	327	137	305	128	45	218	
Per 100 buses.....		198.7	30.4	.3	1.5	9.4	5.5	2.3	5.2	2.2	.8	3.7	
Buses out of service.....	688												
All defects (number).....		2,340	568	9	42	105	75	90	58	39	10	113	
Per 100 buses.....		340.1	82.6	1.3	6.1	15.3	10.9	13.1	8.4	5.7	1.5	16.4	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		836	394	7	40	7	36	73	18	25	3	102	
Per 100 buses.....		121.5	57.3	1.0	5.8	1.0	5.2	10.6	2.6	3.6	.4	4.8	

ALL REGIONS—B

Equipment defects

	Body										Total: all defects and violations
	Engine (starting)	Fuel system	Lamps		Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc.	Safety features: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc.	Other areas of the vehicle	Accessories for safety and emergencies	Driver violations		
			Stop lamps	All other lamps							
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
SCHEDULED SERVICE											
Buses inspected:											
All defects (number).....	32	29	183	999	648	1,155	754	1,047	1,185	8,380	
Per 100 buses.....	.8	.8	4.8	26.1	16.9	30.2	19.7	27.4	31.0	219.1	
Buses out of service:											
All defects (number).....	290	18	74	157	88	183	105	150	153	1,683	
Per 100 buses.....	6.3	3.9	16.0	34.0	19.0	39.6	22.7	32.5	33.1	364.3	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....	28	16	40	1		2	4				
Per 100 buses.....	6.1	3.5	8.7	.2		.4	.9				
CHARTERED SERVICE											
Buses inspected:											
All defects (number).....	18	4	87	467	418	946	376	948	1,536	6,067	
Per 100 buses.....	.9	.2	4.2	22.5	20.1	45.5	18.1	45.6	73.9	292.0	
Buses out of service:											
All defects (number).....	15	2	33	73	51	92	53	108	151	961	
Per 100 buses.....	6.6	.9	14.6	32.3	22.6	40.7	23.5	47.8	66.8	425.2	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....	15	2	21		2						
Per 100 buses.....	6.6	.9	9.3		.9						
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED											
Buses inspected:											
All defects (number).....	50	33	270	1,466	1,066	2,101	1,130	1,995	2,721	14,447	
Per 100 buses.....	.8	.6	4.6	24.8	18.1	35.6	19.1	33.8	63.0	244.8	
Buses out of service:											
All defects (number).....	44	20	107	230	139	275	158	258	304	2,644	
Per 100 buses.....	6.4	2.9	15.6	33.4	20.2	40.0	23.0	37.5	44.2	384.3	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....	43	18	61	1	2	2	4				
Per 100 buses.....	6.2	2.6	8.9	.1	.3	.3	.6				

REGION 1—A

Equipment defects

	Buses involved	Brakes				Tires		Wheels			Steering systems	Suspension systems	Exhaust systems
		Total	Service		Parking	Shallow tread	Structural damage	Wheel proper	Lugs, studs, etc.				
			Application systems	Foundation									
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	
SCHEDULED SERVICE													
Buses inspected.....	763												
All defects, number.....		1,326.0	138.0		7.0	53.0	39.0	13.0	28.0	7.0	9.0	20.0	
Per 100 buses.....		173.8	18.1		.9	6.9	5.1	1.7	3.7	.9	1.2	2.6	
Buses out of service.....	85												
All defects, number.....		288.0	57.0		6.0	11.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	3.0	1.0	16.0	
Per 100 buses.....		338.8	67.1		7.1	12.9	9.4	11.8	4.7	3.5	1.2	18.8	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		97.0	43.0		6.0		4.0	6.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	16.0	
Per 100 buses.....		114.1	50.6		7.1		4.7	7.1	3.5	1.2	1.2	18.8	
CHARTERED SERVICE													
Buses inspected.....	583												
All defects, number.....		1,397.0	75.0	2.0	4.0	89.0	36.0	2.0	16.0	37.0	8.0	13.0	
Per 100 buses.....		239.6	12.9	.3	.7	15.3	6.2	.3	2.7	6.3	1.4	2.2	
Buses out of service.....	47												
All defects, number.....		200.0	35.0	1.0	2.0	18.0		1.0	6.0	14.0	3.0	8.0	
Per 100 buses.....		425.5	74.5	2.1	4.3	38.3		2.1	12.8	29.8	6.4	17.0	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		64.0	27.0	1.0	2.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	12.0		6.0	
Per 100 buses.....		136.2	57.4	2.1	4.3	2.1		2.1	2.1	25.5		12.8	
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED													
Buses inspected.....	1,346												
All defects, number.....		2,723.0	213.0	2.0	11.0	142.0	75.0	15.0	44.0	44.0	17.0	33.0	
Per 100 buses.....		202.3	15.8	.1	.8	10.5	5.6	1.1	3.3	3.3	1.3	2.5	
Buses out of service.....	132												
All defects, number.....		488.0	92.0	1.0	8.0	29.0	8.0	11.0	10.0	17.0	4.0	24.0	
Per 100 buses.....		369.7	69.7	.8	6.1	22.0	6.1	8.3	7.6	12.9	3.0	18.2	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		161.0	70.0	1.0	8.0	1.0	4.0	7.0	4.0	13.0	7.0	22.0	
Per 100 buses.....		122.0	53.0	.8	6.1	.8	3.0	5.3	3.0	9.8	.8	16.7	

REGIONS 1—B

	Equipment defects											Total: all defects and violations
	Body											
	Engine (starting)	Fuel system	Lamps	Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc.	Safety features: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc.	Other areas of the vehicle	Accessories for safety and emergencies	Driver violations				
			Stop lamps							All other lamps		
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		
SCHEDULED SERVICE												
Buses inspected:												
All defects (number).....	3	3	42	197	168	171	124	304	319	1,645		
Per 100 buses.....	.4	.4	5.5	25.8	2.20	22.4	16.3	16.3	41.8	215.6		
Buses out of service:												
All defects (number).....	3.0	2	19	30	29	28	20	41	31	319		
Per 100 buses.....	3.5	2.4	22.4	24.5	34.1	34.1	32.9	23.9	36.5	375.3		
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	3	2	10				2					
Per 100 buses.....	3.5	2.4	11.8				2.4					
CHARTERED SERVICE												
Buses inspected:												
All defects (number).....	4		27	139	133	301	83	428	467	1,864		
Per 100 buses.....	.7		4.6	23.8	22.8	51.6	1.2	73.4	80.1	319.7		
Buses out of service:												
All defects (number).....	3		11	17	12	23	16	30	35	235		
Per 100 buses.....	6.4		23.4	36.2	25.5	48.9	24.0	63.8	74.5	500.0		
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	3		10									
Per 100 buses.....	6.4		21.3									
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED												
Buses inspected:												
All defects (number).....	7	3	69	336	301	472	207	732	786	3,509		
Per 100 buses.....	.5	.2	5.1	25.0	22.4	35.1	15.4	54.4	58.4	260.7		
Buses out of service:												
All defects (number).....	6	2	30	47	41	51	36	71	66	554		
Per 100 buses.....	4.5	1.5	22.7	3.6	3.11	38.6	27.3	53.8	50.0	419.7		
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	6	2	20				2					
Per 100 buses.....	4.5	1.5	15.2				1.5					

BUSES INSPECTED, SHOWING NUMBER ORDERED OUT OF SERVICE AND NUMBER OF DEFECTS BY TYPE OF OPERATION AND KIND OF DEFECT—CALENDAR YEAR 1970

ALL REGIONS—A

	Equipment defects												
	Buses involved	Brakes				Tires		Wheels			Steering systems	Suspension systems	Exhaust systems
		Total	Service		Parking	Shallow tread	Structural damage	Wheel proper	Lugs, studs, etc.				
			Application systems	Founda-tion									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
SCHEDULED SERVICE													
Buses inspected.....	2,824												
All defects (number).....		7,195	1,255	10	66	324	202	105	178	61	27	120	
Per 100 buses.....		185.2	32.8	.3	1.7	8.5	5.3	2.8	4.7	1.6	.7	3.1	
Buses out of service.....	462												
All defects (number).....		1,530	389	6	30	56	55	68	32	18	4	58	
Per 100 buses.....		331.2	84.2	1.3	6.5	12.1	11.9	14.7	6.9	3.9	.9	14.7	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		552	259	4	28	2	28	52	11	9	2	52	
Per 100 buses.....		120.8	58.2	.9	6.1	.4	6.1	11.3	2.4	1.9	.4	12.4	
CHARTERED SERVICE													
Buses inspected.....	566												
All defects (number).....		1,335	183	2	4	72	44	15	52	12	3	32	
Per 100 buses.....		235.9	32.3	.4	.7	12.7	7.8	2.7	9.2	2.1	.5	5.7	
Buses out of service.....	77												
All defects (number).....		278	47	1	4	19	11	12	13	4	2	23	
Per 100 buses.....		361.0	61.0	1.3	5.2	24.7	14.3	15.6	16.9	5.2	2.6	29.9	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		89	32	1	4		4	11	3	4	1	21	
Per 100 buses.....		115.6	41.6	1.3	5.2		5.2	14.3	3.9	5.2	1.3	27.3	
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED													
Buses inspected.....	870												
All defects (number).....		1,884	250	2	12	101	61	25	69	12	5	46	
Per 100 buses.....		216.5	28.7	.2	1.4	11.6	7.0	2.9	7.9	1.4	.6	5.3	
Buses out of service.....	113												
All defects (number).....		399	70	1	10	21	15	16	15	4	3	34	
Per 100 buses.....		353.1	61.9	.9	8.8	18.6	13.3	14.2	13.3	3.5	2.7	30.1	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		129	46	1	10		7	13	5	4	1	31	
Per 100 buses.....		114.2	40.7	.9	8.8		6.2	11.5	4.4	3.5	.9	27.4	

REGION 2-B

Equipment defects

	Engine (starting)	Fuel system	Lamps		Bus		Body		Other areas of the vehicle	Accessories for safety and emergencies	Driver violations	Total, all defects and violations
			Stop lamps	All other lamps	Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc.	Safety fea- tures: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc.						
	13	14	15	16	17	18			19	20	21	22
SCHEDULED SERVICE												
Buses inspected:												
All defects (number).....	2		11	66	49	94		68	95		84	633
Per 100 buses.....	.7		3.6	21.7	16.1	30.9		22.4	31.2		27.6	208.2
Buses out of service:												
All defects (number).....	1		5	14	7	16		10	15		12	133
Per 100 buses.....	2.8		13.9	38.9	19.4	44.4		27.8	41.7		33.3	369.4
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	1		2									
Per 100 buses.....	2.8		5.6									
CHARTERED SERVICE												
Buses inspected:												
All defects (number).....	5	1	21	118	119	296		100	256		416	1,751
Per 100 buses.....	.9	.2	3.7	20.8	21.0	52.3		17.7	45.2		73.5	309.3
Buses out of service:												
All defects (number).....	5	1	4	26	22	35		11	38		57	335
Per 100 buses.....	6.5	1.3	5.2	33.8	28.6	45.5		14.3	49.4		74.0	435.1
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	5	1	2									
Per 100 buses.....	6.5	1.3	2.6									
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED												
Buses inspected:												
All defects (number).....	7	1	32	184	168	390		168	351		500	2,384
Per 100 buses.....	.8	.1	3.7	31.1	19.3	44.8		19.3	40.3		57.5	274.0
Buses out of service:												
All defects (number).....	6	1	9	40	29	51		21	53		69	468
Per 100 buses.....	5.3	.9	8.0	35.4	25.7	45.1		18.6	46.9		61.1	414.2
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	6	1	4									
Per 100 buses.....	5.6	.9	3.5									

BUSES INSPECTED—SHOWING NUMBER ORDERED OUT OF SERVICE AND NUMBER OF DEFECTS BY TYPE OF OPERATION AND KIND OF DEFECT—CALENDAR YEAR 1970

REGION 3-A

	Buses Involved	Total	Brakes		Parking	Tires		Wheel proper	Lugs, studs, etc.	Steering systems	Suspension systems	Exhaust systems
			Service	Foundation		Shallow tread	Structural damage					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
SCHEDULED SERVICE												
Buses inspected.....	898											
All defects (number).....		1,928	360	1	22	125	58	59	49	31		7
Per 100 buses.....		214.7	40.1	.1	2.4	13.9	6.5	6.6	5.5	3.5		.8
Buses out of service.....	119											
All defects (number).....		466	113		6	34	21	36	11	9		7
Per 100 buses.....		391.6	95.0		5.0	28.6	17.6	30.3	9.2	7.6		5.9
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....		145	69		4		7	29	3	3		9
Per 100 buses.....		121.8	58.0		3.4		5.9	24.4	2.5	2.5		5.0
CHARTERED SERVICE												
Buses inspected.....	119											
All defects (number).....		249	30	2	4	6	5	3	12	1	1	2
Per 100 buses.....		209.2	25.2	1.7	3.4	5.0	4.2	2.0	10.1	.8	.8	1.7
Buses out of service.....	12											
All defects (number).....		45	8	1	1			1	1	1		1
Per 100 buses.....		375.0	66.7	8.3	8.3			8.3	8.3	8.3		8.3
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....		13	6	1	1			1				1
Per 100 buses.....		108.3	50.0	8.3	8.3			8.3				8.3
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED												
Buses inspected.....	1,017											
All defects (number).....		2,177	390	3	26	131	63	62	61	32	1	9
Per 100 buses.....		214.1	38.3	.3	2.6	12.9	6.2	6.1	6.0	3.1	.1	.9
Buses out of service.....	131											
All defects (number).....		511	121	1	7	34	21	37	12	10		8
Per 100 buses.....		390.1	92.4	.8	5.3	26.0	16.0	28.2	9.2	7.6		6.1
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....		158	75	1	5		7	30	3	3		7
Per 100 buses.....		120.6	57.3	.8	3.8		5.3	22.9	2.3	2.3		5.3

REGION 3—B

Equipment defects

	Equipment defects											Total: all defects and violations	
	Body												
	Engine (starting)	Fuel systems	Lamps	All other lamps	Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc.	Safety features: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc.	Other areas of the vehicle	Accessories for safety and emergencies	Driver violations				
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22			
SCHEDULED SERVICE													
Buses inspected:													
All defects—Number	7	9	45	222	187	379	160	207	280		2,208		
Per 100 buses	.8	1.0	5.0	24.7	20.8	42.2	17.8	23.1	31.2		2.54		
Buses out of service:													
All defects—Number	7	4	20	46	27	61	35	29	39		505		
Per 100 buses	5.9	3.4	16.8	38.7	22.7	51.3	29.4	24.4	32.8		424.4		
Out-of-service defects:													
Number	7	3	12				2						
Per 100 buses	5.9	2.5	10.1				1.7						
CHARTERED SERVICE													
Buses inspected:													
All defects—Number	2	1	3	35	26	39	26	51	96		345		
Per 100 buses	1.7	.8	2.5	29.4	21.8	32.8	21.8	42.8	80.7		289.9		
Buses out of service:													
All defects—Number	2		2	7	4	5	3	8	11		56		
Per 100 buses	16.7		16.7	58.3	33.3	41.7	25.0	66.7	91.7		466.7		
Out-of-service defects:													
Number	2		1										
Per 100 buses	16.7		8.3										
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED													
Buses inspected:													
All defects—Number	9	10	48	257	213	418	186	258	376		2,553		
Per 100 buses	.9	1.0	4.7	25.3	20.9	41.1	18.3	25.4	37.0		251.0		
Buses out of service:													
All defects—Number	9	4	22	53	31	66	38	37	50		561		
Per 100 buses	6.9	3.1	16.8	40.5	23.7	50.4	29.0	28.2	38.2		428.2		
Out-of-service defects:													
Number	9	3	13				2						
Per 100 buses	6.9	2.3	9.9				1.5						

REGION 4—A

Equipment defects

	Buses involved	Brakes				Tires		Wheels			Steering systems	Suspension systems	Exhaust systems
		Service			Parking	Shallow tread	Structural damage	Wheel proper	Lugs, studs, etc.				
		Total	Application systems	Foundation									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
SCHEDULED SERVICE													
Buses inspected.....	526												
All defects—number.....		1,015	139		8	23	49		18	5	9	36	
Per 100 buses.....		193.0	26.4		1.5	4.4	9.3		3.4	1.0	1.7	6.8	
Buses out of service.....	45												
All defects—number.....		117	26				14		2			4	
Per 100 buses.....		260.0	57.8				31.1		4.4			8.9	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		55	26				9		1			4	
Per 100 buses.....		122.2	57.8				20.0		2.2			8.9	
CHARTERED SERVICE													
Buses inspected.....	224												
All defects—number.....		596	47	1	1	33	24	1	15	10	5	33	
Per 100 buses.....		266.1	21.0	.4	.4	14.7	10.7	.4	6.7	4.5	2.2	14.7	
Buses out of service.....	19												
All defects—number.....		84	13			3	6	1	2	1	1	7	
Per 100 buses.....		442.1	68.4			15.8	31.6	5.3	10.5	5.3	5.3	36.8	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		23	11			2	2	1				7	
Per 100 buses.....		121.1	57.9			10.5	5.3	5.3				36.8	
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED													
Buses inspected.....	750												
All defects—number.....		1,611	186	1	9	56	73	1	33	15	14	69	
Per 100 buses.....		214.8	24.8	.1	1.2	7.5	9.7	.1	4.4	2.0	1.9	9.2	
Buses out of service.....	64												
All defects—number.....		201	39			3	20	1	4	1	1	11	
Per 100 buses.....		314.1	60.9			4.7	31.3	1.6	6.3	1.6	1.6	17.2	
Out-of-service defects:													
Number.....		78	37			11	11	1	1			11	
Per 100 buses.....		121.9	57.8			17.2	17.2	1.6	1.6			17.2	

REGION 4—B

Equipment defects

	Equipment defects										Total: all defects and violations
	Engine (starting)	Fuel system	Lamps		Body			Other areas of the vehicle	Accessories for safety and emergencies	Driver violations	
			Stop lamps	All other lamps	Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc.	Safety features: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc.					
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
SCHEDULED SERVICE											
Buses inspected:											
All defects—Number.....	5	7	28	181	93	114	177	123	182	1,197	
Per 100 buses.....	1.0	1.3	5.3	34.4	17.7	21.7	33.7	23.4	34.6	227.6	
Buses out of service:											
All defects—Number.....	4	7	7	25	3	11	5	9	20	137	
Per 100 buses.....	8.9	15.6	15.6	55.6	6.7	24.4	11.1	20.0	44.4	304.4	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....	4	7	3	1							
Per 100 buses.....	8.9	15.6	6.7	2.2							
CHARTERED SERVICE											
Buses inspected:											
All defects—Number.....	1	1	7	58	75	116	73	95	231	827	
Per 100 buses.....	.4	.4	3.1	25.9	33.5	51.8	32.6	42.4	103.1	369.2	
Buses out of service:											
All defects—Number.....			4	6	3	8	12	17	15	99	
Per 100 buses.....			21.1	31.6	15.8	42.1	63.2	89.5	78.9	521.0	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....			2								
Per 100 buses.....			10.5								
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED											
Buses inspected:											
All defects—Number.....	6	8	35	239	168	230	250	218	413	2,024	
Per 100 buses.....	.8	1.1	4.7	31.9	22.4	30.7	33.3	29.1	55.1	269.9	
Buses out of service:											
All defects—Number.....	4	7	11	31	6	19	17	26	35	236	
Per 100 buses.....	6.3	10.9	17.2	48.4	9.4	29.7	26.6	40.6	54.7	368.8	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....	4	7	5	1							
Per 100 buses.....	6.3	10.9	7.8	1.6							

REGION 5—A

Equipment defects

	Equipment defects											
	Brakes				Tires		Wheels		Lugs, studs, etc.	Steering systems	Suspension systems	Exhaust systems
	Service		Parking	Shallow tread	Structural damage	Wheel proper						
Buses involved	Total	Application systems					Foundation					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
SCHEDULED SERVICE												
Buses inspected:	334											
All defects—Number.....	691	185	6	7	26	22	1	12	6	2	10	
Per 100 buses.....	206.9	55.4	1.8	2.1	7.8	6.6	.3	3.6	1.8	.4	3.0	
Buses out of service:	60											
All defects—Number.....	168	66	3	5	2	5	1	1	1	1	3	
Per 100 buses.....	280.0	110.0	5.0	8.3	3.3	8.3	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	5.0	
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	77	52	3	5		3	1		1		3	
Per 100 buses.....	128.3	86.7	5.0	8.3		5.0	1.7		1.7		5.0	
CHARTERED SERVICE												
Buses inspected:	150											
All defects—Number.....	281	85		1	14	6		9	1		4	
Per 100 buses.....	187.3	56.7		.7	9.3	4.0		6.0	.7		2.7	
Buses out of service:	27											
All defects—Number.....	74	36		1	1	1			1		3	
Per 100 buses.....	274.1	133.3		3.7	3.7	3.7			3.7		11.1	
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	31	21		1		1			1		3	
Per 100 buses.....	114.8	77.8		3.7		3.7			1.1		11.1	
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED												
Buses inspected:	484											
All defects—Number.....	972	270	6	8	40	28	1	21	7	2	1	
Per 100 buses.....	200.8	55.8	1.2	1.6	8.3	5.8	.2	4.3	1.4	.4	2.9	
Buses out of service:	87											
All defects—Number.....	242	102	3	6	3	6	1	1	2	1	6	
Per 100 buses.....	278.2	117.2	3.4	6.9	3.4	6.9	1.1	1.1	2.3	1.1	6.9	
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	108	73	3	6		4	1		1		6	
Per 100 buses.....	124.1	83.9	3.4	6.9		4.6	1.1		1.1		6.9	

REGION 5-B

Equipment defects										
	Bus					Body				
	Engine (starting)	Fuel systems	Lamps	Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc.	Safety features: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc.	Other areas of the vehicle	Accessories for safety and emergencies	Driver violations	Total: all defects and violations	
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
SCHEDULED SERVICE										
Buses inspected.....	9	3	16	84	20	134	53	95	99	790
All defects—number.....	2.7	.9	4.8	25.1	6.0	40.1	15.9	28.4	29.6	236.5
Per 100 buses.....										
Buses out of service.....	8		3	12	7	26	9	15	19	187
All defects—number.....	13.3		5.0	20.0	11.7	43.3	15.0	25.0	31.7	311.7
Per 100 buses.....										
Out-of-service defects:										
Number.....	7		2							
Per 100 buses.....	11.7		3.3							
CHARTERED SERVICE										
Buses inspected.....	5		5	28	6	58	28	30	82	363
All defects—number.....	3.3		4.0	18.7	4.0	38.7	18.7	20.0	54.7	342.0
Per 100 buses.....										
Buses out of service.....	4		2	6		8	7	4	16	90
All defects—number.....	14.8		7.4	22.2		29.7	25.9	14.8	59.3	333.3
Per 100 buses.....										
Out-of-service defects:										
Number.....	4		1							
Per 100 buses.....	14.8		3.7							
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED										
Buses inspected.....	14	3	22	112	26	192	81	125	181	1,153
All defects—number.....	2.9	.6	4.5	23.1	5.4	39.7	16.7	25.8	37.4	238.2
Per 100 buses.....										
Buses out of service.....	12		5	8	7	34	16	19	35	277
All defects—number.....	13.8		5.7	20.7	8.0	39.1	18.4	21.8	40.2	318.4
Per 100 buses.....										
Out-of-service defects:										
Number.....	11		3							
Per 100 buses.....	12.6		3.4							

REGION 6-A

Equipment defects											
	Brakes				Tires		Wheels				
	Service				Shallow tread	Structural damage	Wheel proper	Lugs, studs, etc.	Steering systems	Suspension systems	Exhaust systems
	Buses involved	Total	Application systems	Foundation							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
SCHEDULED SERVICE											
Buses inspected.....	420										
All defects—number.....		634	144	1	7	25	7	5	38	3	
Per 100 buses.....		150.9	34.3	.2	1.7	6.0	1.7	1.2	9.0	.7	
Buses out of service.....	48										
All defects—number.....		169	46	1	5	4	1	5	9	3	
Per 100 buses.....		352.1	95.8	2.1	10.4	8.3	2.1	10.4	18.7	6.2	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....		57	32	1	5	2		5	1	3	
Per 100 buses.....		118.7	66.7	2.1	10.4	4.2		10.4	2.1	6.2	
CHARTERED SERVICE											
Buses inspected.....	32										
All defects—number.....		57	16						1		
Per 100 buses.....		178.1	50.0						3.1		
Buses out of service.....	5										
All defects—number.....		20	5								
Per 100 buses.....		400.0	100.0								
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....		7	5								
Per 100 buses.....		140.0	100.0								
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED											
Buses inspected.....	452										
All defects—number.....		691	160	1	7	25	7	5	39	3	
Per 100 buses.....		152.9	35.4	.2	1.5	5.5	1.5	1.1	8.6	.7	
Buses out of service.....	53										
All defects—number.....		189	51	1	5	4	1	5	9	3	
Per 100 buses.....		356.6	96.2	1.9	9.4	7.5	1.9	9.4	17.0	5.7	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....		64	37	1	5	2		5	1	3	
Per 100 buses.....		120.7	69.8	1.9	9.4	3.8		9.4	1.9	5.7	

REGION 6-B

Equipment defects

	Equipment defects											Total: all defects and violations
	Engine (starting)	Fuel system	Lamps		Bus Body			Other areas of the vehicle	Accessories for safety and emergencies	Driver violations		
			Stop lamps	All other lamps	Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc.	Safety features: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc.						
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22		
SCHEDULED SERVICE												
Buses inspected:												
All defects, number.....	2	3	18	130	24	84	37	106	41	675		
Per 100 buses.....	.5	.7	4.3	31.0	5.7	20.0	8.8	25.2	9.8	160.7		
Buses out of service:												
All defects, number.....	2	3	5	24	2	21	14	24	14	183		
Per 100 buses.....	4.2	6.2	10.4	50.0	4.2	43.7	29.2	50.0	29.2	381.2		
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	2	3	3									
Per 100 buses.....	4.2	6.2	6.2									
CHARTERED SERVICE												
Buses inspected:												
All defects, number.....		1	3	11	4	12	4	5	4	61		
Per 100 buses.....		3.1	9.4	34.4	12.5	37.5	12.5	15.6	12.5	190.6		
Buses out of service:												
All defects, number.....		1	2	5		3	2	2		20		
Per 100 buses.....		20.0	40.0	100.0		60.0	40.0	40.0		400.0		
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....		1	1									
Per 100 buses.....		20.0	20.0									
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED												
Buses inspected:												
All defects, number.....	2	4	21	141	28	96	41	111	45	736		
Per 100 buses.....	.4	.9	4.6	31.2	6.2	21.2	9.1	24.6	1.0	162.8		
Buses out of service:												
All defects, number.....	2	4	7	29	2	24	16	26	14	203		
Per 100 buses.....	3.8	7.5	13.2	54.7	3.8	45.3	30.2	49.1	26.4	383.0		
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	2	4	4									
Per 100 buses.....	3.8	7.5	7.5									

REGION 7-A

Equipment defects

	Equipment defects											Exhaust systems
	Buses involved	Brakes		Tires		Wheels		Steering systems	Suspension systems			
		Service										
	Total	Application systems	Foundation	Parking	Shallow tread	Structural damage	Wheel proper	Lugs, studs, etc.				
(1)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
SCHEDULED SERVICE												
Buses inspected.....	225											
All defects—number.....		251	56		5		7	12	2	1		
Per 100 buses.....		111.6	24.9		2.2		3.1	5.3	.9	.4		
Buses out of service.....	16											
All defects—number.....		33	14				4	2	1	1		
Per 100 buses.....		206.3	87.5				25.0	12.5	6.3	6.3		
Out-of-service defects.....												
Number.....		23	14				4	1	1	1		
Per 100 buses.....		143.8	87.5				25.0	6.3	6.3	6.3		
CHARTERED SERVICE												
Buses inspected.....	158											
All defects—number.....		180	41		1	3	3	6	1	6		
Per 100 buses.....		113.9	25.9		.6	1.9	3.2	3.8	.6	3.8		
Buses out of service.....	16											
All defects—number.....		42	16		1	2	2	2		1		
Per 100 buses.....		262.5	100.0		6.3	12.5	12.5	12.5		6.3		
Out-of-service defects.....												
Number.....		25	15		1	1	1	2		1		
Per 100 buses.....		156.3	93.8		6.3	6.3	6.3	12.5		6.3		
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED												
Buses inspected.....	383											
All defects—number.....		431	97		1	8	5	10	3	1		
Per 100 buses.....		112.5	25.3		.3	2.1	1.3	2.6	.8	.3		
Buses out of service.....	32											
All defects—number.....		75	30		1	2	2	6	2	1		
Per 100 buses.....		234.4	93.8		3.1	6.3	6.3	18.8	6.3	3.1		
Out-of-service defects.....												
Number.....		48	29		1	1	1	6	1	1		
Per 100 buses.....		150.0	90.6		3.1	3.1	3.1	18.8	3.1	3.1		

REGION 7-B

Equipment defects

	Engine (starting)	Fuel system	Lamps		Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc.	Body Safety fea- tures: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc.	Other areas of the vehicle	Accessories for safety and emergencies	Driver violations	Total: all defects and violations
			Stop lamps	All other lamps						
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
SCHEDULED SERVICE										
Buses inspected:										
All defects (number).....		1	4	47	17	39	24	36	39	290
Per 100 buses.....		.4	1.8	20.9	7.6	17.3	10.7	16.0	17.3	128.0
Buses out of service:										
All defects (number).....		1	2		1	2		5	3	36
Per 100 buses.....		6.3	12.5		6.3	12.5		31.3	18.8	225.0
Out-of-service defects:										
Number.....		1	1							
Per 100 buses.....		6.3	6.3							
CHARTERED SERVICE										
Buses inspected:										
All defects (number).....			6	22	21	10	26	29	99	279
Per 100 buses.....			3.8	13.9	13.3	6.3	16.5	18.4	62.7	176.6
Buses out of service:										
All defects (number).....			4	1	6		1	6	10	52
Per 100 buses.....			25.0	6.3	37.5		6.3	37.5	62.5	325.0
Out-of-service defects:										
Number.....			2		2					
Per 100 buses.....			12.5		12.5					
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED										
Buses inspected:										
All defects (number).....		1	10	69	38	49	50	65	138	569
Per 100 buses.....		.3	2.6	18.0	9.9	12.8	13.1	17.0	36.0	148.6
Buses out of service:										
All defects (number).....		1	6	1	7	2	1	11	13	88
Per 100 buses.....		3.1	18.8	3.1	21.9	6.3	3.1	34.4	40.6	275.0
Out-of-service defects:										
Number.....		1	3		2					
Per 100 buses.....		3.1	9.4		6.3					

REGION 8-A

Equipment defects

	Buses Involved	Brakes				Tires		Wheels			Lugs, studs, etc.	Steering systems	Suspension systems	Exhaust systems
		Total	Service		Parking	Shallow tread	Structural damage	Wheel proper						
			Application systems	Founda- tion										
		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
SCHEDULED SERVICE														
Buses inspected.....	194													
All defects, number.....		442	122	2	1	22	7	4	1	4	4	28		
Per 100 buses.....		227.8	62.9	1.0	.5	11.3	3.6	2.1	.5	2.1	2.1	14.4		
Buses out of service.....	30													
All defects, number.....		93	29	2				2	1	1		25		
Per 100 buses.....		310	96.7	6.7				6.7	3.3	3.3		83.3		
Out-of-service defects:														
Number.....		41	12					1				23		
Per 100 buses.....		136.7	40.0					3.3				76.7		
CHARTERED SERVICE														
Buses inspected.....	71													
All defects, number.....		147	22		1	8	5	4	3	4	1	4		
Per 100 buses.....		207.0	31.0		1.4	11.3	7.0	5.6	4.2	5.6	1.4	5.6		
Buses out of service.....	5													
All defects, number.....		20	8			2		1	1			2		
Per 100 buses.....		400.0	160.0			40.0		20.0	20.0			40.0		
Out-of-service defects:														
Number.....		7	3			1		1	1			0		
Per 100 buses.....		140.0	60.0			20.0		20.0	20.0			20.1		
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED														
Buses inspected.....	265													
All defects, number.....		589	144	2	2	30	12	8	4	8	5	32		
Per 100 buses.....		222.3	54.3	.8	.8	11.3	4.5	3.0	1.5	3.0	1.9	12.1		
Buses out of service.....	35													
All defects, number.....		113	37	2		2		3	2	1		27		
Per 100 buses.....		322.9	105.7	5.7		5.7		8.6	5.7	2.9		77.1		
Out-of-service defects:														
Number.....		48	15			1		2	1			24		
Per 100 buses.....		137.1	42.9			2.9		5.7	2.9			68.6		

REGION 8-B

Equipment defects

	Equipment defects										Total: all defects and violations
	Engine (starting)	Fuel systems	Lamps		Body			Other areas of the vehicle	Accessories for safety and emergencies	Driver violations	
			Stop lamps	All other lamps	Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc.	Safety features: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc.					
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
SCHEDULED SERVICE											
Buses inspected:											
All defects (number)-----	1	1	6	38	27	69	72	33	79	521	
Per 100 buses-----	.5	.5	3.1	19.6	13.9	35.6	37.1	17.0	40.7	268.6	
Buses out of service:											
All defects (number)-----	1		3	5	4	9	9	2	6	99	
Per 100 buses-----	3.3		10.0	16.7	13.3	30.0	30.0	6.7	20.0	330.0	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number-----	1		2			2					
Per 100 buses-----	3.3		6.7			6.7					
CHARTERED SERVICE											
Buses inspected:											
All defects (number)-----			1	19	13	28	13	21	58	205	
Per 100 buses-----			1.4	26.8	18.3	39.4	18.3	29.6	81.7	288.7	
Buses out of service:											
All defects (number)-----				3	1	1		1	1	21	
Per 100 buses-----				60.0	20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	420.0	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number-----											
Per 100 buses-----											
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED											
Buses inspected:											
All defects (number)-----	1	1	7	57	40	97	85	54	137	726	
Per 100 buses-----	.4	.4	2.6	21.5	15.1	36.6	32.1	20.4	51.7	274.0	
Buses out of service:											
All defects (number)-----	1		3	8	5	10	9	3	7	120	
Per 100 buses-----	2.9		8.6	22.9	14.3	28.6	25.7	8.6	20.0	342.9	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number-----	1		2			2					
Per 100 buses-----	2.9		5.7			5.7					

REGION 9-A

Equipment defects

Buses Involved	Brakes				Tires		Wheels			Steering systems	Suspension systems	Exhaust systems
	Total	Service		Parking	Shallow tread	Structural damage	Wheel proper	Lugs, studs, etc.				
		Application systems	Founda- tion									
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
SCHEDULED SERVICE												
Buses inspected (160):												
All defects, number.....	359	44		6	16	3	6	3	3		5	
Per 100 buses.....	224.4	27.5		3.8	10.0	1.9	3.8	1.9	1.9		3.1	
Buses out of service (23):												
All defects, number.....	75	15		2	3	2	6				2	
Per 100 buses.....	326.1	65.2		8.7	13.0	8.7	26.1				8.7	
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	23	7		2		2	4					
Per 100 buses.....		30.4		8.7		8.7	17.4					
CHARTERED SERVICE												
Buses inspected (175):												
All defects, number.....	289	40		5	8		4	13	1		4	
Per 100 buses.....	165.1	22.9		2.9	4.6		2.3	7.4	.6		2.3	
Buses out of service (18):												
All defects, number.....	47	11		3	4		4	3				
Per 100 buses.....	261.1	61.1		16.7	22.2		22.2	16.7				
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	19	5		3	2		4	2				
Per 100 buses.....	105.6	27.8		16.7	11.1		22.2	11.2				
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED												
Buses inspected (335):												
All defects, number.....	648	84		11	24	3	10	16	4		9	
Per 100 buses.....	193.4	25.1		3.3	7.2	.9	3.0	4.8	1.2		2.7	
Buses out of service (41):												
All defects, number.....	122	26		5	7	2	10	3			2	
Per 100 buses.....	297.6	63.4		12.2	17.1	4.9	24.4	7.3			4.9	
Out-of-service defects:												
Number.....	42	12		5	2	2	8	2				
Per 100 buses.....	102.4	29.3		12.2	4.9	4.9	19.5	4.9				

REGION 9-B

Equipment defects

	Engine (starting) 13	Fuel system 14	Body					Other areas of the vehicle 19	Accessories for safety and emergencies 20	Driver violations 21	Total: all defects and violations 22
			Lamps		Condition (maintenance): doors, floor, seats, windows, etc. 17	Safety fea- tures: escape windows, windshield wipers, etc. 18					
			Stop lamps 15	All other lamps 16							
SCHEDULED SERVICE											
Buses inspected:											
All defects, number.....	3	2	13	34	63	71	39	48	62	419	
Per 100 buses.....	1.9	1.3	8.1	21.3	30.4	44.4	24.4	30.0	38.8	251.9	
Buses out of service:											
All defects, number.....	3	1	10	1	8	9	3	10	9	24	
Per 100 buses.....	13.0	4.3	42.5	4.3	34.8	39.1	13.0	43.5	39.1	365.2	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....	3		5								
Per 100 buses.....	13.0		21.7								
CHARTERED SERVICE											
Buses inspected:											
All defects, number.....	1		13	37	21	86	23	33	83	372	
Per 100 buses.....	.6		7.4	21.1	12.0	49.1	13.1	18.9	47.4	212.6	
Buses out of service:											
All defects, number.....	1		4	2	3	9	1	2	6	53	
Per 100 buses.....	5.6		22.2	11.1	16.7	50.0	5.6	11.1	33.3	294.4	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....	1		2								
Per 100 buses.....	5.6		11.1								
CHARTERED AND SCHEDULED											
Buses inspected:											
All defects, number.....	4	2	26	71	84	157	62	81	145	793	
Per 100 buses.....	1.2	.6	7.8	21.2	25.1	46.9	18.5	24.2	43.3	236.7	
Buses out of service:											
All defects, number.....	4	1	14	3	11	19	4	12	15	137	
Per 100 buses.....	9.8	2.4	34.1	7.3	26.9	43.9	9.8	29.3	36.6	334.1	
Out-of-service defects:											
Number.....	4		7								
Per 100 buses.....	9.8		17.1								

POSTAL DIFFICULTIES

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, one of the most important means of communication in Alaska is the U.S. mail. The U.S. Postal Service at Fort Yukon and Barrow are experiencing extraordinary difficulty in performing their constitutional duties. Presently, there are no roads at Fort Yukon and Barrow which are utilized by the U.S. Postal Service system.

Many citizens of these areas are totally dependent on air service for all items of mail. This includes personal communications, business communications and supplies of every kind and description. Although there is daily air service to Fort Yukon and Barrow, the postal service is generally poor.

Many times, citizens are caused to suffer needless delays and unnecessary hardships due to the poor service. Many times people suffer a loss of a good credit rating because bills arrive after they are due, and businesses are damaged by the lack of communication. Transportation facilities have suffered because parts are not received within a reasonable time after they are ordered.

Because communication is so basic to the growth of any area, the Alaska State Legislature has requested that the U.S. Post Office take whatever action necessary to upgrade the postal service at

Fort Yukon and Barrow. I include for inclusion into the Record a copy of the legislature's resolution:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 67—RELATING TO THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AT FORT YUKON AND BARROW

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas there are no roads to Fort Yukon and Barrow, Alaska, which can be utilized by any form of ground transportation; and

Whereas the many citizens of Fort Yukon and Barrow must totally depend upon air service for all items of mail, including personal communications, business communications, supplies of every kind and description, newspapers, and all other items and commodities that may be forwarded by the United States Postal Service; and

Whereas, although there is daily air service to Fort Yukon and Barrow, the postal service, in general, fails to accommodate even the basic needs of the community; and

Whereas there are many instances where in-state newspapers (even from Fairbanks) arrive over two weeks late; medical supplies have arrived after they are no longer needed; individuals suffer loss of credit because bills arrive after they are due; businesses are damaged by the lack of communication; transportation facilities have suffered because parts are not received within a reasonable time after they are ordered; and

Whereas a host of other inconveniences and aggravations have been foisted upon the residents of Fort Yukon and Barrow because of the less than dependable postal service; and

Whereas morale is affected by constant disappointment and frustration over these failures in communication, and personal lives are drastically affected by the lack of dependable ties with family and friends; and

Whereas the postal service to Fort Yukon and Barrow has deteriorated to an even

greater degree since the institution by the United States Postal Service of the "two track" air transport system;

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that the United States Post Office is urgently requested to take all action necessary to upgrade the postal services to Fort Yukon and Barrow, at least to the level of adequacy present before institution of the "two track" system.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Winton M. Blount, Postmaster General of the United States; the Honorable Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator and Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service; the Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski, U.S. Representative and Chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SECRET BILDERBERG MEETING AND THE LOGAN ACT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in recent remarks—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, pages 13688-13691 of May 5, 1971, entitled "Bilderbergs' Woodstock Meeting;" and pages 14189-14195 of May 10, 1971, entitled "U.S. Dollar Crisis—A Dividend of Internationalism"—I raised several questions about the secrecy of the Bilderberg meetings and the possible consequences of such secrecy.

Since all the details of the discussions, conclusions, and recommendations reached have been suppressed from the public, one can only speculate as to what transpired. Following their meeting, the Bilderbergs returned to their respective countries with the ordinary citizens uninformed as to their goals and plans.

Secret discussions are not in keeping with Western political tradition of "open covenants openly arrived at." Ordinary citizens are alarmed when influential men meet privately to solve world problems, especially when the membership lists are overwhelmingly composed of international Socialists, businessmen, and financiers.

The cause and effect method can be used to arrive at the latest intentions of the Bilderbergs. Following the first Bilderberg meeting held in the United States in 1957 came the announcement that French gold and silver reserves had dropped more than 50 percent in the previous year and of the partial withdrawal of French gold balances in the United States. Within a few days following the recent Bilderberg meeting of April 23-25 in Woodstock, Vt., came the recent U.S. dollar crisis in Europe. The Bilderbergs' decisions are highly suspect of manipulating gold and international currencies.

Could the secrecy of the Bilderberg meetings be because of the Logan Act which prohibits unauthorized contacts between a citizen of the United States and an officer or agent of a foreign government?

As amended and enacted into positive law on June 25, 1948, as 18 U.S.C. 953, the Logan Act provides:

§ 953. Private correspondence with foreign governments

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both.

This section shall not abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of

its agents or subjects. June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 744.

The elements of a crime under the Logan Act appear to be as follows:

- (1) The actions forbidden to U.S. citizens are:
 - (a) Without the permission or authority of the Government;
 - (b) Directly or indirectly;
 - (c) To commence or carry on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign Government or any officer or agent thereof.
- Or—
- (d) To counsel, advise or assist in any "such correspondence," i.e., in any verbal or written correspondence by a U.S. citizen with any foreign Government or officer or agent thereof;
- (e) With an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign Government or any officer or agent thereof in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States;
- Or—
- (f) With an intent to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States.

As can be seen from the membership list of the recently held Bilderberg meeting there were citizens of the United States as well as officials of foreign governments in attendance. Since no official announcement was made of this meeting by the U.S. Government, we can only assume that the meeting was not authorized by the U.S. Government. Since the meeting at the Laurance Rockefeller Woodstock Inn lasted 3 days, it is logical to assume that one or more of those citizens of the United States in attendance did carry on "correspondence or intercourse" with one or more officers of foreign governments present. Since the two points discussed as announced by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands were, first, "the contribution of business in dealing with current problems of social instability," and second, "the possibility of a change of the American role in the world and its consequence," it is very likely that there was an intent to influence measures or conduct of one or more foreign governments or officers or agents thereof in relation to disputes or controversies with the United States or an intent to defeat measures of the Government of the United States—especially when shortly following the close of the Bilderberg meeting there occurred a rejection of U.S. dollars by four of the governments whose officers were in attendance at the Bilderberg meeting. Additionally the Socialist Prime Minister of Canada whose defense minister was present, now is in Moscow carrying on defense agreements with the Soviets against the United States.

So, it seems plausible that one or more of the U.S. citizens present at the recent secret Bilderberg meeting could very well have committed a criminal offense under the Logan Act. Could this be the reason for the veiled secrecy?

I insert at this point in my remarks a list of the participants at the Bilderberg Woodstock Conference on April 23-25, 1971; information about the origin of and participants at Bilderberg meetings; and a legal analysis of the Logan Act:

BILDERBERG MEETING, WOODSTOCK CONFERENCE APRIL 23, 24, AND 25, 1971

(Arrival April 22)

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

H.R.H. The Prince of the Netherlands, chairman.

Ernest H. van der Beugel, Professor International Relations, Leiden University, and Honorary Secretary General for Europe.

Joseph E. Johnson, President Emeritus, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Honorary Secretary General for the United States.

Observer: H.R.H. Princess Beatrix of the Netherlands.

Belgium

Janssen, Daniel, Deputy General Manager UCB, S.A. and Lecturer Brussels University. Lambert, Baron, Chairman, Banque Lambert.

Simonet, H., Member of Parliament and President, Brussels University.

Vanistendael, August A. J., Secretary General, International Cooperation for Socio-Economic Development (CIDSE).

Canada

Bourassa, Robert, Prime Minister of Quebec.

Griffin, Anthony G. S., President, Triarch Corporation Ltd.

Leman, Paul H., President, Aluminum Company of Canada Ltd.

MacDonald, Donald S., Minister of National Defence.

Rotstein, Abraham, Professor at the Department of Political Economy University of Toronto.

Denmark

Schleimann, Jorgen, Editor, Radio Denmark.

Sorensen, Svend O., General Manager, Den Danske Landmands Bank.

Terkelsen, Terkel M., Chief Editor, Berlingske Tidende.

Finland

Enckell, Ralph, Head of the Finnish Delegation to OECD.

von Julin, Jacob, Chairman of the Finnish Cellulose Association.

France

Aumonier, Andre, Vice President of "Fondation Europeenne pour l'Economie".

Baumgartner, Wilfrid S., President, Rhone-Poulenc S.A. and Honorary Governor Banque de France.

Cartier, Raymond, Director, "Paris-Match".

Martinet, Gilles, Editor, "le Nouvel Observateur".

Rothschild, Baron Edmond de, Director of Companies.

Germany

Bahr, Egon, State Secretary in the Federal Chancellery.

Carstens, Karl, Director, German Institute for Foreign Affairs.

Kaiser, Karl, Professor at the "Institut für Theorie und Soziologie der Politik", Saarbrücken University.

Merkle, Hans L., Chairman, Board of Management Robert Bosch GmbH.

Schröder, Gerhard, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Policy of the Bundestag and former Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Wischnewski, Hans-Jürgen, Federal Secretary of the SPD.

Wolff von Amerongen, Otto, President of Otto Wolff A. G.

International

Duchene, L.-François, Director, Institute for Strategic Studies, London.

Gazzo, Emanuele, Editor-in-Chief "Agence Europe", Brussels.

Healey, Denis, Member of Parliament and Author working paper.

Kohnstamm, Max, Vice President, Action Committee for the United States of Europe.

Tuthill, John W., Director-General "The Atlantic Institute", Paris.

Italy

Cittadinia-cesi, Marchese Gian G., Minister Plenipotentiary and President, A.E.P.E.

Glisenti, Giuseppe, Chairman of INTER-SIND, Confederation of Italian State-owned Industries.

Migone, Gian G., Professor at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Torino.

Ottone, Piero, Editor-in-Chief "II Secolo XIX."

Plazzesi, Gianfranco, Journalist and Correspondent for "La Stampa".

Netherlands

Idenburg, Peter J. A., Lecturer International Relations, Amsterdam University.

Kraijenhoff, Jonkheer Gualtherus, Vice-President, Board of Management AKZO N.V. and President, Netherlands Red Cross.

Luns, Joseph M. A. H., Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Netherlands, H. R. H. Prince Claus of the. Spoor, André S., Editor-in-Chief "NRC Handelsblad."

Norway

Hoegh, Leif, Shipowner.

Tidemand, O. Grieg, Shipowner and former Cabinet Minister.

Sweden

Bengtsson, Ingemund, Minister of Agriculture.

Wallenberg, Marcus, Chairman, Stockholm Enskilda Bank.

Switzerland

Casserini, Karl, Chief Economist, International Metalworkers' Federation.

Jann, Adolf W., Chairman and Managing Director, F. Hoffmann-La Roche & Co. Ltd.

Umbrecht, Victor H., Member of the Board, CIBA-GEIGY Ltd.

Turkey

Beyazit, Selahattin, Director of Companies. Birgi, M. Nuri, Ambassador to N.A.T.O.

United Kingdom

Bennett, Sir Frederic, Member of Parliament.

Catherwood, Sir Frederick, Director General, National Development Office.

Cockcroft, John, Economic Leader Writer, "The Daily Telegraph."

Grierson, Ronald H., Chairman, Orion Bank Limited.

Kleinwort, Sir Cyril, Chairman, Kleinwort, Benson Ltd.

Maudling, Reginald, Secretary of State for Home Affairs.

Roll, Sir Eric, Director, S. G. Warburg & Co. Ltd.

Thomson, George, Member of Parliament.

United States

Allison, Graham T., Associate Professor of Politics, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Anderson, Robert O., Chairman of the Board, Atlantic Richfield Co., Roswell, New Mexico, and Chairman, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.

Ball, George W., Managing Director, Lehman Brothers Incorporated.

Bendtsen, Karl R., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers, Inc., New York.

Collado, Emilio G., Executive Vice President, Standard Oil Company (New Jersey). Corson, John J., Chairman of the Board, Fry Consultants, Washington.

Dean, Arthur H., Senior Partner, Sullivan and Cromwell.

Dunlop, John T., Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University.

Duster, Donald L., President, Chicago Commons Association.

Elliott, Osborn, Editor-in-Chief and President, "Newsweek".

Fraser, Donald M., Member of Congress. Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., Member of Congress.

Hauge, Gabriel, Chairman of the Board, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company Author of Working Paper.

Heinz II, Henry J., Chairman of the Board, T. J. Heinz Company.

Hughes, Thomas L., President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Kissinger, Henry A., Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

MacDonald, Gordon J., Member, Council on Environmental Quality, Washington.

MacGregor, Ian K., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, American Metal Climax, New York.

Moyers, Bill, Journalist, former Publisher and Vice President, "Newsday".

Pease, Robert, Executive Director, Allegheny Conference on Community Development, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Perkins, James A., Chairman, International Council for Educational Development.

Reuss, Henry S., Member of Congress. Riegle, Donald W., Member of Congress.

Rockefeller, David, Chairman of the Board, The Chase Manhattan Bank, N.Y.

Rockefeller IV, John D., Secretary of State of West Virginia.

Slater, Joseph E., President, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, President, Salk Institute.

Stein, Howard, President, Dreyfus Corporation, New York.

Stevenson III, Adlai, United States Senator.

Stone, Shepard, President, International Association for Cultural Freedom.

Vogt, Lt. General John W., USAF, Director of the Joint Staff, Organization of the Joint Chiefs.

THE BILDERBERG MEETINGS

I. ORIGIN

In the early 1950's, a number of people on both sides of the Atlantic sought a means of bringing together leading citizens, both in and out of government, for informational discussions of problems facing the Atlantic community. Such meetings, they felt, would create a better understanding of the forces and trends affecting Western nations; in particular, they believed that direct exchanges could help to clear up differences and misunderstandings that might weaken the West.

The first meeting that brought Americans and Europeans together took place under the chairmanship of H.R.H. Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands at the Bilderberg Hotel in Oosterbeek, Holland, from May 29 to May 31, 1954. Ever since, the meetings have been called Bilderberg Meetings.

II. PARTICIPANTS

It was obvious from the first that the success of the meetings would depend primarily on the level of the participants. Leading figures from many fields—industry, labor, education, government, etc.—are invited, who, through their special knowledge or experience, can help to further the Bilderberg objective of better knowledge and understanding. Government officials attend in a personal and not an official capacity. To insure full discussion, an attempt is made to include participants representing many political and economic points of view.

Each year since its inception, Prince Bernhard has been the Bilderberg chairman. There are no "members" of Bilderberg. Each year an invitation list is compiled by Prince Bernhard in consultation with an informal international steering committee; individuals are chosen in the light of their knowledge and standing. Of the 80 to 100 participants, approximately one-third are from government and politics. From the beginning participants have come from North America and Western Europe, and from various in-

ternational organizations. The official languages are English and French.

The meetings take place in a different country each year. Since 1957, they have been held in many Western European countries and in North America as well.

The discussion at each meeting is centered upon topics of current concern in the broad fields of foreign policy, world economy, and other contemporary issues. Basic groundwork for the symposium is laid by means of working papers and general discussion follows. In order to assure freedom of speech and opinion, the gatherings are closed and off the record. No resolutions are proposed, no votes taken, and no policy statements issued during or after the meetings.

In short, Bilderberg is a high-ranking and flexible international forum in which opposing viewpoints can be brought closer together and mutual understanding furthered.

THE LOGAN ACT

(By Vincent A. Doyle)

As amended and enacted into positive law on June 25, 1948 as 18 U.S.C. 953, the Logan Act provides as follows:

§ 953. Private correspondence with foreign governments

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both.

This section shall not abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of its agents or subjects. June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 744.

There have been no substantial changes in the law since its original enactment on January 30, 1799, (1 Stat. 613). An extensive memorandum on the history and scope of the Logan Act was prepared by Charles Warren when he was Assistant Attorney General and published in 1917, in Senate Document No. 696, 64th Cong., 2d Sess. The comments in this paper are designed to supplement rather than supplant Mr. Warren's memorandum. [That memorandum appears on pages 8-21 of this paper]

We are informally advised by the Department of Justice that, so far as it can determine, there have been no prosecutions under the Logan Act. However, it has been considered in judicial context on at least two occasions not mentioned by Mr. Warren as well as in several opinions handed down since his memorandum was written. Judge Sprague, of the Circuit Court for the District of Massachusetts, called attention to the provisions of the Logan Act in two charges he made to grand juries during the period of the Civil War. In the first of these, on October 18, 1861, he said:

There are other offenses to which our attention is called by the present condition of our country. A few months since, a member of the British parliament declared, in the most public manner, that he had received many letters from the Northern states of America urging parliament to acknowledge the independence of the Southern confederacy. Such an announcement ought to arrest the attention of grand juries; for if any such communication has been made by a citizen of the United States, it is a high misdemeanor. St. 1799, c. 1 (1 Stat. 613) was especially designed to prevent such unwar-

rantable interference with the diplomacy and purposes of our government. 30 Fed. Cas. 1049, 1050-51, (No. 18, 277).

In the second, in 1863, he said:

We have seen it stated in such form as to arrest attention, that unauthorized individuals have entered into communication with members of parliament and foreign ministers and officers in order to influence their conduct in controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of our government. It ought to be known that such acts have long been prohibited by law. 30 Fed. Cas. 1042, 1046 (No. 18, 274).

There have been at least two judicial references to the Logan Act since Mr. Warren's memorandum in 1917.

In *Martin v. Young*, 134 F. Supp. 204 (D.C.N.D. Cal. 1955), a petition for habeas corpus by a serviceman awaiting trial by a general court martial, the principal issue was whether the petitioner could be tried in a civil court for the offense charged against him by the Army. A part of the specification read as follows:

[That petitioner while interned in a North Korean prisoner of war camp, did] without proper authority, wrongfully, unlawfully, and knowingly collaborate, communicate, and hold intercourse, directly and indirectly, with the enemy by joining with, participating in, and leading discussion groups and classes conducted by the enemy reflecting views and opinions that the United Nations and the United States were illegal aggressors in the Korean conflict. . . .

The Court stated that the conduct described in the specification violated at least three criminal statutes under which the petitioner could be tried in a civil court, one of which was the Logan Act, and granted the petition. The Department of Justice, however, did not prosecute Martin under the Logan Act, presumably because it was thought that his conduct did not violate the Act.

In *Waldron v. British Petroleum Co. et al.*, 231 F. Supp. 72 (U.S.D.C.S.D.N.Y. 1964) the plaintiff sued for triple damages under the Clayton Act for alleged conspiracy of the defendants to prevent the importation and sale by the plaintiff of some Iranian oil, for which the plaintiff had a contract of importation and sale in this country. The defendants asserted that the plaintiff had obtained his contract through a series of violations of the criminal statutes, among them the Logan Act. The court held that, for this defense to be maintained, it would have to be shown that plaintiff sought to thwart some clearly and unequivocally asserted policy measures of the United States, as distinguished from statements of opinion, attitude, and belief of government officials. The court also noted "the existence of a doubtful question with regard to the constitutionality of that statute (Logan Act) under the Sixth Amendment. That doubt is engendered by the statute's use of the vague and indefinite terms, 'defeat' and 'measures'. . . . Neither of these words is an abstraction of common certainty or possesses a definite statutory or judicial definition." *Id.* at 89. Although it was unnecessary for the court to decide this constitutional issue, it did invite the attention of Congress to the problem suggesting that Congress consider the need for using more precise words than "defeat" or "measure". *Ibid.*, n. 30.

We have found no other cases directly involving the Logan Act. Something of its meaning, however, may be gleaned from its legislative history.

The Logan Act takes its name from Dr. George Logan, a Pennsylvania Quaker, who visited France as a self-styled envoy of peace after a presidentially appointed diplomatic team consisting of John Marshall, Charles Pinckney and Elbridge Gerry had failed to resolve the serious differences which existed

between France and the United States in 1798. Though Logan went ostensibly as an individual, he was armed with letters of introduction from Thomas Jefferson and it was generally thought that he was a representative of the Republican opposition to the Federalist Party then in power. It is perhaps for this reason that many of the proponents of the bill emphasized the dangers of allowing any dissenting faction, however well intentioned, to negotiate with a foreign power about matters in controversy between it and the United States Government. Nevertheless, it is quite clear from the arguments of the proponents, as well as from the language of the act itself, that even acts of individuals, representing no one but themselves, were to be made criminal. As Thomas Pinckney, of South Carolina, said:

"If an individual goes forward to a foreign Government to negotiate on national concerns, what answer could he give to such a Government when he was asked, 'Upon what authority do you come?' He must say, 'I have no power, I am undelegated; but our administration is either weak or wicked, and will not do what is for the interest of the country, and therefore I come, because I think myself more wise, and better disposed to serve my country than its constituted authorities.' And is there no criminality . . . in this throwing censure on those who have been appointed by the people to administer the government? If such an act produces any effect at all, it must produce a bad one. Any sensible Government must either laugh at such a man as mad, or conclude that he is the agent of a deep-rooted party opposed to the Government of the country from whence he comes. And certainly no individual ought to be permitted to do an act with impunity which might throw so great a contempt upon the Government of his country." 8-9 Annals of Congress 2609-10.

Yet not every communication with a foreign Government was to be made criminal. One of the leading spokesmen for the bill, Robert Goodloe Harper, a Representative from South Carolina, said:

"I will say that were I in France, after the bill should be passed, and M. Talleyrand were to invite me to sup with him, which perhaps might be the case, considering that I had the pleasure of his acquaintance in this country, and he were to ask my opinion about the political relations of the two countries, I should not scruple to tell him that the conduct of his government was highly impolitic, and to assign my reasons for the opinion. I might, perhaps, not think it prudent to do that, but, if I thought it prudent, and the occasion offered, I should not consider myself as offending against this bill by doing so. Why? Because I should not act with the intent which this bill fixes on as the essence of the offense created by it; the intent to interfere or intermeddle with the public relations of the two countries."

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 339

(By Mr. Brandegee)

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 31, 1917.

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Brandegee) on January 29, 1917, entitled "Memorandum on the History and Scope of the Laws Prohibiting Correspondence with a Foreign Government, and Acceptance of a Commission to Serve a Foreign State in War," by Charles Warren, Assistant Attorney General, be printed as a Senate document, and that 500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER,
Secretary.

MEMORANDUM ON THE HISTORY AND SCOPE OF THE LAWS PROHIBITING CORRESPONDENCE WITH A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT, AND ACCEPTANCE OF A COMMISSION TO SERVE A FOREIGN STATE IN WAR

(By Charles Warren)

HISTORY AND SCOPE OF SECTION 5 OF THE FEDERAL PENAL CODE

SEC. 5. Every citizen of the United States, whether actually resident or abiding within the same, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or in any foreign country, without the permission or authority of the Government, directly or indirectly, commences or carries on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign Government or any officer or agent thereof, with an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign Government or any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States; and every person, being a citizen of or resident within the United States or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, and not duly authorized, counsels, advises, or assists in any such correspondence with such intent, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not more than three years; but nothing in this section shall be construed to abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign Government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such Government or any of its agents or subjects.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The original act, reproduced in section 5 of the Federal Penal Code (35 Stat. 1088, ch. 321, sec. 5, formerly Rev. Stat. sec. 5335), is the act of January 30, 1799 (1 Stat. 613). There have been no substantial changes except that the words "or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof," have been twice inserted.

The statute has never been construed in any reported case. It is cited in *United States v. Craig* (1886—28 Fed. 795, 801) as an illustration of the power of the United States to punish its own citizens for acts committed in a foreign country. It is also cited in *American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co.* (1909—213 U.S. 347, 356).

They [civilized countries] go further, at times, and declare that they will punish any one, subject or not, who shall do certain things, if they can catch him, as in the case of pirates on the high seas. In cases immediately affecting national interests they may go further still and may make, and if they get the chance, execute similar threats as to acts done within another recognized jurisdiction. An illustration from our statutes is found with regard to criminal correspondence with foreign governments. (Rev. Stat., sec. 5335.)

History, therefore, must throw the chief light upon the meaning of the statute. While congressional debates are not determinative of the meaning of statutory language, they are unquestionably of great aid in ascertaining the history of the period and the chief causes which led to the legislation.

As was said in *Standard Oil Co. v. United States* (1911—221 U.S., 1, 50):

The debates . . . show, however, that the main cause which led to the legislation was the thought that it was required by the economic condition of times. . . .

Although debates may not be used as a means for interpreting a statute (*United States v. Trans-Missouri Freight Association*, 166 U.S. 318 and cases cited) that rule in the nature of things is not violated by resorting to debates as a means of ascertaining the environment at the time of the enactment of a particular law, that is, the history of the period when it was adopted.

Moreover, as the Supreme Court has not hesitated to have recourse to the debates in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in order to ascertain the construction of words and phrases in the Constitution, the general rule as to statutes laid down above may be somewhat relaxed when the congressional debates in question occurred over a hundred years ago and only 12 years after 1787, and in a time which has now become historical. Debates so long removed from present times and among men of historical eminence may be valuable aids toward the ascertainment of the purport and purpose of the legislation discussed.

OCCASION FOR THE ENACTMENT OF THE ACT OF 1799

The immediate cause of the passage of the act of 1799 was the intermeddling of a private citizen, Dr. George Logan, in negotiations pending in 1798 between the United States and France.

President Adams, in 1797, had sent John Marshall, Charles C. Pinckney, and Elbridge Gerry as special envoys to France to negotiate and settle, if possible, all claims and causes of differences which then existed between the French Directory and the United States. From this mission arose the X Y Z letters controversy, the failure of the envoys, increased anti-France feeling in the United States, warlike preparations in Congress, and stringent measures against aliens. The envoys one by one returned, having accomplished nothing. Thereupon, Logan, a benevolent Quaker of Pennsylvania, undertook to act upon his own account. Bearing letters of introduction from Jefferson, Thomas McKean, and others, he sailed for France, moved to do what the three envoys had failed to do. In France "he was hailed by the newspapers as the envoy of peace, was dined and feasted by Merlin (the new President of the Directory), received by Talleyrand, and came home to Philadelphia in November with some copies of old letters to the Counsel General and the verbal assurance that France negotiate for peace." (McMaster's History of the United States, vol. 4, pp. 368-410.)

While this errand has been sincerely intended, and probably without any partisan political motive, Logan was denounced by the Federalists during his absence and after his return as a treasonable envoy of the Republican party, carrying on a traitorous correspondence between the American and the French "Jacobins." On his return he was coldly received by the Secretary of State, and even more coldly by ex-President Washington, who regarded his action as fatal intermeddling. Federalists, in general, condemned him; and it was resolved that such interference should be forbidden in the future.² President Adams wrote to Timothy Pickens, Secretary of State, November 2, 1798 (Life and Works of John Adams, Vol. VIII, p. 615).

The object of Logan, in his embassy, seems to have been to do or obtain something which might give opportunity for the "true American character to blaze forth in the approach-

ing elections." Is this constitutional for a party of opposition to send embassies to foreign nations to obtain their interference in elections?

In his message to Congress, in December, 1798, the President, while dealing chiefly with relations with France, made no reference to Logan. The address of the Senate to the President, December 11, 1798, however, contained references to professions made by France "neglecting and passing by the constitutional and authorized agents of the Government" and "made through the medium of individuals without public character or authority." The President in his reply to the Senate, December 12, 1798, said (Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Vol. I, pp. 276, 277):

Although the officious interference of individuals without public character or authority is not entitled to any credit, yet it deserves to be considered whether that temerity and impertinence of individuals affecting to interfere in public affairs between France and the United States, whether by their secret correspondence or otherwise, and intended to impose upon the people and separate them from their Government, ought not to be inquired into and corrected.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF THE ACT OF 1799

The history and purposes of the act of 1799 are fully set forth in Annals of Congress, Fifth Congress, 1797-1799, Volumes I and III, at the pages cited, *infra*.

The questions involved in the act were first presented in a resolution introduced in the House of Representatives, December 26, 1798 (p. 2488), by Roger Griswold, of Connecticut, as a proposal to amend the sedition law. He said:

"Its object is to punish a crime which goes to the destruction of the Executive power of the Government—that description of crime which arises from an interference of individual citizens in the negotiations of our Executive with foreign Governments."

The resolution was as follows:

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of amending the act entitled "An act in addition to the act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States," so far as to extend the penalties, if need be, to all persons, citizens of the United States, who shall usurp the Executive authority of this Government, by commencing or carrying on any correspondence with the Governments of any foreign prince or state, relating to controversies or disputes which do or shall exist between such prince or state and the United States.

The resolution was debated December 27, 28, 1798 (pp. 2493 et seq.), by Congressmen of great eminence, Griswold, John Rutledge of South Carolina, Albert Gallatin of Pennsylvania, Thomas Pinckney of South Carolina, Robert Goodloe Harper of Maryland, Harrison Gray Otis of Massachusetts, John Nicholas of Virginia, Abraham Baldwin of Georgia, John Williams of New York, Nathaniel Smith of Connecticut, Nathaniel Macon of North Carolina.

Griswold said that the object of the resolution was "of first importance."

I think it necessary to guard by law against the interference of individuals in the negotiation of our Executive with the Governments of foreign countries. The present situation of Europe, in my opinion, calls aloud for a resolution of this kind. * * * If offenses of this kind are to pass unpunished, it may be in the power of an individual to frustrate all the designs of the Executive. The agent of a faction, if such a faction shall exist, may be sent to a foreign country to negotiate in behalf of that faction, in opposition to the Executive authority, and will any one say that such an offense ought not severely to be punished? It certainly ought. * * * No gentleman would pretend to say that an unau-

thorized individual ought to exercise a power which should influence the measures of a foreign Government with respect to this country. This power has been delegated by the Constitution to the President, and the people of this country might as well meet and legislate for us, or erect themselves into a judicial tribunal, in place of the established judiciary, as that any individual, or set of persons, should take upon him or themselves this power, vested in the Executive. Such practices would be destructive to the principles of our Government.

Rutledge said that "if the citizens of this country shall be permitted to have intercourse with foreign Governments, they may do the greatest injury to this country under what they conceive to be the best intentions," and he stated that he thought this "a good measure of national defense."

Dana said that a person thus employed must be considered as acting in direct hostility with the authority of our Government and against the general character of our country. * * * It is a crime of severe magnitude, as the person thus acting must be considered as the agent of a faction waiting only for an opportunity of joining the enemies of their country.

Pinckney said that it was a leading doctrine of republican government that "no one can pretend to interfere so as to counteract the proceedings of the people of their country as expressed by its legal organs." He stated that he knew of no case, no situation, on which it would be lawful or right for an individual to interfere with a foreign Government at a time when any negotiation is going forward by legal authority. Such an interference can have but a bad effect; it may have a very bad effect. It shows, at least, that there is a party in the country divided from the Government who take upon themselves a separate negotiation, and set up a distinct power, which they wish to be paramount to the legal authority.

Harper said:

"The principle once admitted must go to the utter subversion of government—the principle being that whenever an individual, or, by stronger reason, a number of individuals, conceive themselves wiser than the Government, more able to discern or more willing to pursue, the interest of the country, they may assume its functions, counteract its views, and interfere in its most important operations. * * * Upon this pretense, if this principle be once established, any discontented faction, under the name of a club, or patriotic society, or revolution society, * * * may usurp the most essential functions of government in their own country, negotiate on all sorts of subjects with the Governments of other countries, and open a direct and broad road for the entrance of that foreign influence which, with equal and force, has been declared as the 'angel of destruction to republican governments.' * * * When we knew that that (foreign) Government openly avows its determination to encourage such intercourse, to protect all factions, all malcontents, all insurgents in all countries, when we knew that this intercourse and her consequent protection of domestic factions are the great engines of her foreign policies—when we know all this, shall we not oppose an effectual barrier?"

The resolution was passed, 65-23 (p. 2545), and Griswold, Pinckney, Baldwin, Bayard, and Spaight were appointed a committee.

A bill based on the resolution was introduced in the House by Mr. Griswold January 7, 1799, as follows (pp. 2565, 2583):

"Be it enacted, &c., That if any person, being a citizen of the United States, whether he be actually resident or abiding within the United States, or in any foreign country, shall, without the permission or authority of the Government of the United States, directly or indirectly, commence or carry on any

² References to Logan's mission and the consequent legislation are also to be found in Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. VII, letter of June 21, 1798, p. 273; Jan. 16, 1799, p. 161; Jan. 26, 1799, p. 326; Jan. 29, 1799, pp. 338, 339.

Writings of Washington, Vol. XI, pp. 384, 388. See also Schouler's History of the United States, Vol. I, pp. 415, 417. Hildreth's History of the United States, Vol. II, p. 265.

John Adams' Works, Vol. VIII, 615; Vol. IX, 243, 244, 265, 293, 307. Writings of John Quincy Adams (1913), Vol. II, 349, 398, 399, and letters of Mar. 30, Aug. 11, 14, 15, Sept. 3, 4, 18, 25, Oct. 6, 1799. Lawrence's Wheaton (1863), 1003. Wharton's State Trials, 20, 21. American State Papers, For. Rel. Vol. II, 242. Memoirs of Dr. George Logan.

verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign Government, or any officer or agent thereof, relating to any dispute or controversy between any foreign Government and the United States, with an intent to influence the measures or conduct of the Government having disputes or controversies with the United States, as aforesaid; or of any person, being a citizen of, or resident within, the United States, and not duly authorized shall counsel, advise, aid, or assist, in any such correspondence, with intent as aforesaid, he or they shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor; and, on conviction before any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding _____ thousand dollars, and by imprisonment during a term not less than _____ months, nor exceeding _____ years.

The bill was debated at length under the heading of "Usurpation of executive authority," from January 9 to January 17, 1799 (pp. 2583 et seq.), by many eminent Congressmen in addition to those already speaking on the resolution—James A. Bayard of Delaware, Jonathan Dayton of New Jersey, Carter B. Harrison of Virginia, William C. Claiborne of Tennessee, Thomas Claiborne of Virginia, Isaac Parker of Massachusetts, Edward Livingston of New York, Joseph McDowell, John Dennis, Jonathan Brace, Samuel Smith, Samuel Sewall, John Dawson, Josiah Parker, William Gordon, Joseph Eggleston, George Thatcher, John Allen, William Edmond, and others.

The principal opposition came from Albert Gallatin and Edward Livingston, and was largely based on an unfounded fear that the bill would prevent private individuals corresponding in regard to their private and personal affairs.

Gallatin argued (p. 2586):

All cases where a change of the measures of government was attempted, though it were done merely by an individual to secure his private rights, would come within the meaning of this bill. Thus, if an individual whose vessel is taken by the French should, after his vessel is carried into one of their ports, remonstrate or enter into a correspondence with any of the agents of that Government he must do it in such a manner as that his arguments shall not involve any of the general principles in dispute between the two Governments; because the moment he does this he falls within the penalties of the bill. It appeared extremely difficult that an individual who is not only perhaps concerned for himself but an agent for others should be able to make any effectual application to the French Government without taking into consideration in some respect the principles of dispute between the two Governments.

He wished the bill amended so as to exclude this.

Otis said in reply that the words, "with an intent to influence the measures of a foreign Government" must relate to general public measures, not to the concerns of any individual.

A motion was made to insert in place of "as follows" the words "so as to prevent or impede the amicable adjustment of said disputes or controversies."

Bayard said:

"If this amendment were to pass, a person might carry on any correspondence whatever and no punishment could be inflicted upon him, unless a bad intention was proved.

"The object of the law is to prevent these private interferences altogether, since the Constitution has placed the power of negotiation in the hands of the Executive only. An individual may do good, but he may also do evil; and it can not be supposed that any private person has more wisdom or greater desire to serve his country than the Executive of the United States."

The amendment was lost (51 to 33), and on being reviewed was again lost (51 to 35).

Later in the debate Gallatin, supported by Nicholas, moved to add the following proviso (p. 2591):

Provided, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed to extend to any person who shall apply to any foreign Government, or to any officer or agent thereof, for the purpose of obtaining either the release of American seamen or for the restoration of any property belonging to citizens of the United States and captured, sequestered, or detained by or under the authority of any such foreign Government or any of its officers or agents, or for the payment of any debts due by such Government to the citizens of the United States.

Bayard opposed, saying the bill was not intended to apply to such case and there was no need of the proviso:

In order to establish a crime by this bill, what is to be proved? First, that there are disputes subsisting between the United States and the foreign nation with whom the correspondence is said to have taken place; that this intercourse has really existed; and that it was carried on with a view to influence the measures or conduct of the foreign Government in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States; and unless all these facts are proved, the crime is not made out. The intention must be proved before the crime will appear.

Dana said that the disputes and controversies mentioned in this bill are those which exist between the Government of the United States and foreign Governments—disputes and controversies of a political nature, unconnected with individual claims.

Edmond said:

"It will be wise and prudent at this time to frame a law to prevent individuals from interfering with the Executive authority in a manner injurious to the community."

The proviso was defeated (48 to 37).

A motion to add after the word "influence" the words "or defeat" was made by Joseph Parker (p. 2588), saying that he wished "to make the bill as complete as possible and to put every check upon individual interference with foreign negotiations, which the Government had in its power to do so."

The amendment was voted (48 to 30).

Dayton proposed an amendment to strike out the words "relating to any dispute or controversy between any foreign country and the United States," and also the word "having" and the words "as aforesaid," and to insert in place of "having" the words "in relation to any."

These amendments were voted.

Further statements as to the purpose and intent of the bill were made in the debates on January 10, 1799 (p. 2599), January 11, 1799 (pp. 2626, 2648), January 16 (pp. 2677, 2682), January 17 (pp. 2686, 2721).

Bayard said: "The offense proposed to be punished by this law is separated only by a shade from treason." Referring to the particular action of Dr. Logan, out of which the bill arose, he said: "It must be clear to every reasonable man that a law of this kind is a necessary barrier to guard against an arrogation of power in public factions. The bill is founded on justice and policy."

Griswold said that the object of the bill was perfectly well known and understood "to prevent all interference with the Executive power in our foreign intercourse."

Pinckney said that a grave evil existed which it was wise for all nations to prepare against:

"This evil is no less than an endeavor on the part of one government, by means of its diplomatic skill, to overset all the governments which do not occur with them in its mad career. It is become necessary, therefore, for us, in common with other nations, to guard against this evil, and to oppose it by such barriers as are within our power. Upon this footing, the bill now before the House

might be justified, if no inconveniences had already been experienced which make such a law necessary. * * * If an individual goes forward to a foreign government to negotiate on national concerns, any sensible government must either laugh at such a man as mad or conclude that he is the agent of a deep-rooted party opposed to the government of the country from which he comes. And certainly no individual ought to be permitted to do an act with impunity which might throw so great a contempt upon the government of his country."

Harper said:

"It was this intent which constituted the essence of the offense; an intent to interfere in the political relations of this country with foreign nations, or to defeat the measures of our own Government. * * * It is this interference, this intermeddling, and not an accidental conversation, which the bill forbids. The bill includes, in order to constitute the offense required, that the act should be done with an intent to interfere with the functions of government, and intermeddle with the political relations of the two countries."

Brace said:

"The bill proposes to punish any person who shall interfere in any controversy or dispute between the Government and any of these foreign Governments. * * * Indeed, this is a part of our defense which is above all others necessary, as it will defend us against foreign intrigue, against what has already brought upon this country great calamities and involved many others in irretrievable ruin. This crime is, of all others, of the deepest dye. * * * The evil of an offense of this kind is that it involves a whole nation and puts at hazard everything we hold dear."

Rutledge said that in all well-constituted Governments it is a fundamental principle that the Government should possess exclusively the power of carrying on foreign relations.

Isaac Parker said that this bill is founded on the principle that the people of the United States have given to the executive department the power to negotiate with foreign Governments and to carry on all foreign relations, and that it is therefore an usurpation of that power for an individual to undertake to correspond with any foreign power on any dispute between the two Governments.

Various motions to amend the bill in unessential ways, including a motion to limit its operation to one year, were made and defeated (pp. 2679-2682); and the bill was finally passed in the House of Representatives January 17, 1799, by a vote of 58 to 36 (p. 2686).

The bill was introduced in the Senate, and passed on January 25, 1799, by a vote of 18 to 2. It was signed and became a law, January 30, 1799 (1 Stat. 613).

THE ELEMENTS OF THE CRIME

The actions made criminal by the statute fall into two classes: (1) Those performed by United States citizens wherever resident or abiding; (2) those performed by a person resident in the United States, whether alien or citizen.

(1) The actions forbidden to United States citizens are:

- (a) Without the permission or authority of the Government;
- (b) Directly or indirectly;
- (c) To commence or carry on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign Government or any officer or agent thereof.

Or—

- (d) To counsel, advise or assist in any "such correspondence," i.e., in any verbal or written correspondence by a United States citizen with any foreign Government or any officer or agent thereof;

- (e) With an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign Government

of any officer or agent thereof in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States.

Or—

(f) With an intent to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States.

(2) The actions forbidden to persons resident within the United States, whether alien or citizen, are: to counsel, advise or assist in the verbal or written correspondence, or intercourse made criminal as above, with the intent designated as above.

The dictionaries in vogue in or about 1799 define the phrase "to carry on," used in the statute, as follows:

Johnson's Dictionary of the English Language (London, 1755, Todd's Ed., 1818):

To carry on: To promote; to help forward; to continue; to put forward from one stage to another; to prosecute; not to let cease.

Sheridan's English Dictionary (London, 1790) and Walker's Dictionary of the English Language (London, 1791):

To carry on: To promote; to help forward. Webster's American Dictionary (1828):

Carry on: To promote, advance, or help forward; to continue; as, to carry on a design; to carry on the administration of grace; (2) to manage or prosecute; as, to carry on husbandry; (3) to prosecute, continue, or pursue; as, to carry on trade or war.

Similar dictionaries define the word "correspondence" and "intercourse" as follows: Sheridan's English Dictionary (London, 1790), and Walker's Dictionary of the English Language (London, 1791):

Correspondence: Intercourse, reciprocal intelligence.

Intercourse: Commerce, exchange, communication.

Dyche's English Dictionary (London, 1794):

Correspondence: Intercourse by letter or otherwise.

Intercourse: Commerce, exchange, mutual communication.

Entick's New Spelling Dictionary (London, 1791):

Correspondence: Agreement, fitness, intercourse.

Intercourse: Communication, commerce, trade.

Johnson's Dictionary of the English Language (London, 1755):

Correspondence: (2) Intercourse, reciprocal intelligence.

Intercourse: (1) Commerce, exchange; (2) communication.

Kersey's English Dictionary (London, 1721):

Correspondence: Holding intelligence, intercourse, mutual commerce.

Intercourse: Mutual commerce, traffic, or correspondence.

Marchant's New English Dictionary (London, 1760):

Correspondence: Intercourse, reciprocal intelligence.

Intercourse: Commerce, communication, free and mutual correspondence between persons.

From the above it would appear that the words "correspondence" and "intercourse" were interchangeable or synonymous. "Correspondence" is evidently used in the statute in the sense of "general communication or intercourse with," and can not be limited to the technical sense of "communication by letter" inasmuch as it is preceded in the statute by the words "verbal or written."

Proof of intent is, of course, an essential element of the crime. Intent is to be determined from the facts, circumstances, and surroundings at the time of the transaction and from the defendant's prior course of dealing. If the natural and probable result of commencing or carrying on the correspondence or intercourse in question or assisting therein would be the influencing of

a foreign Government or its officials or would be the defeat of measures of the United States Government, then the law presumes that the person so acting intended so to influence or defeat. In other words, there is a presumption of law that a person intends the natural and probable consequence of acts knowingly done by him.

See in general: Reynolds v. United States (1878—98 U.S. 145, 167); Allen v. United States (1896—184 U.S. 492, 496); Agnew v. United States (1897—165 U.S. 36, 50, 53); United States v. Quincy (1832—6 Peters 445, 467; 11 L. R. A. Note p. 810).

"Any officer or agent" of "any foreign Government" is a broad term and clearly includes diplomatic and consular officers located in the United States, so that intercourse or correspondence with them in the United States by a United States citizen, if for the purpose and with the intent prescribed by the statute, is forbidden.

The only other phrase in the statute about which any question is likely to arise is the scope of the phrase "in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States."

Consideration of the history and general purposes of the statute makes it clear that this phrase refers to all questions which are at the time the subject of diplomatic or official correspondence or negotiation between the United States and the foreign country.

GENERAL OBJECT OF THE STATUTE

Under the Constitution, Article II, section 23, the President has the power (by and with the advice and consent of the Senate) to "appoint ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls" and "shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers."

By the act of July 27, 1789, chapter 4 (1 Stat., 28), it was provided that—there shall be an executive department, to be denominated by the Department of Foreign Affairs, and that there shall be a principal officer therein, to be called the Secretary for the Department of Foreign Affairs, who shall perform and execute such duties as shall from time to time be enjoined on or entrusted to him by the President of the United States, agreeable to the Constitution, relative to correspondences, commissions, or instructions to or with public ministers or consuls, from the United States, or to negotiations with public ministers from foreign States or princes, or to memorials or other applications from foreign public ministers or other foreigners, or to such other matters respecting foreign affairs as the President of the United States shall assign to the said department; and furthermore, that the said principal officer shall conduct the business of the said department in such manner as the President of the United States shall from time to time order or instruct.

These functions of the President with reference to foreign nations were stated by Jefferson to Genet, the French minister, in a letter November 22, 1793, as follows:

He [the President] being the only channel of communication between this country and foreign nations or their agents, it is from him alone that foreign nations or their agents are to learn what is or has been the will of the Nation.

The Executive, therefore, is the head of the Government, especially "charged with our foreign relations," and their conduct. See Williams v. Suffolk Insurance Co. (1839—13 Peters, 415 420), in which case it was so held, and the President's decisions as "to what sovereignty any island or country belongs" was

By the act of Sept. 15, 1789, ch. 14 (1 Stat., 68), the name of the Department of Foreign Affairs was changed to that of the Department of State. These statutes are embodied in the Revised Statutes sec. 202.

held to be "in the exercise of his constitutional functions," and "under the responsibilities which belong to him."

It is highly important to the welfare of the country that there shall be no interference with the President's constitutional and statutory functions, and especially no attempt to influence or intermeddle in official foreign negotiations carried on by him, through private negotiations with foreign officials in relation to the same subject matter. In foreign negotiation, the President must speak for the people of this country. Private individuals can not be allowed to open negotiations which might have the effect of inducing or promoting in the foreign country views as to discord or faction in this country.

The influencing of a foreign nation by correspondence with foreign officials upon a question in dispute between it and the United States, or upon a measure of the United States, is a function which should be possessed solely by the Government, and which a private citizen ought not to be allowed to assume.

PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE STATUTE

Moore, in his digest of International Law (1906), volume IV, page 449, says:

"As to Pickering's subsequent violation, when out of power and in opposition, of the statute, the enactment of which he had inspired, see Adams's History of the United States, IV, 236 et seq.

"No conviction or prosecution is known to have taken place under this act, although it has on various occasions been invoked, officially or unofficially, as a possible ground of action against individuals who were supposed to have infringed it."

President Jefferson by message of December 21, 1803, laid before Congress correspondence with Charles Pinckney, minister to Spain, relative to responsibility of Spain for "French seizures and condemnations of our vessels in the ports of Spain, for which we deemed the latter power responsible," and for which "our minister at that court was instructed to press for an additional article" in the proposed treaty or convention "comprehending that branch of wrongs."

Among the papers transmitted when copies of opinions rendered by five of the most eminent American lawyers, Jared Ingersoll, William Rawle, Joseph B. McKean, Peter S. Duponceau, all of Philadelphia, and Edward Livingston, of New York, on an abstract question submitted to them by the Government of Spain, and which opinions were used by the Spanish ministry in declining to adopt the suggestions for an arbitration treaty made by Pinckney. The latter insisted that arbitration must include every class of case of wrong to American citizens, both losses due to acts of Spanish subjects and to acts of French consuls, etc., in Spanish ports—Spain being liable under the law of nations for the acts of aliens in her territory. (See Annals of Congress, Eighth Congress, 2d sess., App., pp. 1261, et seq.)

The legal opinions were rendered in November, 1802, on an abstract hypothetical case, and were adverse to the contentions of the United States as advanced by Pinckney as to the rights of the United States to indemnity under the law of nations. Pinckney claimed that the abstract question did not present the actual facts in the case, and that the United States had never relinquished any rights which it had against Spain by any convention with France.

As a result of this action on the part of American lawyers, a committee in the Senate to whom the President's message had been referred, made the following report to the Senate February 24, 1804 (see Executive Journal of the Senate, Vol. I, p. 468):

Upon a careful examination of the message and documents communicated by the President on the 21st of December your committee notice certain unauthorized acts and

doings of individuals, contrary to law and highly prejudicial to the rights and sovereignty of the United States, tending to defeat the measures of the Government thereof, and which, in their opinion, merit the consideration of the Senate.

They find that on the 15th of November, 1802, and before and subsequent to that day, divers controversies and disputes had arisen between the Governments of the United States and Spain concerning certain seizures and condemnation of the vessels and effects of the citizens of the United States in the ports of Spain, and for which the Government of Spain was deemed responsible, and in the prosecution of which, for indemnification, the minister of the United States near the Court of Spain had been instructed to press that Government, by friendly negotiations, to provide for those wrongs.

Your committee find, while said negotiation was pending and this said disputes and controversies in nowise settled or adjusted, that Jared Ingersoll, William Rawle, Joseph B. McKean, and P. S. Duponceau, of the city of Philadelphia, did, at said Philadelphia, on the same 15th of November, 1802, and Edward Livingston, of the city of New York, did, at said New York, on the 3d day of the same November, in violation of the act entitled "An act for the punishment of certain crimes therein specified," passed the 30th day of January, 1799, commence and carry on a correspondence and intercourse with the said Government of Spain and with the agents thereof, and, as your committee believe, with an intent to influence the measures and conduct of the Government of Spain and to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States; and did, then and there, counsel, advise, aid, and assist, in such correspondence with intent as aforesaid.

Your committee, with the knowledge of these facts, are compelled to observe that however there might exist in Senate a great reluctance to express any opinion in relation to proceedings in the ordinary course of criminal jurisprudence yet, when they reflect on the nature of the offense, the improbability of the ministers of the law ever coming to the knowledge thereof without the aid of the Executive, and the delicate situation of the Executive in relation to the subject, duty seems to demand and propriety to justify their expressing an opinion in favor of that aid, without which, in their judgment, the justice of the Nation would be exposed to suffer.

Your committee have no doubt that precedents may be adduced, and from the best authority, to justify such a measure and warrant the proceedings with safety to the remedial justice of the law, which admits of no rules, or pretended rules, uncorrected and uncontrolled by circumstances, the certain result of which would be the failure of justice.

With these impressions, your committee respectfully offer to the Senate the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to cause to be laid before the Attorney General all such papers, documents, and evidence, as he may deem expedient, and which relate to any unauthorized correspondence and intercourse, carried on by Jared Ingersoll, William Rawle, Joseph B. McKean, P.S. Duponceau, and Edward Livingston, with the Government of Spain, or with the agents thereof, with an intent to influence the measures and conduct of the Government of Spain, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States, in relation to certain disputes and controversies between the said Governments.

Resolved, That if in the opinion of the Attorney General, such papers, documents, and evidence, or such other evidence as may be presumed, from any that is particeps criminis, shall be deemed sufficient to warrant a

prosecution of the aforesaid persons, or either of them, that the President of the United States be, and hereby is, requested to instruct the proper law officer to commence a prosecution, at such time and in such manner as he may judge expedient, against Jared Ingersoll, William Rawle, Joseph B. McKean, P. S. Duponceau, and Edward Livingston, or either of them on the act, entitled "An act for the punishment of certain crimes therein specified." And that he be requested to furnish the attorney on the part of the United States, for the purpose of carrying on said prosecution, with such papers, documents, and evidence, from the Executive Department of the Government, as he may deem expedient and necessary.

A motion was made by Mr. White, that it be

Resolved, That the Senate will take no further order on the report made to them respecting the opinions of certain lawyers, relating to the convention between the United States and His Catholic Majesty; the Senate not considering it within the province of their duty to do so, and that the injunction of secrecy upon the same be taken off.

On motion,

Ordered, That the consideration of this resolution be postponed to the first Monday in November next.

No action on the resolution was ever taken (see Foster's Century of American Diplomacy, 229).

The only other instances in which the statute has been utilized are cited by Moore (Sec. 631), as follows:

The last clause of the statute was appealed to by Mr. Seward in 1861, to stop certain proceedings of Mr. Bunch, British consul at Charleston, S.C., in urging the British Government to recognize Confederate independence. (Bernard's Neutrality of Great Britain, 185, and infra, Sec. 700).

See, in relation to the Sackville case, and the "Murchison correspondence," the report of Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, to the President, Oct. 29, 1838. For, Rel. 1838, 11, 1670; infra, sec. 649.

LETTER FROM VIETNAM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter I recently received from Capt. William D. Harman. The letter concerns Captain Harman's views about the war in Vietnam. I believe opinions of men who risk much in Vietnam are deserving of wide dissemination.

The letter follows:

MAY 1, 1971.

DEAR SIR: I am currently stationed at Han Son Nhut AB and have been in Vietnam for over 5 months. Before arriving I was unsure of what our position should be in regards to this war. But after actually experiencing the situation first hand I am thoroughly convinced that we should get out now!!

My experience has been that the Vietnamese people could honestly care less if we weren't here. The only thing they see when an American comes into view is dollars, PX items, etc., and not of a true friend here to save them from the evils of communism. Hell, most of them wouldn't know the difference anyhow.

But what's even worse is that there is no sense of purpose among our own troops. Many, including myself, see nothing worth fighting for. And to keep us here for the sake

of the nearly 50,000 that have died is ridiculous. I would venture to say that most of the Americans that have died over here would be more than happy to see us out of here before another life is lost.

Being in the military now for over four years has offered me quite an opportunity to see parts of the world I would otherwise have never seen. I spent 2½ years in Greece and have visited both Turkey and Italy. And through all of this I have gained a much greater appreciation of the good ol' US of A. And coupled with this appreciation is a sincere desire to preserve what our nation believes to be morally and politically correct. This war is not in line with these beliefs. It is tearing our country apart emotionally, politically and socially. To me our own internal political and social situation is much more important than the survival of a weak government and an indifferent populous. Let's get out now, please!!!

Yours sincerely,

DAVE HARMAN,
Captain, USAF.

UNIQUE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there are many people-to-people programs in which Americans are taking increasingly active roles in making new friendships with peoples from distant lands.

I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues in the House to a unique and far-reaching program of this kind undertaken by the Wally Byam Foundation of Washington, D.C., and directed by Mrs. Carolyn Bennett Patterson, an assistant editor of the National Geographic magazine and board chairman of the foundation.

Chartered in 1962 as a nonprofit organization and named after the late Wally Byam, founder of the Airstream Co., travel trailer manufacturers, the foundation has applied the Byam good-neighbor concept by sponsoring 30-day cross-country trailer trips for foreign visitors through small-town America.

Before his death in 1962, Wally Byam sponsored American trailer caravan tours to Europe, Africa, and Asia with the primary goal in mind. He said:

When people of two different countries get to know each other, they discover that everyone is essentially the same, has the same problems, and enjoys the same things. This bond of fellowship is the only factor that can ensure peace.

In 1963, the foundation started a relatively modest refamiliarization program for returning American diplomats from overseas posts, first with the U.S. Information Agency and later on with the U.S. Department of State.

The diplomats were provided trailers and automobiles so that they might take leisurely tours of various parts of our great land and at the same time reacquant themselves with grassroots America and thus obtain firsthand information on changes in American life, ways and thinking while they were away. At the same time, the diplomats gave press,

radio and television interviews, and lectures on the nature of their assignment and duties abroad.

The exchange of views and opinions, made possible by the foundation's "Rediscover America" program, resulted in a better understanding by Americans of our foreign policy and at the same time afforded our diplomats the opportunity to clarify misconceptions about Americans' role in foreign affairs.

In 1967, Mr. Speaker, the foundation took on a new and far more challenging assignment by sponsoring the "Caravan America" program, still carrying on the Wally Byam foreign friendship role. He once said:

We haven't a ghost of a chance to build firm international peace unless the citizens of every country understand the motives and way of life of every other country. There has to be a meeting.

The first Caravan America, launched in 1967, made possible tours of our national shrines, parks, and forests and an almost endless round of transcontinental hospitality for 20 British and 20 French families.

Caravan America was underway again last year with 20 German, 20 Swiss, and 18 foreign diplomatic families as participants. The families were chosen by ADAC, the German equivalent of our American Automobile Association, the Swiss Non-Commissioned Officers Association and the various foreign embassies accredited to the United States in Washington.

This is indeed a unique program, Mr. Speaker, initiated by the Wally Byam Foundation on a nongovernmental basis and without the expenditure of public funds.

C. H. Manchester, president of Airstream, Inc., a division of Beatrice Foods, describes the low key noncommercial company participation in the Foundation activities in these words:

The Foundation is financed by contributions made by purchasers of Airstream travel trailers, matched by a similar contribution by the Airstream company, together with contributions from interested trailer clubs and individuals around the country.

The foundation budget is a modest one, but its programs, however, are far-reaching in view of the vast reservoirs of goodwill which have been created since the foundation began its Rediscover America and Caravan America programs. Their success is due in great measure, Mr. Speaker, to the dynamic leadership of Mrs. Patterson in serving the foundation on a voluntary unpaid basis as director of its activities.

What she is accomplishing is phenomenal, largely through her ability to get people, the right people, interested in the foundation's objectives. Backing her are numerous volunteers. For instance, advance planning and experienced caravan leadership are supplied by volunteers from the Wally Byam Club International. Members and private citizens, through chambers of commerce and other organizations, have enthusiastically assisted in welcoming arrangements for the foreign guests all across the land.

As an illustration of the volunteer work involved, I cite just one small wel-

coming activity here at the capitol last May for the 20 German families upon their arrival in Washington. New England, unfortunately, could not be included in the visitors' itinerary. Consequently, some typical Massachusetts hospitality was brought to Washington where a Capitol luncheon was held, featuring some food products that have made New England famous.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Patterson is not resting on her laurels from these very successful foundation activities. She is now working on what may well be her most ambitious project. It is called Open House, U.S.A., a concept she gave to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, which adopted it as part of the official planning for the Nation's birthday.

Open House, U.S.A. is seeking support from prominent Americans in starting hospitality campaigns all over the Nation, through State and city government leaders, service organizations, and individuals in inviting and sponsoring the visits of foreign nationals to local observances of America's 200th birthday.

This, undoubtedly, will be the biggest people-to-people program ever devised and it is now Mrs. Patterson's dream project for the months ahead as the Nation prepares through pageants, community celebrations, and cultural events to celebrate its birthday in commemoration of the great events of 1776.

The support and help of all Americans will determine the success or failure of Open House, U.S.A. I join my colleagues in the House in wishing this new venture in international friendship and understanding the success that it deserves.

PLANT IN OAKLAND, MD., BREAKS GROUND FOR DEMONSTRATION WASTE TREATMENT SYSTEM

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 1971 ground was broken at the Sterling Processing Corp. poultry plant in Oakland, Md., for a demonstration pilot plant for secondary waste treatment.

This is a demonstration project sponsored by the Sterling Processing Corp., the Department of the Interior, and the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. I commend these efforts. Mr. Gilman Sylvester, the plant manager, has invested much time, effort, and enthusiasm in getting this project started. The Republican of Oakland carried the following story on May 20, 1971, describing the ground breaking:

GROUND BROKEN FOR PILOT PROJECT AT STERLING PLANT

Ground was broken Tuesday at the Sterling Processing Corporation poultry plant, just west of Oakland, for a building to house machinery for the recirculation of secondary waste effluent and its reuse in the plant itself. This is the first attempt in the United States for such a project.

The 300 gallon per minute double filtration

system to be installed will be a demonstration pilot plant. Total cost will be \$204,000 with a grant of \$146,000 coming from the Department of the Interior, and the balance being furnished by the State Health Department and the Processing Corporation. The results are expected to contribute greatly to conserving the water supply of the town of Oakland and serve as an example for other industrialists to follow.

The Sterling corporation already has a waste treatment plant that is 99 percent effective in treating its industrial waste water and has its own water filtration system. The water will go into two aerated lagoons, be treated for some two weeks and then go through the new filtration system and back to the water treatment plant with the water being a potable water source.

Richard Lyons, of the State Health department, will be at the plant on full time basis and will serve as project supervisor at the site.

CUSTOMS OFFICE WANTED IN KENAI, ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the continued growth of the economy of Alaska is particularly important to the people of the State of Alaska. It is, therefore, important that the State make the maximum possible use of its air and marine facilities. One of the most important areas in the State of Alaska is Kenai. The geographical location of Kenai is such that full utilization of its marine and air transportation would enable that city to serve as one of the most important transportation links in Alaska.

One way to insure greater utilization of the Kenai facilities would be to establish a U.S. Customs Office in Kenai. The need for a customs office in Kenai is already fully justified on the basis of projected shipping totals during the current fiscal year. It is expected that not less than 90 foreign-flag ships and some 1,195,000 tons of freight will require customs clearance in Kenai.

The Alaska State Legislature has urged the U.S. Bureau of Customs to establish the U.S. Bureau of Customs Office in Kenai. I wholeheartedly agree with their resolution, and I include a copy of it for inclusion in the RECORD:

ESTABLISHMENT OF A U.S. CUSTOMS OFFICE AT KENAI

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the geographical location of Kenai is such that full utilization of its marine and air transportation facilities would enable Kenai to serve as one of the primary transportation links in the development of Alaskan industries, including those of the North Slope; and

Whereas the maximum possible utilization of air and marine facilities of Kenai will contribute to the economy of Kenai, as well as to the entire state; and

Whereas one way to ensure greater utilization of the Kenai facilities would be the establishment of a United States Customs Office at Kenai; and

Whereas the need for a Customs Office in the Kenai area is already fully justified on the basis of projected shipping totals during the current fiscal year of not less than 96

foreign flagships and some 1,195,000 tons of freight, all requiring Customs clearance; be it resolved by

The Alaska State Legislature that the United States Bureau of Customs is urgently requested to establish a United States Customs Office at Kenai, Alaska.

SEEK SAFE RETURN OF POW'S

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the language of House Resolution 319, which I introduced on March 17, 1971. I was hoping it might catch the attention of the administration:

H. RES. 319

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madam Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on September 17, 1970, that the policy of her government is "In case the United States Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops and those of the other foreign countries, in the United States camp, and the parties will engage at once in discussion on:

"The question of ensuring safety for the total withdrawal from South Vietnam of United States troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp. "The question of releasing captured military men."

Resolved, That the United States shall forthwith propose at the Paris peace talks that in return for the return of all American prisoners held in Indochina, the United States shall withdraw all its Armed Forces

from Vietnam within sixty days following the signing of the agreement: *Provided*, That the agreement shall contain guarantee by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of safe conduct out of Vietnam for all American prisoners and all American Armed Forces simultaneously.

SOME GOOD NEWS FROM VIETNAM

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, the last issue of *Commentary*, a newsletter published by the University of Vermont, has some news about the production of rice in Vietnam which, I am sure, will have a large impact on the future of that unhappy country and on the future stability of Southeast Asia. A part of this newsletter is quoted here:

REPORT FROM VIETNAM: A BUMPER CROP IN RICE

There's a bright side to American involvement in Vietnam, rarely heard, but expressed by a University of Vermont professor who has just returned from there.

Dr. Jerry J. McIntosh, associate professor of plant and soil science, said this year the Vietnamese will once more produce enough rice to meet their own needs, something they haven't done since 1964.

Next year the nation will begin to resume its traditional position as a rice exporter. And, with new approaches to old agricultural problems the Vietnamese may grow more diversified crops, thus improving their own diet as well as their nation's export position.

Two factors have been responsible for this progress: development of "miracle rice" by the International Rice Research Institute; and widespread introduction of this rice into Vietnam by both Vietnamese and American agriculturists.

Dr. McIntosh was asked to go to Vietnam as a consultant for the Federal Extension Service, and was selected because in 1969, during a sabbatical leave from the University, he worked in the Philippines for the International Rice Research Institute, and thus had gained a depth of knowledge about problems associated with increasing the food production of southeast Asia.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DEERE & CO.

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, in an age when it has become fashionable to knock private business for being inconsiderate and indifferent to the common consumer, I am proud to have in my district, Deere & Co., which recently offered its competitors, free access to its patents on protection of tractors against the danger of overturning.

Deere & Co. during the 1960's pioneered in the area of tractor safety and developed the first protective roll-frames for farm tractors. The protective frames were called "Roll-Gard" because tests showed that in most cases the frames would limit overturns to a 90-degree roll instead of the tractors turning completely over.

Tractor overturns are believed to be the leading cause of deaths involving farm equipment, consequently Deere & Co. wants other manufacturers of farm machinery to share with them its data on tractor upsets and protective frames, Deere & Co. should be applauded not only for its outstanding leadership in the field of farm machinery, but for its invaluable research which is constantly striving to make its products safer and better for the farmer.

SENATE—Tuesday, May 25, 1971

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. 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:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for Thy mercies which are new every morning and for this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and eternal. Remind us once more of the profound and holy foundations on which the Founding Fathers established this Republic. Keep us ever faithful to their high vision.

O Lord, help us through this day to labor so as to bring help to others, credit to ourselves, and honor to the Nation. When the days are long and the problems vexing, hold us by Thy grace and sustain us by Thy presence. May nothing deprive us of joy and peace. Guide us on our way by the remembrance of Him who was servant of all.

In His name we pray. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 24, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 24, 1971, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 8190) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 24, 1971, the President pro tempore signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 8190).

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 24, 1971, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 108, House Joint Resolution 633, a joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, be indefinitely postponed.