

propriated to the Highway Trust Fund shall be suspended during any period when amounts in the fund are impounded or otherwise withheld from expenditure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 9466. A bill to provide additional Federal assistance for State programs of treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9467. A bill to protect the public health and welfare and the environment through improved regulation of pesticides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9468. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for a Great Lakes Basin conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9469. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9470. A bill to amend section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 15), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9471. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.J. Res. 749. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the reconfirmation of judges after a term of 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J. Res. 750. Joint resolution: Stable purchasing power resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.J. Res. 751. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the President to proclaim September 12 through 19, 1971, to be "American Field Service Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 752. Joint resolution: Stable purchasing power resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.J. Res. 753. Joint resolution: Stable purchasing power resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:
H.J. Res. 754. Joint resolution: Stable purchasing power resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.J. Res. 755. Joint resolution commending the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSH (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZEK, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LINK, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PIKE, Mr. REES, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa):

H. Res. 511. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to disclosure of the results of the national nutrition survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. COTTER, and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 512. Resolution relative to releasing the National Nutrition Survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H. Res. 513. Resolution to provide for free Federal telecommunications system service to patients in veterans hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

222. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to mortgage assistance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

223. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to the Emergency Employment Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

224. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the method of choosing State delegates to the White House Conference on Aging; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

225. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the establishment of a National Cancer Authority; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

226. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

227. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, relative to sharing Federal tax revenues with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

228. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the importation of textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9472. A bill for the relief of Andreas A. Antypas, his wife Barbel Antypas, and their son Alexis Antypas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 9473. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosanna Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 9474. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States of a certain parcel of land in Jefferson County, Ala., to the Mount Olive Civic Association, Inc., for civic and recreational use by the community of Mount Olive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

90. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to the declassification of the study on U.S. involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

91. Also, petition of the board of directors of the District of Columbia Young Republican Club, relative to a raid conducted by the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Division of the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

92. Also, petition of Miss Marie L. Stack, administrative staff, Blackman's Development Center, Washington, D.C., relative to the creation of a select committee of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE ZION "GOLDEN AGE" FOUNDATION

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the Zion "Golden Age" Foundation, a senior citizens project concerned with health needs and living care for the aged. The foundation's goal is to establish and maintain homes for retired American Jews in the principal cities of Israel.

In this country, there are a great number of American Jews living in homes for the aged who are lonely and without

relatives and friends to cheer them up in times of adversity. For those who would prefer to spend their later years in Israel, but feel unable to adapt to a new language and a new environment, the Zion "Golden Age" Foundation has developed a three-fold program which is outlined below. I commend the efforts of this non-profit organization in helping our senior citizens:

THE PROGRAM OF THE ZION "GOLDEN AGE" FOUNDATION

(1) To establish and maintain in the principal cities of Israel, such as Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, homes for retired American Jews, so conceived and executed as to enable them to live their retirement in a complex which takes into account their long-established ways of living and comforts, and provides a place where they can live within their financial means.

These homes are to be established on a non-profit basis and will be economically successful because they cater to middle class residents and comprise not less than 100 rooms, divided into 60% single rooms and 40% for couples. Also, this arrangement will make it possible for the residents to pay for their full board and lodging within their retirement income (Social Security and other plans), without the necessity to make inroads into their savings and capital.

The location of these homes must be in town so as to enable the residents, many of whom are unwilling or unlikely to drive in Israel, to travel easily to other parts of town and to places of entertainment; after all, these persons have spent all their lives in large cities, and if such homes were located outside the town, it would bring about a sense of isolation, which is the very feature of life such persons seek to avoid and which would be strange to those accustomed to city living.

Also, the setting of these homes will provide a garden either attached to the home, or a public park adjacent to it, so that there is an attractive neighborhood. The facilities in the rooms will be modern and complete, and the public rooms will be comfortable, spacious and yet warm.

(2) In connection with these homes, and attached to them, will be an Institute for Research and Study of the entire field of geriatrics. Such an Institute will deal with the problems of prevention and cure of the illnesses of old age, the slowing of the aging process, and, in general, the prolongation of human life through all means available to modern science. Because of this connection, the residents of these homes will be the beneficiaries of the research developed by the Institute which will work in close cooperation with the foremost scientists in Israel and throughout the world.

However, under no circumstances will the residents of the home be used as subjects of experimentation in the fields of geriatric research. Also, this home and the Institute do not have to be devoted to the treatment of sick residents, since these persons, as immigrants to Israel, will be referred immediately to competent physicians in Kupat Cholim hospitals and clinics.

On the other hand, one of the aims of this Foundation will be the furthering of scientific research into all areas of the important field of geriatrics, through grants, fellowships, etc., as well as the popularization of this research through lectures, films, publications, etc.

(3) To relieve and solve the problems among the Jewish aged in this country, living in institutions created for them, a group or groups of volunteers will be organized under the auspices of the Foundation. These volunteers will undertake the responsibility of working with these old people, visiting them regularly, bringing them little gifts, and, in general, will relieve their loneliness which, in many cases, can become very depressing.

A preliminary survey has indicated that the owners and administrators of such homes will welcome this cooperation most enthusiastically, so that there will be no problem of assigning the volunteers to residents in specific homes in their immediate vicinity.

In addition to this most gratifying and worthwhile work, these groups of volunteers will sponsor and organize regular meetings at which competent medical and other authorities will lecture about problems of old age, geriatrics research and similar subjects of public interest.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Johnson City, Tenn., Evening Press-Chronicle of June 9, 1971, included an excellent editorial on the subject of revenue sharing.

As I have pointed out on several occasions, the principal problem with revenue sharing is that the Federal Government does not at this time have any revenue to share. This point is made strongly in the editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, entitled "Here's the Nub of it," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

HERE'S THE NUB OF IT

"Where is the revenue to share?"

This question, asked pointedly by Sen. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia, probably has been given only the scantest consideration by state and local officials who are expecting some kind of bonanza if the Nixon Administration wins its battle for "revenue sharing." Alas . . .

Catchy phrases are a dime a dozen, but how much money do we have in the bank to back up the phrase "revenue sharing"?

Senator Byrd sizes it up this way in a statement on the floor of the Senate:

"The fact is that, for the fiscal year which ends this month, the federal government will have a federal funds deficit of \$25 billion. Under the administration's own calculations, the federal government will have a federal funds deficit for the new fiscal year which begins July 1 of \$23 billion. So, Mr. President, in these two fiscal years, the one which ends at the end of this month and the other which begins July 1, the federal government will have a federal funds deficit for the 2-year period of at least \$48 billion.

"So I say, Mr. President, that, when they talk about revenue sharing, I would like to have someone answer my question as to where the revenue is to come from."

Government officials—federal, state and local—do not like to come to grips with this kind of question. They prefer to pretend there is no limit to what can be spent here, there and everywhere for all kinds of causes and conditions.

But facts are facts—and it is time to face up to the harsh truth that we are in a fiscal mess which isn't going to be cured by neatly-turned phrases. The cure can come only from national and local discipline of a type we have so far lacked the stamina to employ.

CABLE TELEVISION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received an informative white paper from Donald V. Taverner, president of the National Cable Television Association, Inc.

It candidly responds to questions raised in the cable television versus pay television debate. This controversy has affected the general public and the broadcast media itself. Cable television has been unfairly castigated and this frankly lays down the facts to deliver the full story.

Cable television's innovative and fresh ideas must not be restrained from coming to the full attention of the public.

Congress will eventually play a vital part in determining future legislative action. It has to have the intelligence data made known to it to determine the most proper course of legislative action.

It is for these reasons I enter the following material:

LET CABLE TV GROW

Several years ago a chairman of the Federal Communications Commission characterized television in the United States as a "vast wasteland." Today most critics agree. Very little has changed.

In spite of technology that could give millions of Americans greater variety in TV programming, most viewers are limited to a handful of sometimes difficult-to-receive broadcast TV signals. The irony is that we can easily bring a clear color TV picture live

across 225,000 miles of space from the moon—only to find it will probably be distorted between the local station and your television set.

Cable television (CATV) offers a solution to the problems of reception, program diversity, and needed outlets for truly local expression.

This exciting medium began two decades ago in the hills of eastern Pennsylvania and in northwest Oregon to help people cut off from television signals get a good picture. A large antenna was erected where it could catch TV signals. The signals were then fed by coaxial cable to the homes of subscribers. It was not long before many early CATV systems developed a capacity to bring 12 or more channels to these small communities.

Unlike radio and TV, where only a few signals can be broadcast into the air without interfering with each other, CATV with its current technology can bring viewers 40 programming channels. The potential is even greater.

THINK OF IT: 40 DIFFERENT CHANNELS

In addition to a greater variety of broadcast programs, there could be skills training and college courses. Ethnic programs, programs for minority groups and minority interests. Programs in different languages. Symphony concerts. City council meetings and Little League baseball. Today in an industry where the average cable system serves less than 2,000 subscribers, about 15 percent of the systems are doing things like this.

BUT, THERE IS ANOTHER PROBLEM

The FCC in a series of regulations dating back to 1966 has frozen the growth of the CATV industry. That is why 92 percent of U.S. television viewers cannot enjoy any form of cable television.

CATV should be permitted to grow. And it is the position of the cable television industry that this medium can hold its own in the competitive communications marketplace—if given the opportunity to do so.

The U.S. Justice Department's Antitrust Division, in a series of memorandums to the FCC, agrees. For example, in a 1970 memo, the Antitrust Division said:

... the Commission's purpose must be two-fold: to make efficient use of spectrum space considering all public interests, and to allow development of a combination of broadcast and CATV programming which will serve the public interest. Discrimination against one media because it is newer or more efficient is unjustified.

Change does not come easy. And since Congress has given no statutory instructions on CATV, the protection of broadcasting has continued.

If we are to judge from the past, this is not what Congress intends as Justice also told the FCC this month:

Nothing . . . makes commercial over-the-air television the 'chosen instrument' of Congress for any type of communication. Certainly the (Communications) Act says nothing about suppressing new, non-broadcast modes of electronic communications which may develop and compete with broadcasting. On the contrary, in situations where new modes of service have developed within a regulated industry the Congress has acted to provide that each should be treated on a par and administered so as to promote, develop, and preserve, *not suppress*, the unique advantages of each mode of service.

In addition to the position taken by the Antitrust Division, every major impartial study of CATV conducted in recent years has concluded that FCC regulations are so restrictive that the viewing public is deprived of additional programming.

The people who most directly feel the effects of restrictive cable regulation have also spoken out. Numerous mayors from cities around the country have urged and are still urging the FCC to allow cable to develop.

The FCC, after recent extensive public

hearings, is considering changes in cable television regulations.

It is expected that any major relaxation of rules will be contingent on revisions of copyright law in the Congress. The cable television industry, in the interest of developing CATV's potential, is on record as supporting revisions requiring reasonable copyright payments.

There is no valid reason for continuing to stifle cable television's potential through overly restrictive regulations. The industry does not oppose reasonable Federal regulation; it does oppose the continuing freeze on its development.

The issues are clear. Cable has been studied and debated for years. The overwhelming bulk of impartial evidence points to the conclusion that the public is being denied a service it wants. The time has come for action.

TYRONE, PA.—THE TOWN THAT REFUSES TO DIE

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, the town of Tyrone, Pa., has been beset with major economic problems in recent years. The major industry for over 80 years was a papermaking plant, but late last year this industry found it necessary to cut back its activities in Tyrone substantially and well over 500 people found themselves suddenly unemployed.

Nevertheless, Tyrone, Pa., through the Tyrone Improvement Corp., is confidently and aggressively looking toward the future. Tyrone Improvement Corp. placed an ad recently in the Wall Street Journal describing the readiness of this town to undertake new ventures to provide employment for its citizens and to foster the economic rehabilitation of the area. Tyrone has a large supply of skilled and trained people available and has built a new 50,000 square foot shell industrial building to house new industry. In addition, the town has offered to arrange for 100-percent financing for a company willing to move into the new site.

I am indeed proud of this courageous Pennsylvania community. I ask unanimous consent that two articles and an advertisement describing the efforts of local Tyrone people to bring renewed life into this town be printed in the RECORD.

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

TYRONE IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION—EYES ON THE FUTURE

Tyrone Improvement Corporation—the major industrial development group in this area—is now in the midst of a large-scale promotion of Tyrone.

Focal point of this promotion is a 50,000 square foot industrial shell building now under construction in the Tyrone Industrial Park.

TIC is working closely with Altoona Enterprises in both the construction of the building and the attraction of an industry to occupy the structure.

The Tyrone Development Corporation, forerunner of TIC, was formed to bring the Reliance Manufacturing Co. (now Big Yank) to Tyrone.

In the mid-1940's the group was reorga-

nized under the name of Tyrone Improvement Corporation to bring the Tyrone division of the Chicago Rivet and Machine Co. to the community.

TIC was then inactive for several years and reactivation in 1959 was sparked for the "Jobs For Joes" fund-raising campaign. This effort gained funds in the amount of \$90,000.

The purchase of part of the former Athletic Park at a cost of \$32,000 has been the major TIC expense. According to recent financial statements made by TIC, the group has on hand approximately \$57,000 of the original total collected.

This money, as well as contributions to the current fund drive, will be used to pay for construction of the shell building.

SHELL BUILDING

The building is being constructed by Maurice A. Lawruck Builder, Inc., of Altoona at a cost of \$282,200.

The architect for the project is N. Grant Nicklas of Hollidaysburg, who has been retained at a cost of \$16,920.

The shell structure will measure 250x200 feet. It will be a one-story steel supported building with masonry side base and metal walls. There will be a crushed stone floor and interior height of 18 feet will extend to the horizontal steel girders.

Designed for occupancy by a "heavy" industry, the building is able to facilitate expansion.

It is located adjacent to the Chicago Rivet and Machine Co. plant on the 32-acre industrial park site with railroad siding access at its rear.

It will have access roads off Adams ave. and will include a parking area.

Altoona Enterprises, in cooperation with certain financial institutions in Altoona, the First Blair County National Bank and Improvement Savings and Loan Association have pledged financial support in the project.

Robert Halloran, industrial development director of Altoona Enterprises, has noted that "finding a tenant for the Tyrone shell building is a top-priority aim for Altoona Enterprises."

Local, county and state officials attended the informal ground-breaking ceremonies held Tuesday, October 6. This ceremony marked the culmination of nearly a decade of work on the part of TIC officials.

Bids on the structure were first sought June 15 and seven bids were opened July 10, with the contract being awarded to the Lawruck firm.

TIC funds have also been used to assist Altoona Enterprises in attracting PPG Industries, Proctor-Silex and L. Grief and Bro. to the Tyrone area.

MAIN PURPOSE

The purpose of TIC, as set forth in the organization's by-laws, is "to foster and promote business and industrial growth of the borough of Tyrone and surrounding community by aiding in the establishment of manufacturing and other business plants therein to provide employment for the people thereof; to acquire, hold, mortgage, lease, convey, donate and otherwise manage and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary for such purpose; and for such purpose to have, possess and enjoy all the rights, benefits and privileges under said Act of Assembly."

The corporation is a non-profit organization operated solely for the benefit of Tyrone and surrounding area.

Most of the TIC business is conducted by 25 directors elected at the annual meeting to serve three-year terms.

[From the Tyrone (Pa.) Daily Herald,
May 21, 1971]

T.I.C.: ONE GOAL IS REACHED—\$150,000
"NEW JOBS FOR JOES" PASSED, \$200,000
NOW TARGET

The Tyrone Improvement Corp. today raised its sights and fired away toward a

target of \$200,000 after topping its \$150,000 "New Jobs for Joes" fund campaign goal.

An audited report issued today by T.I.C. Treasurer Richard W. Getz shows that 785 persons, firms, organizations and employee groups have subscribed a total of \$150,330.40 and a spokesman said there is still evidence of more contributions and pledges to come.

The money will be used in the attempts to attract new industry to Tyrone, to offset the loss of some 550 jobs created last Dec. 2 when Westvaco Corp., the community's largest employer, announced steep cutbacks in its operation here. Westvaco now has about 350 persons at work, compared to more than 900 last year.

BEGAN DEC. 8

The intensive campaign was initiated by T.I.C. on Dec. 8, less than a week after the Westvaco announcement. In a 3-hour meeting, T.I.C. directors and committeemen established a goal of \$100,000 and J. Thomas Marsden and John A. Hiller were named co-chairmen for the campaign.

Ten days later, on Dec. 18, the goal of \$150,000 was recommended by the co-drive chairmen, and T.I.C. directors immediately accepted the plan.

At the end of December the campaign and the effort to offset the economic plight here had been snowballing, with various groups offering assistance.

MAJOR OFFERS

One of the major pledges of aid came from the Columbia Avenue United Methodist Church. The church, under its pastor the Rev. Leroy Harrison, for a couple years had been planning to relocate its edifice near the Gray Field practice field, Clay ave. and Garfield st. On Dec. 29 the congregation of the church voted unanimously to provide immediately a guarantee of \$100,000 of its building funds to cover pledges to the T.I.C. campaign. This would allow T.I.C. to have money available immediately, should the need arise, rather than being required to borrow against its campaign pledges.

The first four months of 1971 saw additional offers of help roll in to this community.

PENELEC POWER

Major offers of assistance came rapidly from the Pennsylvania Electric Co. which put its industrial development experts to work in contacting prospective industries; from the Indiana University of Pennsylvania where its President, a former Tyrone, Dr. William W. Hassler, offered the services of his trained professional educators in devising training and promotional projects; from five townships and Birmingham Borough which sent representatives to A.M.I.D. (Area Municipal Industrial Development) to offer its financial and other aids, and of course Altoona Enterprises, Inc., one of the most highly successful industrial development organizations in the nation, which has been responsible for bringing more than 30 firms into Blair County in some 16 years.

Aiding the cause was the Bureau of Employment Security office and the office of the Blair County Board of Assistance, both of which set up offices in Tyrone to process applications for work and for unemployment benefits, by the mill workers who were laid off.

TALENTS OFFERED

Hundreds of individuals and heads of organizations wrote to T.I.C. President Harry K. Sickler offering their specific talents. The Altoona-Johnstown Diocese's Bishop James J. Hogan gave his diocese's offer of help, and the Tyrone Ministerium did likewise.

At Tyrone High School, students went to work under direction of their teachers. They conducted a "Tyrone, I Like It" essay contest and members of the business curriculum offered to help type application and other forms to the laid off Westvaco people.

Tyrone Borough Council was among the

first organizations to offer financial support. At its December meeting it approved a resolution offering assistance and cooperation with T.I.C. At its February meeting it approved the contribution of \$4,500 for 1971 to the T.I.C. That same night Snyder Township Supervisors approved a contribution of \$2,000 annually over five years toward the project.

AGENCIES HELP

The B.E.S. officials joined in the effort by scheduling a day-long meeting here of leaders in the various state and federal agencies who could assist the community. Robert Johnson, a Tyrone, employed by B.E.S. at Altoona, organized a meeting of CAMPS, an acronym for Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System. The theme of the meeting was "Uniting a Region for Jobs." The various agency representatives outlined their agency's programs and how they could apply to Tyrone's plight.

WORD SPREADING

At this chronological point the word had been spreading of Tyrone's effort to shake off a heavy economic blow. Hundreds of newspapers, radio and television stations found the story unique, and carried the message to thousands.

Penelec and its parent-company, General Public Utilities, came up with the idea of an advertisement in the Wall Street Journal, with national circulation. The advertisement appeared on May 14 depicting some 1,000 Tyroners facing the camera, with the eye-catching line above them "This Town For Hire."

The ABC-TV network got wind of the advertisement and rushed to this community to make what became a 3-minute documentary feature on Tyrone and its problems. The Wall Street Journal adv. had side-benefits. Newspapers picked up the picture and story and spread the word.

Back home T.I.C. was nearing its \$150,000 campaign goal, and beginning to wonder if the goal should have been higher.

With warm Spring weather arriving, the T.I.C.'s shell building at its industrial tract at the former Athletic Park began to take physical form. Today, with steel rising above the base, the shell is more than halfway completed. It will provide adaptable 50,000 sq. ft. of work space for an interested firm.

The effort will continue for months to come, with the ultimate goal a viable economy for Tyrone and its environs.

THIS TOWN FOR HIRE

For over 80 years, our town's major industry was a paper making plant. Good labor relations and high worker productivity prompted the company to keep the facility competitive.

But late in 1970, changing marketing conditions forced the company to mothball over half its facilities at the plant.

Five hundred and fifty skilled workers—almost 90% of us in our 30's or younger—were let go. Hundreds more lost their jobs as the ripples spread through the surrounding economy.

Tyrone, Pennsylvania, is ready to go to work for new companies. We have a large pool of trained people—machine operators, woodworkers, electricians, material handlers, foremen and supervisors. But we know it takes more than available labor to attract industry. So we've built a new 50,000 sq. ft. shell industrial building. It's 200' X 250', with bays 30' square and 18' high. All utilities are available and the site has access to the Penn Central Railroad.

If your company is looking for a plant site where workers still believe in delivering a day's work for a day's pay, consider this offer:

You can move into our new building without putting up a nickel of your capital. That's right, 100% financing. The same offer applies to several prime industrial sites within our town. We'll even arrange a loan to help cover the cost of capital equipment. And Pennsylvania's VO-Tech program stands ready to retrain as many workers as you require with special skills not available in our labor pool.

We'd like to send you all the facts on Tyrone, its industrious work force, and the 100% financing available to companies relocating here. Clip the coupon and mail it back today. Or for faster action, call Ernest L. Petersen collect at Pennsylvania Electric Co. (814) 536-6611.

TYRONE IMPROVEMENT CORP.,
Route 220, Wilson Development,
Tyrone, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: I'd like more information on Tyrone, Pa., and details on:

—The new 50,000 sq. ft. shell industrial building.

—Other industrial sites in Tyrone available with the same 100% financing plan.

Name _____
Address _____
City/State/Zip _____

MAIL DELIVERY IN CONGRESSIONAL OFFICES

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to learn more about the adequacy of mail service to congressional offices, the House Postal Service Subcommittee recently conducted a survey of the first-class mail service to the subcommittee office and to my congressional office.

The 2-week survey was conducted from May 28 to June 15. It consisted of determining the time elapsed between postmark and delivery for every piece of first-class mail received at the two offices. In order to compare mail service, mail received at the offices was broken down into four categories: mail originating in the Second District—Tucson—of Arizona; mail originating in other parts of Arizona; mail originating in the District of Columbia and surrounding metropolitan area, and mail originating in all other parts of the United States. For each category there was a further breakdown between regular first-class mail and airmail.

The most striking finding of the survey was that there is a significant slowdown in moving the mails over weekends. Letters delivered to the two offices on Mondays generally took much longer to reach their destination than did letters received on other days of the week.

The following tables illustrate the point: Table I shows the time of mail service to the offices, excluding mail received on Mondays. Table II shows time of service for Monday mail only. Table III is a summary of all mail deliveries to the offices.

TABLE I

[In percent]

	District mail			Other, Arizona			Other mail (excluding District of Columbia area)			District of Columbia area			Total
	Regular	Air	Combined	Regular	Air	Combined	Regular	Air	Combined	Regular	Air	Combined	
Monday excluded:													
1 day.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	3.5	92.1	0	92.1	18.4
2 days.....	72.3	90.0	77.6	70.0	66.6	68.9	70.0	71.4	70.1	2.6	0	2.6	58.2
3 days.....	21.2	5.0	16.4	20.0	11.1	17.2	18.0	21.5	19.2	5.2	0	5.2	17.4
4 days.....	6.3	5.0	5.9	10.0	11.1	10.3	8.0	0	7.0	0	0	0	5.9
5 days.....	0	0	0	0	11.1	3.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE II

	District mail	Other, Arizona	Other mail (excluding District of Columbia area)	District of Columbia area	Total
Monday only mail:					
1 day.....	0	0	0	0	0
2 days.....	10	42.8	12.9	9.5	20.0
3 days.....	28.5	42.8	29.8	47.6	60.0
4 days.....	38.5	0	35	14.2	20.0
5 days.....	22.8	14.2	22.0	25.5	0

TABLE III

Summary of all mail:	Total
1 day.....	10.3
2 days.....	36.9
3 days.....	25.2
4 days.....	18.7
5 days.....	8.6

As table III shows, while 72 percent of all mail was delivered within 3 days, 9 percent took 5 or more days to reach the two offices. When letters delivered on Mondays are excluded—table I—the service shows a marked improvement. In these cases, 76 percent of the mail was delivered within 2 days and 93 percent within 3 days. No letters took 5 days or more to be delivered. Finally, table II—Monday deliveries only—graphically illustrates the deterioration of mail movement over weekends and shows why, overall, 9 percent of the mail received at the offices took 5 days or more to be delivered. For the Monday deliveries only, almost 20 percent of the letters took 5 or more days to be delivered. Moreover, in 55 percent of the cases, the delivery time was at least 4 days—compared to deliveries on other days, when 76 percent of the letters reached their destination within 2 days and 93 percent within 3 days.

The figures demonstrate that mail service is reasonably good during the week but seriously deteriorates on weekends. The offices, for instance, received 80 percent of the mail from the Second District of Arizona within 2 days if Monday deliveries are excluded from the figures. But the 2-day service drops to only 13 percent of letters for Monday only deliveries.

The survey suggests that we need to take a much closer look at the weekend mail processing problem. Much of the wide variance in service is attributable to the discretion that individual postmasters have in determining employee work levels during this weekend period. Concern over budgets and other factors may tend to outweigh, in certain cases, the necessity for maintaining a high level of service. In addition, the most experienced postal workers have seniority rights which allow them to refuse weekend work. In effect, the Postal Service has its least experienced and efficient workers available to process mail on weekends.

The public also ought to be informed of this disparity in service. People should know that if they mail a letter on Friday they can expect it to take longer to reach its destination than if they mail it on Monday.

Finally, we need to begin considering what steps should be taken to reduce this disparity and to make mail service consistent throughout the week. Suggestions from other Members on this and other problems affecting the Postal Service will be welcomed.

**PROPOSED RECONFIRMATION OF
FEDERAL JUDGES EVERY 8 YEARS
BY THE SENATE**

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Fort Worth, Tex., Morning Star-Telegram of June 7, 1971, included an interesting editorial concerning a constitutional amendment which I have pro-

posed requiring reconfirmation of Federal judges by the Senate every 8 years.

The editorial is a balanced treatment of the issues involved in the amendment which I have proposed. It includes the sound comment that—

If the court is going to decide political questions it ought to be politically accountable.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial entitled "Political Decisions Need Public Check," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks:

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

POLITICAL DECISIONS NEED PUBLIC CHECK

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. of Virginia has proposed a constitutional amendment to require that federal judges must have, in order to stay in their positions, reconfirmation by the Senate every eight years. The requirement would apply to Supreme Court justices. The Supreme Court's decision that Hinds County, Miss., must elect its members of the state legislature from single-member districts is added evidence of the merit of the Byrd proposal.

Members of the federal judiciary are appointed for life or for good behavior, and making unwise decisions is not considered poor behavior. There is sound reason for this, or at least there was sound reason for it in the original plan. The idea for life appointment was to keep politics out of the judiciary. If we are going to keep politics out of the courts the courts ought to stay out of politics. But if the judiciary is going to persist in making political decisions the public ought to have a chance, even such an indirect chance as reconfirmation tests by the Senate would present, of judging whether the judiciary's decisions are wise or unwise.

It has been almost a decade since the Supreme Court plunged headlong into the political thicket in Baker vs. Carr, the landmark Tennessee legislative appointment case. Federal courts previously had disclaimed jurisdiction in such political questions. Since then the federal judiciary has become more and more entangled in that thicket, and more and more it is deciding how the people are to be governed rather than sticking to judging whether or not the rules are being followed.

The United States government, as well as our state governments, is separated into three branches—legislative, executive and judicial. Another way to put it would be to say that we have a branch to make the rules, a branch to administer the public business according to the rules and a branch to decide disputes about violations or alleged violations of the rules.

Rule-making—or law-making—was left to a legislative body elected by the public. This authority given to Congress, or to legislatures in the case of the states is, political authority. It is authority to decide how the people are to be governed. The structure of governing bodies certainly is a matter left to political authority, and there is no cause for the federal judiciary to decide either that a state has or that it has not acted wisely in deciding how its legislature is to be apportioned.

But the courts have decided, and they have decided many times that they have that authority. No amount of argument is going to change this.

That is why it is appropriate to say that Senator Byrd of Virginia has something. If the court is going to decide political questions it ought to be politically accountable. It would be better, of course, if this were not necessary. It would be better if the Supreme Court found a way out of the political thicket, but it apparently is not looking for one.

**BRITISH CONTROL OVER U.S.
FOREIGN POLICY**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we now read that British pressure at COCOM, an agency of NATO was responsible for the decision that the United States must sell Russia two 1906A computers—highly sophisticated electronic computers—for the Soviet Institute of High Energy Physics. In turn, American scientists will be permitted to participate in Soviet research.

A week ago the American people were astounded by the announcement that the Nixon administration had secretly approved a \$700 million Mack truck plant for Russia which was also, we must surmise, approved by our British friends.

Then we were notified that trade with Red China was approved in the same category as that which has been extended to Russia.

Americans are beginning to wonder when the British were restored to control of U.S. foreign policy. In 1776, our ancestors freed themselves from British colonialism. In 1971, under the new American revolution of the Nixon administration and party, we seem to have been restored to British control.

In testimony last week before the Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding lifting British-encouraged U.N. sanction against Rhodesia, I said:

There may or may not be a good reason for being the rubberstamp endorser of British colonial policy. If there is, it has never been even suggested to the American people nor to their representatives in the Congress, much less explained to any of us. I, for one, have had enough of the British willingness to fight to the last American, whether in Rhodesia or elsewhere. I believe the majority of the American people share this view.

I insert several related newsclippings in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, June 27, 1971]

**UNITED STATES YIELDS ON COMPUTER FOR
RUSSIA**

(By Arthur L. Gavshon)

The United States has yielded to a sustained British drive for approval of a huge computer deal with the Soviet Union, informed diplomats reported yesterday.

They said the British have undertaken to obtain safeguards insuring that the Soviets do not assign the computers to their nuclear weapons program.

The American-British arrangement, in its final stage after months of political, military and technical discussion, could mark a breakthrough in Western technological cooperation with the Russians.

An announcement of the imminent agreement is expected in a matter of days after details have been submitted to a 15-nation group which has the job of guarding against trade in war-potential goods with Communist countries.

The Paris-based group, known as COCOM, consists of all the members of the North Atlantic Alliance, with Japan sitting in for Iceland.

The Russians last year first approached International Computers Ltd. of Britain with a request to buy two big and highly sophisticated 1906A computers. They said they

wanted them for the Soviet Institute of High Energy Physics at Serpukhev where Western scientists, including Americans and Swiss, are permitted to participate in research operations.

Britain, which has sold 27 of Russia's 33 Western computers, wanted to accept the order valued at up to \$24 million. In preliminary talks with the Russians the British say they were assured the computers would be used only for civilian research and could be checked by British inspectors from time to time, although the Russians never before had accepted the principle of on-site inspection in any safeguard system.

American objections snagged the projected deal. These objections were voiced within COCOM, which must authorize exceptions to Allied embargo lists. American military and defense experts were not convinced the Russians wouldn't divert the computers to their nuclear arms program.

Months of tough American-British talking followed. Prime Minister Edward Heath personally raised the issue with President Nixon when they met in December. The President, as a result, ordered an interdepartment review.

A major British argument, sources said, stressed two points:

Soviet assurances of proper checking facilities could insure the computers would not be misused for military purposes.

Soviet assurances of checking facilities could speed the process of opening Russia's long-closed society which has been a consistent aim of Western governments.

Precisely how British technicians will be able to prevent any Soviet attempt to divert the computers was not disclosed by the informant.

The computers sought by the Russians possess a tremendously high speed rate and a magnetic-disc memory system which Soviet scientists have been unable to develop.

There has been intermittent American interest in selling computers to the Russians. Last year an International Business Machines representative visited the Soviet Union to investigate sales prospects. The Russians themselves have made periodic inquiries in this country about buying advanced computers.

Besides the two computers now about to be authorized, the British company is building four smaller models for the Russians. Some of these are destined for use in the Moskvich automobile factory.

Along with these machines the Soviets would want the company to provide technicians to train and support Soviet experts.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, June 27, 1971]

IS UNITED STATES-INDIA POLICY BRITISH? (By Kuldip Nayar)

NEW DELHI.—Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the prime minister, told a meeting recently that America follows Britain when formulating policy on India, Pakistan and other countries in the region. She was answering a question why the United States was not openly siding with India on the question of East Bengal.

More or less, that is the quintessence of Indian opinion. There is a feeling here that despite the liberal traditions of America, Britain has been able to influence it in adopting an "anti-people" policy to preserve the status quo.

It is conceded that U.S. public and press are sympathetic to India's insistence that no refugee from East Bengal can go back unless there is an acceptable government in that part of Pakistan. But it also is alleged that the State Department and the Pentagon, particularly the latter, are unwilling to put enough pressure on Pakistan to alienate it or drive it completely to the Chinese side. And

here; as far as India is concerned, is the land of London.

Both the government and the people of India are happy that the visit of Indian Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh to Washington has brought about some change in the U.S. thinking in the sense that the government realizes that President Yahya Khan of Pakistan will have to make major political concessions to create a climate for the return of the refugees.

But the reluctance of the United States to openly condemn Pakistan or to pressure it is deplored. Yet a segment of opinion in the Indian government and among the people believes that had it not been for behind-the-scenes activity by Britain, the United States would have come out on India's side in a more positive way.

U.S. assistance in the wake of cholera in the refugee camps has been appreciated, and the visit of Frank Kellogg, special assistant to the Secretary of State for refugees and migration affairs has been welcomed.

But the feeling persists that America, like most countries in the world, has been tardy in its reactions.

And where Indian opinion feels most sensitive is that the United States has not as vehemently condemned the barbarities of the Pakistan army in East Bengal, particularly on the Hindus, as might have been expected.

"America has rightly felt angry over the My Lal incident; but it is surprising how scores of incidents like My Lal in East Bengal have gone almost unnoticed in the United States," says a top official of the Indian External Affairs Ministry.

However, the real disappointment of the Indian people is not so much from America as from the Arab countries which New Delhi has been supporting all along. Their complete silence over the happenings in East Bengal has come under adverse notice both by the public and the press.

And some quarters are demanding a re-assessment of the policy which, according to them has been tantamount to having no contact with Israel lest the Arab countries should feel offended. Indian officials say the fact of Pakistan being a Moslem country has weighed with the Arab countries more than the brutality and the influx of six million refugees into India.

[From the Sunday Star, June 27, 1971]

INDIANS BLAST UNITED STATES ON PAKISTAN ARMS

NEW DELHI.—Demonstrators burned an effigy of President Nixon today and the Indian government demanded that the United States halt freighters carrying military equipment to neighboring Pakistan.

"Curse President Nixon!" and "Nixon may be destroyed!" shouted a crowd of 300 persons as they marched on the U.S. Embassy. The demonstrators were led by a member of Parliament from President Indira Gandhi's ruling Congress party.

The State Department acknowledged yesterday that three Pakistani freighters loaded with military equipment had sailed from New York for Karachi after the United States announced a ban on deliveries of arms to Pakistan.

"REASON TO BELIEVE"

They said they had "reason to believe that the (first) vessel carried equipment for the Pakistani armed forces that was purchased under the United States foreign military sales program and from commercial suppliers" the New York Times reported.

A State Department spokesman acknowledged that while the administration order to halt the issuing of licenses for military sales to Pakistan was meant to have been effective on March 25, it did not actually go into effect until April 6. The first ship left April 2.

He said two additional export licenses were

issued to Pakistan after the ban went into effect—one for frequency calibration equipment for radios, dated March 31, and another for aircraft engine spare parts, authorized on April 6. The licenses were canceled yesterday, he said, but he did not know whether the equipment had already been shipped.

PROTEST LETTER

The New Delhi protesters were halted outside the Embassy gates by police and a small delegation was allowed to deliver a letter of protest addressed to Nixon. The group included Parliament members, members of the Delhi State Congress Committee, students and workers. They set fire to a cardboard effigy of Nixon.

In Parliament, Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh told a noisy session of the lower house today that India had asked the United States to try to stop two Pakistani freighters which have not yet delivered their military cargoes.

Singh said the U.S. government had agreed to take the matter under "urgent consideration" and said India was awaiting a reply.

Opposition members of parliament interrupted Singh repeatedly with shouts of "American Imperialists!"

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1971]

MACK TO BUILD \$700 MILLION PLANT IN RUSSIA

(By Frank C. Porter)

The Nixon administration is seriously considering—or may have already secretly approved—a \$700 million deal whereby Mack Trucks would help build a huge manufacturing complex in the Soviet Union.

The refusal of officials to reply to queries on the subject yesterday only heightened speculation that the White House gave an informal okay to the project even before Mack President Zenon C. R. Hansen signed a letter of intent with V. N. Sushkov of the Soviet Trade Ministry recently.

Hansen confirmed the tentative contract yesterday after it was reported in detail in the current issue of Business Week. There is reason to believe Hansen would not have done so if government approval was still hanging in the balance.

If implemented, the transaction would dwarf all previous commercial transactions with the Soviet Union—even the big wheat deals after the U.S.S.R.'s massive crop failure in 1963. Last year's total exports to the Soviet Union, for example, were only \$125 million—less than a quarter of the amount involved in the truck project.

Earlier this month the White House approved export licenses for \$85 million in vehicle-making equipment to the Soviet Union with so little fanfare that it took several days for the press to catch up.

Even then, government officials tried to minimize what foreign trade and political analysts considered a major shift in American foreign policy.

Some who are close to these major moves toward expanded commerce between East and West have explained that the Nixon administration fears that excessive publicity might torpedo them. Conservatives in Mr. Nixon's own party and such avowed anti-Communists in the political opposition as AFL-CIO President George Meany could team up against the trade moves.

The very fact that the Soviets were willing to contract with Americans for a facility that many thought was within the capability of the Soviet Union itself is a bitter commentary on former Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's boast of the 1950s that "we will bury you."

What Mack Trucks has tentatively contracted to supply the Soviets is believed to be the huge factory Henry Ford II was dissuaded from building by Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird last year.

Since then—particularly in Mr. Nixon's dramatic relaxation of the 21-year trade embargo with China—the Laird view has been overruled, in large part by advocates of expanded East-West trade in the State and Commerce Departments.

After the Ford deal fell through last year, there were extended discussions between the Russians and the French government automotive concern, Renault. Jonathan Randal, of The Washington Post Foreign Service, reported from Paris a fortnight ago that agreement appeared to be closer.

It was not immediately apparent yesterday whether the letter of intent signed by the Russians meant that Mack is intended to supplant Renault as prime contractor for the huge Kama River truck manufacturing complex the Soviet Union has long been planning. There was speculation that both might be in on the deal or that Moscow had merely lined up as many alternatives as possible.

[From the Washington Post, June 27, 1971]

SALE OF COMPUTER TO SOVIETS BACKED

The United States had yielded to a sustained British bid for its approval of a huge computer deal with the Soviet Union, informed diplomats reported yesterday.

They said the British, for their part, have undertaken to obtain ironclad safeguards insuring the Soviets do not assign the computers to the Soviet nuclear weapons program.

The American-British arrangement, in its final stage after months of intensive political, military and technical discussion, could mark a breakthrough in Western technological cooperation with the Soviet Union.

An announcement of the agreement is expected in a matter of days after details have been submitted to a 15-nation group which has the job of barring trade in war-potential goods with Communist countries.

The Paris-based group, known as COCOM, is made up of all the members of the North Atlantic Alliance, with Japan sitting in for Iceland.

FIRST MOVE BY SOVIET

The Soviet Union last year first approached International Computers Ltd.—ICL—of Britain with a request to buy two big and highly sophisticated 1906A computers. These were wanted for the Soviet Institute of High Energy Physics at Serpukhov where Western scientists, including Americans and Swiss, are permitted to participate on ongoing research operations.

Britain, which has sold 27 of the Soviet Union's 33 Western computers, badly wanted to accept the order valued at anything up to about \$24 million. In preliminary talks with the U.S.S.R., the British say they were assured the computers would be used only for purposes of civilian research and could be checked by British inspectors from time to time, although the Soviets never before had accepted the principle of on-site inspection in any safeguard system.

But American objections snagged the projected deal. These objections were voiced within COCOM, which must authorize any extraordinary exception to allied embargo lists. American military and defense experts were not convinced the Russians would resist the temptation to divert the computers to their nuclear arms program.

Months of tough American-British talking followed. Prime Minister Edward Heath last December personally raised the issue with President Nixon when they met. The President, as a result, ordered an interdepartmental review.

TWO POINTS STRESSED

A major British argument, sources said, stressed two points:

Soviet assurances of proper checking facilities could insure the computers would not be misused for military purposes.

Soviet assurances of checking facilities could help along the process of opening up

Russia's long-closed society which has been a consistent aim of Western governments.

Precisely how British technicians will be able to prevent any Soviet attempt to divert the computers was not disclosed by the informant.

The computers wanted by the Soviet Union possess a tremendously high speed rate and a magnetic-disc memory system that Soviet scientists have been unable themselves to develop.

These qualities placed the machines far beyond the levels of smaller computers which Western countries are permitted to sell Russia. Besides those from Britain, the Soviets have bought three computers from France, two from Italy, one from West Germany.

There has been intermittent American interest in selling computers to the Soviets. Last year, an International Business Machines representative visited the Soviet Union to investigate sales prospects. The Soviet Union has made periodic inquiries in this country about buying advanced computers.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last December, the House passed the Emergency School Aid Act, a bill to provide assistance to school districts for programs to eliminate or reduce racial isolation in the public schools. Unfortunately, this bill did not become law in the last Congress, and now we must act again.

On April 26, the Senate passed the Emergency School Aid and Quality Integrated Education Act of 1971, a bill similar to the one passed by the House last December. These actions by the Congress have led many of the Nation's school districts to anticipate important new financial support during the coming school year. I am sure that we are all aware of the serious financial problems facing our public schools. Now we have the opportunity to take action which will have an immediate effect on those problems.

The Emergency School Aid Act would authorize \$1.5 billion over the next 2 years to assist school districts in providing equal educational opportunity for their students. This constitutes important and timely assistance for our schools in facing one of the most critical problems facing them today. It also provides much-needed support to relieve the general financial squeeze which prevails, particularly in our large urban school systems.

The time for action is growing short. As each day passes, we are steadily diminishing the chances that these much-needed funds will be available to school districts in the fall. This fall will be a critical time for most of our Nation's schools. They will be facing the prospect, in many cases, of inadequate operating budgets for the coming school year as well as demands that they meet the legitimate rising expectations for education in our democracy.

I urge the House Committee on Education and Labor as well as the House as a whole to expedite action on this important measure.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a number of participants in the recently concluded Minneapolis health hearings raised a number of important health related issues. One such issue is the question of family planning and its relevance to State, local, and Federal laws. A number of witnesses concerned themselves with this question and the resulting dialog touched all sides of this question.

Dr. Jane Hodgson stated that her figures indicated a total of 9,000 criminal abortions a year in Minnesota while there were only 77 hospital abortions in all of 1970. Claiming that the question of abortion is one solely to be resolved between mother and doctor, Dr. Hodgson argues for changes in present laws.

Mrs. Marilyn Keating representing the Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life stated that the question of abortion raises serious moral and ethical questions about the right to life for the unborn child. In essence, the question is a constitutional one in that the Constitution protects life. Mrs. Keating also argues against changes in present abortion laws on other grounds stating unequivocally that such changes are not the answer to complex population problems, nor to the problems of battered and unwanted children.

Katherine Taylor, president of the Minnesota Council for the Legal Termination of Pregnancy favors congressional action on the question of abortion, stating that the vast differences among State laws unfairly discriminates against the poor who are unable to travel to a State with the least stringent law.

The Minnesota Licensed Practical Nurses Association submitted the following statement concerning abortion.

Mr. Frank Mabley representing the Planned Parenthood Association of Minnesota stated that over 65,000 women in Minnesota are in need of family planning services. His statement is also included:

TESTIMONY BEFORE HEARINGS ON HEALTH CARE DELIVERY, FEBRUARY 27, 1971

(By Katherine W. Taylor)

I would like to urge the National Congress to pass a national abortion law such as proposed by Senator Packwood of Oregon.

There are now almost as many different abortion laws in the United States as there are states. This puts any woman in the position of having to find the particular state which has a law under which she can obtain medical treatment.

Since residency requirements of some states preclude their physicians from treating outstate women in this one medical area, the problem is compounded.

A bill introduced into the Minnesota legislature which asks a \$5,000 fine and/or five years in prison for any woman who travels outstate for an abortion increases the need for national legislation.

Minnesota women must travel to either coast, New York or California, at considerable expense to themselves, for abortions.

The inequality of the present state laws

invoke a particular hardship on the poor woman.

While Minnesota is renowned for the excellence of its medical care, restrictive laws here do not permit one single segment of its society to benefit from that excellence. In behalf of that segment, women of child bearing age, the Minnesota Council for the Legal Termination of Pregnancy asks that a nation wide abortion law be passed, putting abortion decisions where they belong—with the woman involved and her physician.

POSITION STATEMENT ON ABORTION BY THE MINNESOTA LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSES ASSOCIATION

Last August, the Board of Directors of Minnesota L.P.N.'s adopted the position of the Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life. We went on record as opposing the violent, destructive, dehumanizing approach represented by abortion on demand or liberal abortion laws. We believe that the Legislature, alone, should determine under what circumstances abortion should be performed. We believe it is the responsibility of the Legislature to protect the life of the child and that the Legislature must set the limits on when abortions may or may not be performed.

The nursing profession takes an oath to preserve life. We don't feel that we would be any more qualified to make a decision on when a life should be ended than would any other group or committee. If life isn't precious at the beginning, it won't be precious at the other end of the spectrum either.

With both of our nursing groups (L.P.N. and M.N.A.) opposing liberalization of Minnesota's abortion statute, one must face the reality of what qualified personnel will be available or willing to participate in abortions, if abortion would become lawful in Minnesota.

We are witnessing more and more the public's response against a liberal abortion policy in Minnesota. With some revisions in our current law clarifying the conditions under which abortions may be performed, and setting forth some procedures, we feel that we will have a statute that will withstand a constitutional test on vagueness as well as protect and respect the life of both mother and child. This, we believe, will be a responsible law and one that reflects the beliefs of most Minnesotans.

HEALTH CARE AND FAMILY PLANNING, PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF MINNESOTA

The crisis in health care in the United States is obvious and well documented. An integral and important facet of total health care is the provision of contraceptive control to those families who request such services. In broad and general terms it enables families to have loved and wanted children thereby strengthening family life; it improves maternal and child health and can provide the key to a better existence for the economically deprived in our society.

Both experience and numerous studies by government and private foundations have demonstrated that voluntary family planning is the most cost-effective measure to help families overcome poverty, as well as to reduce infant mortality and improve the health of mothers and children. (Note 1.)

According to an OEO study conducted in 1968 there are approximately 70,000 medically indigent women in the state of Minnesota in need of subsidized family planning services.

Currently, subsidized care is available through Planned Parenthood in the Twin Cities and Duluth, City Health Departments in Minneapolis and St. Paul as well as both municipal hospitals and Teen-Age Medical Center. There are 5 smaller programs in rural counties funded by OEO.

However, there are too many women not being reached (approximately 65,000 in 1970). Availability of service is spotty and confined primarily to the Twin Cities and Duluth while 40% of the indigent population is in rural Minnesota where little or no care is available. (Note 2.)

The passage of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act (PL 91-572) was a major step towards the extension of family planning services in the United States generally and hopefully also in Minnesota.

If we are to reach the 65,000 women in Minnesota still in need of care, substantial Federal monies must be budgeted immediately. It is my understanding that President Nixon has proposed to provide only \$57 million to this program for 1971. This is about 2/3 of that allotted by Congress.

We feel that to hold back funding in the field of family planning is both tragic and uneconomical.

NOTE 1

(a) Contraceptive, abortion, maternal, and child care: Comparative basic costs per woman in 1969 (using local Medi-Cal figures):

<i>Service and cost for the first year</i>	
Contraceptive	\$50
Abortion	370
Delivery, pre & post natal care adoption services	1,825
Delivery, pre & post natal care foster home	1,825
Delivery, pre & post natal care Aid to family with dependent children.....	2,400

In a state that forbids abortion this means that for the first year alone the cost benefits are from 36-1 to 48-1 in favor of voluntary family planning.

(b) The OEO has estimated that family planning programs offered to those in need could reduce the poverty rolls by 21.5%.

(c) The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has found that family planning outranks 6-1 in cost effectiveness any other measure to reduce infant mortality.

(d) Studies by economic analyst, Stephen Enke, Dr. Harold Shepard of the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research and Planned Parenthood-World Population show cost benefits of some 70-1 to 100-1 in favor of birth control when taking into account reduced expenditures of maternal and child health, care of mental retardates, ADC costs and higher family incomes through child spacing.

NOTE 2

Dr. Charles F. Westoff and Dr. Larry Bumpass of Princeton University analyzed the data of the 1965 National Fertility Study and presented a paper, *The Perfect Contraceptive Population: Extent and Implications of Unwanted Fertility in the United States*. The study indicated that, at the minimum, 22% of all births in the United States were unwanted by at least one spouse.

Using this 22% and dealing with the 65,932 babies born in Minnesota in 1969, it would appear that 13,186 of these births were not wanted.

A Department of Agriculture study on the costs of raising a child to age 18 ranged from \$19,360 to \$25,000. If we select the lowest figure, the cost to families able to support their children would result in family expenditures of \$225,280,960.00 over the first eighteen years of that 1969 cohort of unwanted pregnancies.

What financial burden those unwanted pregnancies place on the state through school costs, welfare costs, and other public costs is difficult to calculate, but it is safe to assume that such costs exceed the cost of providing the women of this state with

the freedom to decide when and how many times they will become pregnant.

CONGRESSMAN McCLORY FAVORS ISRAELI FRIENDSHIP TREATY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from New York, Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN, and Members from both sides of the aisle, in sponsoring House Resolution 509, calling for an American-Israeli friendship treaty. I feel certain that this resolution will significantly serve the cause of peace by dramatizing to potential aggressors that the United States intends to stand firm in its commitment to Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I call this body's attention to the accord signed by Egypt and the Soviet Union on May 27 of this year. This treaty calls for military cooperation and aid "with a view to strengthening the UAR's capacity to combat aggression." This 15-year treaty with its options for perpetual 5-year extensions commits the Soviet Union to unqualified support of Egypt against Israel. Indeed, there is evidence that the treaty may be a device for concealing the shipment of additional Soviet arms to Egypt and prevent a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. Already it has been announced in Cairo that Egypt's new military budget for the year beginning July 1 will be larger than last year's record budget of well over \$1 billion. The imbalance of arms between Israel and Egypt could reach dangerous proportions if the United States continues to defer new phantom jet contracts while the U.S.S.R. supplies Egypt with large shipments of its most modern weapons.

Mr. Speaker, for Israel these are most dangerous developments. I strongly believe that the United States can best counter Moscow's 15-year treaty for military assistance to Egypt by negotiating a long-term agreement with Israel. This is precisely what our resolution seeks to accomplish. I should point out that unlike the Soviet-Egyptian pact, the American-Israeli accord would not inhibit either party from entering into better relations with other nations and would formally establish the principle of mutuality and lack of domination by either party, a principle which has long characterized existing relations between the United States and Israel.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 509 would not obligate the United States to go to war in defense of Israel, but it would reaffirm our commitment to the preservation of the State of Israel—including the maintenance of a balance of force in the Middle East and the sale of arms to Israel in order to assure that it remains able to adequately defend itself.

HEROIC AMERICANS DISPLAY THEIR METTLE IN VIETNAM WAR

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, some Vietnam veterans, including medal winners, feel they fought in America's most unpopular war and suddenly realizing this, became ashamed of their heroic acts.

I am sure that political scientists and historians will agree that the War Between the States was and still is the most unpopular war Americans ever fought in. Notwithstanding the fact that Winston Churchill termed the War Between the States as the last of the noble wars, we still had atrocities and defoliation. Yet I do not recall in any history book a report where Civil War veterans were ashamed of their valor or turned in their medals.

Perhaps this did happen, but history certainly has emphasized the positive elements of the Civil War. Lloyd Graham, writing in the Buffalo Courier-Express feels at times:

The only ones worthy of reportage from Vietnam are the grafters, the goats, the jerks, the sadists, the dope peddlers, the murderers, the embezzlers and the cop-outs, plus those who have espoused the cause of America's enemies.

I call attention to his column "Perspective" appearing in the Sunday, May 30, 1971, issue and include the article at this point in the RECORD:

HEROIC AMERICANS DISPLAY THEIR METTLE IN VIETNAM WAR

(By Lloyd Graham)

Traditionally, every war has its heroes, celebrated not only in national records but often in song and story; a hero being a man of distinguished courage or ability, admired for his brave deeds and noble qualities.

For 150 years, every American schoolboy has thrilled to the story of the midnight ride of Paul Revere in the Revolution. There was the extraordinary exploit of Comm. Oliver H. Perry in the Battle of Lake Erie in the War of 1812.

The generation after the Civil War told and retold the stories of many fighting men from privates to generals, not forgetting the Navy's Adm. Farragut and his sensational action on Mobile Bay. Even the Mexican conflict had its heroes at the Alamo, Theodore Roosevelt, among others, won national fame in the War with Spain on Cuba's San Juan Hill.

In World War I, there were innumerable heroes, perhaps the best known being Sgt. Alvin York. During World War II, newspapers with vastly improved reportage carried many stories of heroism.

Up to the Korea fighting and the current conflict in Vietnam there has been great national pride in feats of military heroism. But one might decide from reports from Vietnam that this is a conflict without heroes.

It would seem at times, especially in television, that the only ones worthy of reportage from Vietnam are the grafters, the goats, the jerks, the sadists, the dope peddlers, the murderers, the embezzlers and the cop-outs, plus those who have espoused the cause of America's enemies.

However, it is not true that Vietnam is a conflict without American heroes. It is merely that we have heard relatively little about them.

Without going into the morality or justification of the war itself, or its unpopularity, it seems a pity that human courage and sacrifice are more or less ignored. From time to time, there has been a brief mention of White House ceremonies in which the President has conferred Medals of Honor on veterans of the Vietnam conflict.

But tales of heroism from the scene of conflict have been rare. Perhaps this is the day of the cop-out, when it has become declass and even contemptible to recognize, much less celebrate, human courage and heroism.

This seems to be pointed up by the relish and even derision with which veterans are shown throwing away medals representing honors which they have earned. One might almost think that heroism in American conflict or anywhere else is a thing of the past, that individual courage and self-sacrifice are no longer evident in America life.

However, this is far from the fact, and perhaps this is an appropriate time of year to call attention to the individual acts of heroism, regardless of the right or wrong of the conflict.

Best evidence of acts of heroism is to be found in the records of those who have received the Medal of Honor. Copies of those records have been kindly provided by Rep. Jack F. Kemp of the 39th District.

Society from the beginning of history has found ways to honor courage, loyalty, fidelity, and human sacrifice. It began in this country when Gen. George Washington in 1782 conferred the Purple Heart on three of his soldiers for "singularly meritorious action."

Since that time, there have been and are various awards. But the highest of all is that presented by the President in the name of the Congress of the United States.

This is only presented for a deed of personal bravery or self-sacrifice above and beyond the call of duty while a person is a member of the American armed forces in actual combat with an enemy of this country.

It may come as a great surprise to you that 196 Medals of Honor have been conferred on American fighting men in the Vietnam conflict to date. They have gone to all ranks and to many high in the officer class.

It is significant that more than half of them have been awarded posthumously, the citation involving the story of a man giving his life to help protect the lives of others. "Greater love hath no man. . . ."

Without exceptions, it may be said that each citation represents a gripping tale of adventure and high courage. The most that can be done in a short piece such as this is to give a random sampling of those living and dead, who have received this highest of all medals.

There is the example of Pfc. Gary W. Martini of the Marine Corps, "for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty." Martini was a rifleman with Company F, Second Battalion, First Marine in Vietnam.

On April 21, 1967, his company was operating at Binh Son against an entrenched enemy force.

Marines in Martini's platoon assaulted the entrenched enemy across an open rice paddy. Intense enemy fire developed at short range, pinning the Marines down behind a low paddy dike. Fourteen Marines killed and 18 wounded. Martini moved out from scant shelter to within 50 feet of the enemy and hurled several grenades into their positions, killing several.

Observing several of his wounded comrades helpless in the fire-swept paddy, he raced through the open area and dragged a comrade back to the protected position. Disregarding a wound he received in this rescue, he tried it again, bringing back a wounded companion though he himself had been mortally wounded by the withering enemy fire.

When friends tried to help him rescue the wounded Marine, he shouted to them to re-

main under cover. In a final supreme effort before he was stopped cold by death, he got the wounded Marine to a position where others could drag him to safety.

"Private Martini, says the citation, "unhesitatingly yielded his life to save two of his comrades and insure the safety of his platoon."

These stories of bravery usually reflect the nature of the service of which the hero is a part. Take the case of Navy Boatswain's Mate 1C, James E. Williams. In October 1966, he was serving as captain and patrol officer aboard a river patrolboat on the Mekong River.

His craft and another came under enemy fire from two sampans. One sampan was put out of action, and the other tried to escape to a nearby river inlet.

Williams pursued the escapee with his patrol boat only to find a strong enemy force along the river bank, plus two enemy junks and eight sampans. He called in armed helicopters to assist, only to discover a much larger force of enemy craft.

Says the citation: "Not waiting for the arrival of the armed helicopters, he displayed great initiative and boldly led the patrol through intense enemy fire and damaged or destroyed 50 enemy sampans and seven junks." By now, it was nearly dark. Despite the fact that it made his boats a better target, he ordered searchlights turned on and pressed the attack.

Williams, as cited, "demonstrated unusual professional skill and indomitable courage throughout the three-hour battle." The citation refers to his "extraordinary heroism and exemplary fighting spirit in the face of grave risks."

In view of these facts of gallantry, (and you can multiply them by 50 in Vietnam), who can say that American courage is a thing of the past?

Why? Why does a man cover a grenade about to explode with his own body to save the lives of those around him, as has been done scores of times in Vietnam? Why, indeed? Who are we to pry into his reasons, perhaps hidden in the innermost soul of these men of valor?

The least you can say is that these are no cop-outs.

A SPECIAL NOTE OF THANKS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to call the attention of the House of Representatives to seven persons who deserve a special note of thanks for some outstanding services they rendered to a very special group of people.

Miss Carol Gilbert, of the Rayburn House Cafeteria, and six members of the U.S. Marine Corps: Cpl. Fred T. Herring, Sgt. George R. Bubenhein, Sgt. Peter C. Lang, Lance Cpl. Frederick J. Murock, Sgt. David G. Simmerly, and Cpl. George T. Ratajczak, all of whom are stationed at the Marine Barracks here in Washington.

A good friend and constituent, Mrs. Dorothy Axson, of Indianapolis, Ind., sponsors and directs Handy-Cap Horizons, which specializes, among other things, in tours for the handicapped. She has brought groups to Washington, D.C., and escorted them all over the world, using wit, commonsense, and a bottomless

store of energy to overcome seemingly insurmountable obstacles. My office has assisted her in the past.

There are persons on these tours confined to wheelchairs who simply cannot hope to get around by themselves. The Marine Corps has always graciously provided assistance when needed and those who have helped in the past—and unfortunately I do not have their names—should be listed here, too.

This year the group was larger than usual, and the time when they were here had some of the hottest, most humid weather of the year. The Marines named above, assigned to help, rendered truly noble service and helped these people, many of them realizing the dream of a lifetime, to enjoy themselves very much.

The group had one meal on Capitol Hill in the Rayburn Cafeteria. Miss Gilbert checked them through the line—considering their handicaps it was a difficult process—with gracious, smiling courtesy that was commented on by the entire group.

These seven people gave of themselves, in a heartwarming and encouraging display of kindness and courtesy toward those less fortunate. Their attitude and their acts reminded me of the words in Matthew, XXV, 40:

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE R. H. "HOP" HARVARD

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, I lost a friend. His name was Richard Hobson Harvard, but his friends called him "Hop." "Hop" Harvard was a friend to all who knew him, a gentle, devoted man who was dedicated to his family.

His passing saddened all who knew him and moved one of his friends, Editor Frank Raley of the News Examiner in his hometown of Tifton, Ga., to write the following tribute which was published June 17, 1971:

WE MISS OUR FRIEND, R. H. "HOP" HARVARD
(By Frank Raley)

I always called him "Hop" and I may have been in error because his middle name was Hobson and it could be that the correct nickname was "Hob." Anyway, he didn't correct me, so I know it was all right with him.

His full name was Richard Hobson Harvard and he lived on Rt. 2, Tifton.

"He'd do anything in the world for you."

That's the way a traveling companion described Mr. Harvard. You see, on every working day, "Hop" chauffeured a group of Tiftonites to their jobs at the Marine Corps Supply Center in Albany. These men spent a lot of time with him, and they knew him well.

Another who knew Hop is a camping friend:

"He was a quiet easy-going man, easy to know and easy to like."

To us here at The News-Examiner, Hop

was what the others said, plus—he was a dependable associate. We have printed the Marine base newspaper for several years, and Hop brought us copy and delivered the newspaper—never failing at either end. And you just don't find much of that type of dependability around anymore.

We miss him. All his friends miss him. And you can imagine what his loss was to his family.

Hop died at 11 a.m. May 25 in Tift General Hospital. He was 57.

He was born Jan. 5, 1914 in Bibb County, the son of John Jorda Harvard and Nora West Harvard. He had lived here for most of his life and was a member of the First Methodist Church.

He was a Mason, Shriner, and a past-patron of Blanche Chapter No. 8 of the Order of the Eastern Star. He held a responsible Civil Service position at the Marine Corps Supply Center.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Kathleen Whitfield Harvard; a daughter, Mrs. W. E. Page of Stone Mountain; two sisters, Mrs. C. L. Burch of Tifton and Mrs. Joe Bridges of Tifton; and two grandchildren.

The Rev. Jerry Richards and the Rev. Floyd Richards officiated at funeral services conducted at 11 a.m. May 27 from the Chapel of Bowen-Donaldson Home for Funerals. Burial was in Oak Ridge Cemetery in Tifton.

U.S. PHANTOM F-4'S VERSUS THE NEW SOVIET MIG-23

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, I have been urging cancellation of plans to build the F-14 fighter plane for the Navy and urging instead that we explore the possibility of upgrading the successful F-4 Phantom or developing a new, lighter plane than the F-14.

In the Washington Post yesterday, June 27, there was an interesting article in Parade magazine discussing Israel's experience with the F-4 Phantom. I include the full text of that article in the RECORD at this point:

PHANTOMS VERSUS MIGS

The appearance of Russia's fastest fighters in Egypt doesn't scare the Israelis. Like winged lightning these new Mig-23's can boom out of the blue at three times the speed of sound. They can outrace, outsoar and outfly anything in the Israeli Air Force. They are so new they haven't been seen in operation by Russia's own satellites. Indeed, the Russians themselves are reported to possess no more than 100 Mig-23's. Yet Israeli pilots, quite unperturbed, would rather fly the slower, American-made Phantoms. This is what they have told representatives of the McDonnell Douglas Company which makes the Phantom fighter-bombers the U.S. has been supplying to Israel. The company representatives have been debriefing Israeli pilots to find out how well the Phantoms are performing. The pilots generally agree that the Phantom can beat anything the Russians have sent to Egypt, including the new Mig-23's. In order to engage a Phantom, they point out, the Mig-23 would have to fly lower and slower. At this speed the Phantom can outmaneuver it. Talking to PARADE in Tel Aviv, the McDonnell Douglas representatives boasted that the Phantom is the best plane in the Middle East. Asked how many Phantoms had been lost in

the "war of attrition" against Egypt, they said "less than 5 percent." Since Israel has about 370 Phantoms, this would mean a maximum loss of 17. A more realistic figure, obtained from other confidential sources, is about 10. The McDonnell Douglas representatives told PARADE that only one Phantom had ever been shot down in a dogfight. All other losses were caused by antiaircraft fire or crashes. Meanwhile, competent sources suggested that the new Mig-23's are so highly classified that the Russians can't afford to lose one over Israel. This suggests the Russians are using them in Egypt for training purposes. The desert climate and semicombat conditions provide the Soviets with a good place to put the new fighter through its paces.

HOOSIER PHYSICIAN STILL MAKES HOUSE CALLS AT AGE 90

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include an excellent article in the Indianapolis Star about a respected and revered Hoosier, Dr. E. A. Porter.

Dr. Porter, who has been practicing medicine for more than 60 years, exemplified the finest traditions of his profession. At age 90, he continues to see his patients and even makes house calls.

This article, by Bonnie Britton, describes the dedication of this country doctor to the welfare of his community:

HAS PRACTICED THERE 40 YEARS—AT 90, WESTPORT PHYSICIAN STILL MAKING HOUSE CALLS
(By Bonnie Britton)

WESTPORT, IND.—There are no street numbers in Westport, but even the children know where 90-year-old Dr. E. A. Porter lives.

The general practitioner, who turned 90 last Wednesday, has lived in a rambling, white two-story house on Main Street for the last 40 years.

He is the town's only physician, "unless there are some other doctors practicing medicine here on the sly," and serves patients from Westport, North Vermon, Hartsville and other nearby communities.

After attending the University of Louisville for two years, he worked as a grade-school teacher, and then completed his education at the Indiana University Schools of Medicine at Indianapolis in 1908.

He first practiced medicine at Burney and Hartsville, both near Greensburg, before settling in Westport in 1931.

Dr. Porter served as Decatur County health officer from 1933 through 1937 and three terms as county coroner, which he proudly says were nonpolitical appointments.

He still makes house calls, although most of his time is spent at home or at his office nearby, where he works in the afternoon and sometimes in the evening.

He runs the office without a nurse and said he has no plans to retire.

"I sometimes see 30 and 40 patients a day, and I get around pretty good once I get started."

What is most amazing about Dr. Porter is that he underwent an operation in 1969 to implant a pacemaker in his chest.

"I may have to go back soon to get a new battery, since they're only supposed to last about a year," he said.

His heart, which had slowed to "36 beats a minute, is beating at 72 again" with the aid of the pacemaker, he says.

Ten days after his operation, Dr. Porter

was sitting in his chair in the living room treating patients, and a month later resumed his regular routine.

Dr. Porter said he only works "five or six hours a day now," but recalled the early years of his practice when he often worked into the night, making house calls in a buggy.

In the early days "I made lots of house calls," he recalls. His first motorized vehicle was a "one-cylinder British that made so much noise people could hear me coming for miles."

The roads, he admits, have gotten a lot better since he first started making house calls. He recalled the many times he got stuck in snowdrifts, one year as late as April.

At his 50th anniversary celebration as a physician in 1958, many of the 3,000 to 4,000 babies he has delivered were there, some of them third generation.

At that time he said, "It's a wonderful thrill to look into the faces of so many people whose first heartbeats I observed."

Two or three years ago he was surprised to receive a letter from the father of the dean of a small Southern college, who said he was enclosing the \$15 delivery fee that he owed the doctor, for almost 40 years.

That wasn't the first late or unusual fee however. One elderly patient gave the doctor a painting which hangs in a bedroom of his home, and back in the 1930s during the Depression vegetables of all sorts became substitutes for money.

The worst crisis he remembers was in 1918 when a flu epidemic swept the country.

"I remember going into homes and finding people stretched out all over the place. Most of the people got well, but quite a few died, too," he said sadly.

He always has been a general practitioner, and feels there is still need for the old-style "G.P."

Since he "slowed down" Dr. Porter finds time for the old family farm which he has kept. The deed was signed by President Andrew Jackson.

In his family are his wife Hester of more than 60 years, eight children, 25 grandchildren and 23 great-grandchildren.

One son, Robert A. Porter, is also a doctor and works in Memorial Hospital at Greensburg as a general anesthetist. A grandson has just graduated from medical school, and his son-in-law, Dr. Sidney S. Gaynor, is a physician for the New York Yankees.

The family ties are still close with sons Robert Porter nearby as well as son Jonathan Porter who works at Cummins Engine Company, Inc. in Columbus. The Porter's daughter, Mrs. Gene (after author Gene Stratton Porter) Faulkner lives just across the street.

The other children are Mrs. Marigall Bentzen of Detroit, Mich., Don E. Porter of Milwaukee, Wis., an employe of the General Electric Company, Thomas N. Porter of New York, a production stage manager currently working on Niel Simon's "Last of the Red Hot Lovers."

Also, Mrs. Martha Lucile Gaynor, who is visiting from New York, said her father made several trips there a few years ago when the Yankees were winning, because "he is a big baseball fan, and a basketball fan too," and David who lives at Osgood where he is the basketball coach at Jac-Cen-Del High School.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, due to official business back in my district I had to

OXVII—1415—Part 17

leave at 5 last Thursday night, before the House took its final vote on passage of H.R. 9272.

That bill, making appropriations for the next fiscal year for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, passed by an overwhelming margin of 337 to 10, and had I been able to be present I certainly would have voted for the bill.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC "GAME PLAN" BAD NEWS FOR JOBLESS

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to direct the attention of the House to a news commentary in yesterday's New York Times, and to the findings of a public opinion poll published in today's Washington Post. Taken together, they add up to bad news for the administration's wrong-again economists, and—far worse news for the more than 5 million jobless Americans who are walking the streets today. The Times said:

Last week President Nixon had reason to worry that his new game plan for the economy, adopted at the start of the year, isn't working.

Mr. Speaker, we know the President's plan is not working because consumer prices last month jumped twice as fast as they did in the first 4 months of this year, and unemployment rose again to 6.2 percent of the labor force.

The American people are not being fooled either by the optimistic predictions that issue almost daily from the White House. The latest Harris poll, in today's Washington Post, reveals that nearly two-thirds of our citizens are convinced we are in the midst of a recession; 40 percent believe that the administration's economic policies are doing more harm than good; and 79 percent have little, if any, confidence in this administration's ability to reduce unemployment and control inflation by 1972.

And yet, in the fact of this alarming evidence, we are told that President Nixon is about to veto the \$2 billion accelerated public works bill which the Congress has overwhelmingly approved, and which offers immediate help to those areas that have been hardest hit by unemployment.

The accelerated public works program cannot of itself undo all the damage that has been caused by the mistaken policies of the recent past. But, if it is implemented aggressively and imaginatively, it can take 400,000 or more of our fellow citizens off the dole and put them to work on public projects of real and lasting importance to our society.

If the President plans to veto this measure, I urge him to reconsider. If he goes through with his intention, I call on the House to override his veto.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1971]
IT MAY BE TIME TO CHANGE THE "GAME PLAN" AGAIN

(By Leonard S. Silk)

No one knows better than the nation's No. 1 football fan that when a game plan doesn't work, the coach must be ready to scrap it. Last week President Nixon had reason to worry that his new game plan for economy, adopted at the start of the year, isn't working.

The consumer price index rose in May by six-tenths of 1 per cent, seasonally adjusted—or at an annual rate of 7.2 per cent. This was twice as fast as consumer prices rose in the first four months of this year.

While a one-month change could be a fluke, the breadth of the rise across the range of goods and services consumers buy was disturbing. The relatively small rise in food prices helped restrain the index—but wholesale food prices are climbing and will keep pushing up retail prices. Housing is going up; earlier, the drop in mortgage rates had offset rising rents—but new mortgage costs are going up, too. Transportation is up—with new and used car prices rising, along with the price of gasoline. And just about everything else is up, with medical bills racing ahead.

The economy is falling behind the target of an average \$1,065-billion Gross National Product for 1971, laid out by the President's Council of Economic Advisers as necessary to reduce unemployment. A flash report that leaked out of the Commerce Department indicated that in the April-June quarter GNP rose by only a bit more than \$20-billion, after the \$31-billion increase in the first quarter. In order to reach the \$1,065-billion pace, GNP this year would have to rise by an average of \$30-billion a quarter. It promises to average \$1,050-billion, as most private forecasters expected.

Actually, the G.N.P. performance is further behind the Administration's forecast than the current dollar figures indicate, because inflation is proceeding faster than the President's economists expected. The over-all GNP price index, which includes government as well as the private sector, rose at an annual rate of 5.6 per cent in the first-quarter; preliminary estimates for the second quarter indicate that inflation declined slightly to a 5.3 per cent rate. If price increases this year average 5 per cent, the real growth rate of the economy will be little better than 2.5 per cent.

With so slow a rate of real growth in output, unemployment is showing no signs of coming down. Unemployment in May rose to 6.2 per cent—the same rate it had attained last December. The June rate is expected to show little change. In fact, little improvement in unemployment appears in prospect for the rest of the year, unless policy changes; the economy would have to grow at a real rate of more than 4.5 per cent to chop into the jobless rolls.

The persistence of unemployment is worrying consumers, causing them to increase their normal rate of saving and putting a drag on the economy. Robert A. Wallace, vice chairman of the Exchange National Bank of Chicago and a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, points out that a 6 per cent unemployment rate hits many more people in the course of a year than the 5 million jobless at any given time. Mr. Wallace estimates that, since unemployment turns over, about 17.5 million people will be out of jobs at some time during 1971. In addition, 3.5 million will be forced to work part time, another 1 million will be forced out of the labor market, and 1.5 million more—such as engineers, technicians, and other skilled workers—will be forced into lower paying jobs.

But there are many optimists, inside and outside the Administration, who expect that

the economy is going to pick up speed as the year wears on. Foremost among those in this camp are the monetarists—an increasingly heterogeneous band who still march more or less in the same direction under the banner of Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago. Noting the rapid rate of growth of the money supply—it has been increasing at an annual rate of more than 12 per cent since the start of the year—the monetarists expect a real surge in G.N.P. in the months ahead.

But the monetarists expect that, if recent rates of monetary growth continue, they will sooner or later generate faster inflation. Indeed, one does not have to be a monetarist to regard money growth rates in excess of 12 per cent as too high.

Faced with the persistence of both inflation and unemployment, the President's Council of Economic Advisers is shifting its position away from official satisfaction with the course of the economy. Paul W. McCracken, chairman of the council, now is reportedly leaning strongly toward tax cuts to boost real growth faster. Treasury Secretary John B. Connally shares this position. Resistance both to Democratic spending proposals—such as the public service job bill—together with pressures for a more aggressive wage-price policy is softening within the Administration.

However, George Shultz, director of the Office of Management and Budget, is still holding out against both a tougher incomes policy complete with wage-price review board, and against tax cuts that might further unbalance the budget. Mr. Shultz and others are wary of rekindling the fires of inflation. At the weekend, President Nixon gathered some of his top officials at his Camp David retreat for a review of the budget problems.

Mr. Nixon has been going along with Mr. Shultz. But if conditions on the job front don't improve soon, the current game plan—based on rapid monetary growth and a theoretically balanced "full-employment budget"—may go the way of the original game plan, labeled "gradualism," which produced the recession of 1969-70. Game Plan Three seems likely to involve stronger fiscal stimulus and tougher wage-price restraints.

[From the Washington Post, June 28, 1971]
NATION STILL IS IN A RECESSION, PUBLIC IS CONVINCED, 63% TO 23%

(By Louis Harris)

Despite indicators that the country's economy is gradually improving, the American people remain pessimistic about the trend of both prices and unemployment and, by 63 to 23 per cent, still think the nation is in a recession.

As far as the average American family is concerned, a substantial 72 per cent see little abatement in the rate of increase in the cost of living. A cross-section of 2,497 households was recently asked:

"Do you feel the prices of most things you buy are rising more rapidly than a year ago, about as rapidly as they were then, less rapidly than a year ago, or are they going down?"

[In percent]			
	June 1971	March 1971	July 1970
Rising more rapidly.....	72	73	71
Rising as rapidly.....	20	22	21
Rising less rapidly.....	6	4	4
Going down.....			1
Not sure.....	2	1	3

Although administration spokesmen have talked optimistically about consumer prices leveling out to a maximum increase of 4 to 4½ percent in 1971, down from a rate of 6 percent last year nearly three out of every four Americans simply feel that inflation is still going at full blast.

At the same time, close to two of every three continue to express concern over unemployment. The cross-section was asked:

"Compared to a year ago, do you feel that unemployment around here has grown worse, has decreased, or stayed about the same?"

[In percent]			
	June 1971	March 1971	January 1971
Grown worse.....	65	62	62
Decreased.....	4	4	5
Stayed same.....	25	29	27
Not sure.....	6	5	6

The continuing phenomenon of rising prices in the midst of increasing unemployment—as the public sees it—is accompanied by a widespread feeling that we are not yet out of the economic woods.

"Do you feel the country is in a recession today or not?"

[In percent]			
	In recession	No recession	Not sure
June, 1971.....	63	23	14
March.....	65	21	14
January.....	56	33	11
November, 1970.....	62	24	14
August.....	58	26	16

The implications of these results for the Nixon administration are that confidence in the ability of the federal government to lead the country out of the recession is not high. People were asked:

"Do you feel that the economic policies of the Nixon Administration are doing more harm than good or more good than harm?"

	June 1971	March 1971	January 1971
More good than harm.....	32	34	35
More harm than good.....	40	37	39
Not sure.....	29	29	26

The repeated claims by administration spokesmen, including the President himself, that 1971 is going to turn into a "good year" economically show little evidence of having persuaded large numbers of the public. In fact, the administration view that 1972 will see economic recovery in the country on a widespread scale with prices leveling out and unemployment down does not evoke a great deal of confidence either. The cross section was asked:

"Do you have a great deal of confidence that the Nixon Administration will keep the cost of living under control and will reduce unemployment by 1972. Do you have some but not a lot of confidence, or hardly any confidence they will do that?"

	June 1971	March 1971	January 1971
Great deal of confidence.....	15	15	18
Some, not a lot.....	36	38	37
Hardly any.....	43	41	38
Not sure.....	6	6	7

CHALLENGES TO AMERICA'S SPACE PROGRAM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, each of us hear the arguments against further

United States activities in space. I strongly disagree with this position. We are just now beginning to see the great benefits from our past years involvement. The following article in Editor and Publisher, April 17 edition, presents some very positive results of our programs:

[From Editor and Publisher, Apr. 17, 1971]
'70s: PAYOFF YEARS FROM SPACE—NEO (NEAR EARTH ORBIT) SPACE: THE ILLITERATE LEARN TO READ AND WRITE

Some 300 million villagers in India have a direct stake in the United States' space program. That's how many Indians, presently illiterate, who may learn to read or to farm more effectively thanks to American satellites in the 1970's.

India's current population (537 million) is growing at a rate that will reach more than a billion people by 1997. While 82 per cent live in 556,000 small villages, and about 70 per cent of the work force are farmers or agricultural laborers, India still does not produce enough food to feed its people. Education also suffers in India, with less than 50 per cent of primary school age children enrolled in schools. Complicating the educational problem is India's multiplicity of languages; there are 12 major languages and several hundred distinct dialects. Journalism is inadequate, too, since only two per cent of the newspapers go to the small villages where more than 80 per cent of the population lives!

The need for fast, extensive communications in India is obvious to its government which is striving to improve basic education, especially in modern agricultural techniques. To do so, India conducted studies of many alternate approaches, and has concluded that a Direct Broadcast Satellite TV system would be the most cost effective way to help solve these problems. Space TV costs about half of what an equivalent, entirely ground-based, system would cost since satellites can eliminate the need for large earth receiving and transmission stations, and complex relay networks. Broadcast satellites of the '70's will be powerful enough to beam TV programs directly from space to villages equipped with small, inexpensive receiving antennas. India already has found that community educational television has proven its worth in the area surrounding Delhi in an important experiment involving some 80 villages.

Under terms of an agreement India signed with the United States in 1969, their first 5000 villages are expected to be receiving televised instruction from space by 1973. Ultimately, some 600,000 direct broadcast receivers will be set up centrally in their villages with audiences of up to several hundred people at each location. And the multi-language problem is solved, also, since each TV set will have a selection of dialect audio channels.

Brazil, too, is studying an educational system calling for direct broadcasts via satellite. There, problems are somewhat different from India's: the imbalance caused by very sparse distribution of the population (90 million people spread over 3.2 million square miles) has resulted in an inadequate educational system—there simply aren't enough teachers to go around. Rural schools are served by only 36 percent of the teachers, but have 54 percent of the enrolled primary students. And of the 100,000 teachers in rural schools, some two-thirds have had only primary education. Through communications satellites, Brazil plans to instruct students in the rural areas on modern agricultural methods and to provide sufficient basic education to help overcome the school system's deficiencies. Plans call for direct satellite broadcast to about 150,000 schools, reaching 30 million people, about double the number of people who presently receive schooling in Brazil. Officials estimate that the system would cost one-fifth of an Earth-bound system. In a few

years, villagers in India and rural students in Brazil will be telling the world what they think of NEO-Space.

Just what is NEO-Space? It's a dark cold vacuum that surrounds our planet beginning some 2000 miles from Earth and extending to 25,000 miles from the planet. NEO-Space is home for the 427 artificial satellites currently in orbit around our world performing important research and operational tasks for Earthlings ranging from weather description to improved communications. The ability of communications satellites in NEO-Space to help bring the benefits of education to millions in the underdeveloped nations is one of the most profound benefits offered by NEO-Space.

Indians and South Americans aren't the only ones to benefit from communications satellites in NEO-Space. Today we have better television, with live, quality trans-oceanic color telecasts via satellites of news events. And, nations now have a capability of maintaining instantaneous, clear, unimpaired and direct communications with all nations of the world, a significant contribution to international relations. These and other Earthly benefits are available now because the use of NEO-Space has become economically competitive with other ways of doing things on Earth. The costs of using NEO-Space are coming down, and are expected to get even lower:

—The investment cost per circuit year in communications satellites has decreased from \$25,000 for the Early Bird satellite in 1965 to an estimated \$870 for the current Intelsat IV.

Charges for the satellite portion of a one-hour color telecast between New York and Europe in 1970 are 19 per cent of what they were in 1967, a reduction of 81 per cent! Advances in cable as well as satellite technology have resulted in better and cheaper telephone communications, resulting in actual rate decreases of up to 40 per cent in the price of trans-oceanic phone calls.

And the future of communications satellites holds even greater potential for improving the quality of life on Earth:

Under the terms of a domestic satellite system proposed by one firm, American television networks could cut their annual communications costs from more than \$70 million to about \$40 million. Such savings represent significant steps in keeping TV production costs down, and help fight inflation.

In air traffic control, particularly over the oceans, communications satellites can lead to an increase in air traffic density without compromising safety. By augmenting the electronic equipment on board, satellites can aid navigation and direct collision avoidance systems in air-lanes worldwide.

Likewise, satellites can make sea shipment and travel more economical and safer by providing continuous communications and accurate navigational aids to ships.

Business use of communications satellites will grow, too. One study estimates that the demand for business and data communications circuits will grow at least by 230 per cent from 1975 to 1985. And, because of time zones, satellites could enable computers to be used and shared economically around the clock throughout the world.

Direct Broadcast satellites, in the more industrialized nations, could help doctors and lawyers to keep abreast of the latest developments in their fields by transmitting new data and instruction directly into their homes or offices.

These are some of the present and future uses of communications satellites in NEO-Space. By helping to teach more effective farming, the United States space program will be combating starvation; by helping to teach reading and writing, it will help the Earth's standard of living; and by helping improve communications between nations, it will improve world understanding.

During the 70's, we are in the real payoff years in space, an age in which we will see even greater economic gains from the space investments of the 60's. Greatly improved communications is just one area in which NEO-Space is helping to solve the problems on Earth in ways that are economically competitive with other ways of doing things on Earth. We've gained experience, honed our technologies, and now we're ready to fully exploit NEO-Space in the 1970's because we've learned that it's a better and cheaper way to attack some problems on Earth.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to have as the leadoff witness at the Minneapolis hearings into the health needs of the citizens of the Twin Cities, Maurice B. Visscher, Ph. D. and M.D. Dr. Visscher has had a distinguished medical career and is presently the president of the National Society for Medical Research. He is also distinguished service and regents' professor of physiology, emeritus, in the Medical School of the University of Minnesota.

Dr. Visscher in his thoughtful analysis, makes a number of perceptive observations and relevant points. According to Dr. Visscher the Federal budget allots three times as much money for training in the Defense Department as it does for education of health professionals.

I commend the remarks of Dr. Visscher to all of my colleagues:

DISTINGUISHED CAREER

(Maurice B. Visscher, Ph. D. and M.D. Distinguished Service and Regents' Professor of Physiology, Emeritus, in the Medical School of the University of Minnesota)

I wish to testify with regard to four matters in connection with the problems related to health with which the Congress should deal in the current session concerning which my previous activities have given me some special knowledge.

I. HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS

The record of such organizations as the several Group Health Plans in Washington, D.C.; St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minnesota; Puget Sound, Washington; the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, the various Kaiser Permanente Plans in several cities, and other smaller examples, have given proof through operating experience that high quality comprehensive pre-paid medical care can be provided in urban communities at substantially lower cost,* with greater efficiency and greater consumer satisfaction through such plans than through the more traditional solo practice of medicine or in fact that by any other fee-for-individual-service type of medical practice.

According to the Social Security Administration Bulletin, Vol. 33, #12, the gross expenditures for all health expenditures in the United States were \$67.2 billion of which \$22.5 billion is for hospitalization and nurs-

* The nationwide experience of the health plans for Federal Civil Service employees shows that in 1966, for non-maternity services, the days of hospitalization per thousand persons covered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield was 876 and for all Group Practice Plans combined, was 408.

ing home care. Physicians' services cost \$12.6 billion. The experience of Health Maintenance Organizations is that their comprehensive services, for both professional care and hospitalization, can be provided at a cost lower than that experienced for much more limited coverage in the remainder of the community under ordinary indemnity plans. It has become obvious that plans under which all appropriate diagnostic services are performed on an ambulatory basis are more economical as to hospital costs than are practice plans which involve hospitalization for many simple diagnostic procedures. With every advance in medical diagnostic procedure the need for specialized competence and facilities increases. Consequently the economic disadvantage to society of unnecessary duplication of staff and facilities will grow.

At present it is estimated that about one third of the bed occupancy of general private hospitals is used improperly, i.e. that with more effective ambulatory care, including adequate laboratory diagnostic facilities, hospitalization costs could be greatly reduced. If this waste were eliminated a saving of \$7 billion annually could be anticipated.

If the Congress wishes to improve the overall picture for provision of medical care, it should not only permit their operation but it should make ample special funds available for the setting up of Health Maintenance Organizations. It should subsidize the initial stages of development of Health Maintenance Organizations. I speak with experience about the difficulties in starting such operations. The Group Health Plan in Minnesota ran a sizable deficit for its first two years. Today it is a flourishing enterprise. It nearly failed, however, in its first years because it took time to build a large enough membership to run an economical enterprise.

One of the ways in which the Congress can insure the development of Health Maintenance Organizations would be to require that Medical Schools subsidized by Federal funds utilize an HMO for at least a part of its clinical teaching. I wish to recommend that the Congress should require that all Medical Schools that receive Federal subsidy for educational purposes shall promptly set up programs for prepaid comprehensive medical care, i.e. an HMO, as a condition for receiving support, so that all medical graduates of the future may have had experience in the operation of such a plan.

II. MEDICAL AND RELATED HEALTH PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

The notion is widely held that education of personnel for the health professions is exorbitantly expensive. Data printed in the November 23, 1970, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association, assembled by the Association of American Medical Colleges, indicates that for 1968-1969, the last year for which full statistics are available, the total expenditures of all medical schools in the United States for educational purposes (not including research) was \$0.76 billion. Comparable exact data for education in dentistry, pharmacy, nursing and other paramedical personnel are not available to me, but I believe that a generous estimate would be an equal sum. The total would then be \$1.52 billion or less. The total cost of preventive and therapeutic health care in the United States in 1968 was \$57.1 billion (Social Security Bulletin, 1970). The educational cost is thus approximately 2.7% of the total.

It is difficult to make comparisons with other professional and occupational groups in connection with the cost of training. However, I have ascertained from the proposed Budget of the United States for 1972 that \$1.8 billion will be used for training and paid drill in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force Reserves; in the National Guards; and in the Reserve Officer Training Corps programs, in addition to the

funds for other various purposes in those services. I have also ascertained that in the regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force the sum of \$13.7 billion is requested for "Training, Medical and General Personnel Activities". The budget item is not further broken down in the budget, despite the fact that the Appendix to the Budget consists of 1,112 quarto size double column pages. I would assume, however, that no less than one-third of the total in the combined set of categories would be employed for training, which would represent \$4.5 billion. Adding this to the above figures for the National Guard, Reserves and ROTC, one obtains \$6.33 billion. The sum of \$75.0 billion has been requested by the Department of Defense for military purposes. The training fraction is 8.3% of that total. This is three times the relative worth given to education for health professionals. If, as is likely, I have underestimated the costs of training in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, the disparity becomes still greater.

My point is not that there should be reckless additions to appropriations for training for health professionals but simply to point out that in this country we are far from giving that sector of education an exorbitant fraction of the total cost of the health services outlay. I do, however, make a plea for the reordering of our national priorities in the light of real needs for human welfare in this country. This Congress needs to begin the process of such reordering in drastic ways. A most obvious point to begin is with reductions in the appropriations for military purposes.

III. SOME SPECIAL ROLES FOR PUBLIC HOSPITALS

The rising costs of hospitalization in all hospitals is a cause of great concern to consumers, providers and government alike. One of the reasons for increased cost is the need to provide more and better services for diagnostic and therapeutic measures that the majority of patients in a private general hospital do not need, or to be more precise, need only rarely. However, more concentration of infrequently used facilities such as those for irradiation in cancer treatment, for cardiac catheterization and numerous others, in fewer hospitals, but available to all, would result in considerable economies. A publicly supported and operated hospital is the logical place to install expensive facilities which cannot be used to full capacity in numerous private hospitals.

There is one type of service that, practically speaking, cannot be afforded in private hospitals without special subsidy, namely the effective treatment of major trauma. According to a report in 1966, the NRC Committees on Trauma and Shock stated: "In 1965, 52 million accidental injuries killed 107,000, temporarily disabled over 10 million and permanently impaired 400,000 American citizens at a cost of approximately \$18 billion.

This neglected epidemic of modern society is the nation's most important environmental health problem. . . . The leading cause of death among persons between the ages of one and thirty-seven is accident. An adequate surgical and medical service for the management of trauma requires a large full-time professional staff and supporting staff as well as properly equipped space. It is a very expensive service, but it is not a luxury. It is a money-saving necessity for every community because it not only saves lives, it prevents much disability in persons who survive. If I myself were to be involved in a serious accident in Minneapolis or St. Paul, the only hospitals to which I would want to be taken would be either the Hennepin County General or the St. Paul-Ramsey.

The public hospitals should be specially supported, in other words, not only because they can serve the indigent, but also because they, and they alone, can provide a center for special, and especially expensive services, at minimum cost to the community at large.

I wish to make one more point especially directed at the trauma problem. American society needs to have a broad-based program instituted in applied research and education in relation to accident prevention and treatment. It is hopeful that, due to the efforts of a few persons, especially Ralph Nader, the Congress has written into law some safety features for automobiles. But much more needs to be done in relation to accident prevention, and much more needs doing in relation to trauma management.

IV. SUPPORT OF MEDICAL RESEARCH

According to the January 1970 report in the Social Security Bulletin, the total expenditure in the United States for health related research (outside the drug industry) was \$1.77 billion. Of this sum, \$1.5 billion was from Federal sources, \$71 million from State and local, with \$182 million coming from private sources. The last figure excludes the research expenditures in the pharmaceutical industry, which according to the annual survey report of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, was \$450 million in 1968. Consequently, the above total must be raised by that amount. The more correct grand total therefore is \$2.22 billion which is 3.8% of the total national health expenditures for the year (\$57.1 billion).

It is of interest that also according to the PMA annual survey report, the amounts spent on research and development as the percentage of total income of the pharmaceutical industry was 11.4%. In other words, the pharmaceutical industry finds it profitable to spend relatively three times as much on research and development as is spent in the overall health enterprise.

It may also be of interest to note that of the total military budget proposed for the Fiscal Year 1972 of \$75 billion, which the Defense Department has requested with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget in the White House, the sum of \$8.1 billion is earmarked for research and development, which is 10.8% of the total.

When the questions are raised as to whether we in the United States are spending an exorbitant sum of money on health related resources, it may very appropriately be asked whether it is relatively less important to improve opportunities for defense against disease than it is for defense against potential military aggressors. The Department of Defense obviously believes that it is appropriate to spend 10.8% of its total funds on R. & D. Is there any good reason to believe that a smaller percentage of what is spent in the health care enterprise should go into research and development? If not, the idea that this country is spending all that it could afford or should spend in its own interest on health research is quite obviously fallacious. Until our overall expenditures reach \$6 or \$7 billion per annum, there would seem to be no justification for any assertion that medical and related research is overfunded.

Another way of looking at the problem is to compare expenditures for research and development in relation to space exploration with those for health. According to Science, February 5, 1971, NASA will spend \$3.11 billion for R and D in Fiscal 1972. Can anyone seriously argue that R and D in the space program is worth \$0.9 billion more to Americans than R and D in the entire health field? To pose the question is to answer it. To attempt to justify the NASA research and development expenditures on the basis of the value of the so-called "spin-off" is not valid, because at least in medicine the spin-off has been of minimal value, and in every area a direct attack on a problem of general importance would have been more economical. It has been argued that without the emotional force of national prestige the money would never have been appropriated. This may be true, but if so it only points up the distortion in our order of priorities. Actually the deciphering of the genetic code, done

largely by American scientists, has undoubtedly raised American scientific prestige in the world more than our success in landing men on the moon. And it will have much more important practical consequences in the future.

I wish to make one very specific criticism of the budget proposals for Fiscal 1972. This is in relation to the decrease in requests for funds for medical research training. The President is asking for a total of \$152.0 million for fellowship and training grants as against appropriations of \$196.7 million in 1970. This reduction in requests has been progressive for two years, and has been justified on the grounds that the only way to stop increasing requests for funds for support of research is to limit the production of researchers. There are several flaws in this argument. First, there is no obvious reason why research funding should not increase to a higher level. Second, there is a great need at the present time for increased numbers of medical scientists to man faculties for new medical schools and expanded medical schools, to meet national professional manpower needs. Finally, the result of the squeeze has been to discontinue completely graduate training programs in a number of smaller institutions and to concentrate them in the more prestigious ones. This is certainly not in the best interests of all of the people in the United States. What this country needs is to strengthen rather than to weaken its less well-supported medical schools and universities in order to increase rather than to decrease the supply of competent manpower for medical education.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion I wish to say that I hope that the Congress will develop a program for universal health insurance, with the financing based upon one or another form of equitable taxation, and that I would strongly recommend that great emphasis be placed upon the setting up of Health Maintenance Organizations with the maximum feasible decentralization of authority as to their operation. It would be a disaster to set up a single agency or individual as a czar for all health care. A thousand or more organizations, preferably competing with one another in offering their services, and operating independently under the broadest possible guidelines would seem essential in this country. Those physicians who preferred not to work in such Organizations should, of course, be allowed to continue in their own style of practice. However, their monetary rewards for services paid out of Federal funds should not be greater than the cost of similar services in HMOs operating in the same locality.

I hope too that the Congress will take a new look at the funding of health professional education and research, as well as of the essential public hospitals, the last as a means of improving health service while lowering overall hospital costs.

PRESIDENT MAY VETO ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS ACT

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely distressed over the persisting reports that President Nixon will tomorrow veto the Accelerated Public Works Act.

There is little doubt that the most serious threat to the economy is our persistent unemployment. As has been pointed out so often during the last few

weeks, the unemployment rate is presently 6.2 percent, a 9-year high.

If the President does follow through in his reported threat to veto this legislation, I can only infer that he has political and partisan motives. Certainly his public statements indicate that he is aware of our serious unemployment problems. In addition, this bill includes help for the Vietnam veteran, a goal which Mr. Nixon outlined earlier this month. If he now vetoes this worthy legislation, his reputed concern for the plight of the Vietnam veteran will sound a hollow note. Some of my colleagues believe the President does not like the idea of public works projects. And yet, his own manpower report, released in April by the Department of Labor states:

Less than one-third of the Nation's population is served by sewage systems as well as adequate waste treatment plants . . . solid waste facilities are inadequate and antiquated. It is estimated that 94% of existing land disposal operations and 75% of incinerator facilities are substandard.

Thus, it can only be for partisan reasons that the President would veto this bill. For the sake of the 5.2 million individuals who are unemployed, I urge him to act as President of all the people, not just a chosen few.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM G. FLORENCE, RETIRED AIR FORCE CIVILIAN SECURITY CLASSIFICATION POLICY EXPERT AT HEARINGS BEFORE THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE, JUNE 24, 1971

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee is holding hearings on the crisis in U.S. Government information policies and practices. We have taken testimony thus far on the broad constitutional principles of a free press, the right of Congress to information from the executive, and the right of the people to know of the decisions being made in their behalf by government.

Also, we are examining the complex security classification system that is at the root of much of the confusion in information policies. Last Thursday, the subcommittee received a most important and revealing statement on the security classification system from Mr. William G. Florence, a retired Air Force civilian security classification policy expert.

Mr. Florence served for 43 years in military and civilian capacities for our Government and assisted in the policy preparation of Executive Order 10501 and implementing directives. He retired from the Government just a little over 3 weeks ago after serving for some 4 years in the Pentagon as a Deputy Assistant for Security and Trade Affairs for the Deputy Chief of Staff for Research and Development and the Deputy Chief of Staff for

Systems and Logistics, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force.

In this forthright, candid statement, Mr. Florence estimates that about 99.5 percent of the classified documents contain information that could be revealed without prejudicing the defense interests of the Nation. He also said that there are at least 20 million classified documents in existence, and the cost of handling such material costs the American taxpayers more than \$50 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, because of the far-reaching interest being focused on this issue here in Congress and throughout the country, I insert in the Extensions of Remarks the full statement of Mr. Florence.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM G. FLORENCE, RETIRED CIVILIAN SECURITY CLASSIFICATION POLICY EXPERT, ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCEDURES FOR CLASSIFYING INFORMATION UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 10501 AS PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE AT HEARINGS ON U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION POLICIES AND PRACTICES, JUNE 24, 1971

Mr. FLORENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am truly honored to have been invited here. I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to participate in this exploration of perhaps the most serious Constitutional question that has arisen in my lifetime: the question whether we shall continue to enjoy the freedom of speech.

I am familiar with the work this Subcommittee has accomplished over the past sixteen years, including the landmark legislation known as the Freedom of Information Act. I believe the time has come for another service of perhaps equal, at least equal, maybe even greater importance.

It is my purpose to furnish facts that could be useful to the Subcommittee in reviewing practices of the Department of Defense involving the evaluation, classification, dissemination and declassification of information under Executive Order 10501, 5 November 1953, entitled "Safeguarding Official Information in the Interests of the Defense of the United States," as amended by Executive Order 10816, 7 May 1959 and Executive Order 10964, 20 September 1961.

I also wish to offer suggestions for eliminating unrealistic restrictions which currently are applied by the Department of Defense in the name of national security against the disclosure of information to the public regarding government business.

During my forty-three years of military and civilian service with the government, which ended by retirement 31 May 1971, I worked in many positions involving responsibility for safeguarding defense information.

At Headquarters U.S. Air Force I exercised responsibility from 1945 until 1960 for developing and publishing Air Force policy and procedures for evaluating, classifying, safeguarding and declassifying defense information. This included writing the basic policy in Air Force Regulation 205-1, subject: Safeguarding Classified Information.

During the period 1945-1960 I also served on committees within the Department of Defense and on interdepartmental groups concerned with developing or revising policy for safeguarding defense information within the United States and international organizations such as NATO.

This included contributing to the preparation of policy in Executive Order 10501, which was originally promulgated as Executive Order 10290, and to the preparation of implementing directives issued by the Department of Defense.

I was the author of DOD Directive 5200.9,

27 September 1958, subject: Declassification and Downgrading of Certain Information Originated Before 1 January 1948.

I also initiated the proposal that a policy be established for automatic downgrading and declassification of information on a very accelerated time-phase basis. (Eventually, a policy for automatic declassification was published in DOD Directive 5200.10 and was incorporated in Executive Order 10501 by Executive Order 10964.) It is not a very accelerated time-phase system.

From May 1960 to July 1967 I occupied positions in the Air Force Systems Command involving responsibility for assuring the protection of classified defense information released to or developed by contractors.

In August 1967 I returned to Headquarters U.S. Air Force where I served until 31 May 1971 as Deputy Assistant for Security and Trade Affairs for both the Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, and the Deputy Chief of Staff, Systems and Logistics.

I exercised responsibility for (1) technical program security requirements in general, (2) classifying and declassifying research and development information and weapon systems, (3) reviewing proposals for public release of technical information, and (4) developing the Air Force position regarding proposals from industry to export technical information and munitions of war.

Based on knowledge and experience gained before and since promulgation in 1951 of the first Executive order for safe-guarding official information I submit that Executive Order 10501 should be rescinded.

The basic classification system and safe-guarding procedures in the order were originally designed for the very narrow field of military information.

The limited scope of military planning, operations, and logistical support activities before World War II permitted the effective application of policy by the Army and Navy for designating and protecting certain items of information against disclosure outside military and naval channels. It is my understanding that military security regulations of the type that existed up to the conclusion of World War II are not at issue here.

The President is specifically authorized to "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." Beginning with World War II, however, responsibility for national defense planning, implementation of defense planning, logistical support operations and the coordination of actual military operations necessarily mushroomed far beyond the limits of military channels. Numerous civilian departments and independent agencies became involved. Requirements for disseminating pertinent information expanded proportionately.

As I recall the facts, a Security Advisory Board operated in World War II to assist in coordinating security procedures among the various government agencies requiring knowledge and custody of military information which had been assigned a security classification by one of the military departments.

Memoranda issued by the Board established standards of protection to be applied by all agencies in the interest of uniformity. However, adherence to the standards was voluntary on the part of each agency. Therefore, the Board developed a draft Executive order for the purpose of having the security standards made directive upon all activities and all information of the Executive Branch.

Notwithstanding the advice of many individuals against expanding the policy for classifying military information to cover all activities and information of the Executive Branch, the draft order was completed and promulgated 24 September 1951 as Executive Order 10290.

Within a short time after issuance I could see that dissemination of classification policy

by Executive action had led to a more widespread use of classification markings than existed before the order.

Regardless of such restrictions as my superiors permitted me to include in Air Force regulations regarding the use of classification categories, overclassification increased.

The classification and withholding of information from the public under Executive Order 10290 had become a political issue by the time the newly-elected President took office in 1953, just two years later.

The policy was quickly redrafted by the new Administration in an effort to reduce its scope. It was republished 5 November 1953 as Executive Order 10501.

The major improvement was to stop the misuse of the restricted classification category. This was done very simply and most effectively by eliminating the category from the classification system. We had no more trouble with that classification.

For about two years there actually was some reduction in the use of security classifications in the Department of Defense. But by 1955 the various types of actions taken by the Department of Defense in implementing Executive Order 10501 had permitted and encouraged the overclassification of information to begin increasing again.

Since then the practice has become so widespread that the defense classification system is literally clogged with material bearing classification markings. I would guess that there are at least twenty million classified documents, including reproduced copies, in existence today.

I sincerely believe that less than one-half of one percent of the different documents which bear currently assigned classification markings actually contain information qualifying even for the lowest defense classification under Executive Order 10501.

In other words, the disclosure of information in at least 99½ percent of those classified documents could not be prejudicial to the defense interests of the nation.

Numerous individuals in the Department of Defense, including myself, have attempted to the best of our ability to limit the use of defense classifications to the purpose for which they were intended.

Various officials from the Secretary of Defense down have initiated measures designed to restrict the use of defense classifications.

But hundreds of thousands of individuals at all echelons in the Department of Defense practice classification as a way of life. They came into military service or civilian employment under the policy in Executive Order 10501 which permits the classification of information, and they simply are not going to change their practice as long as the classification system exists.

Let me tell you about the early indoctrination by the Air Force for its inductees at Lackland Air Force Base, for example. These individuals are immediately advised that there must be this safeguarding of military information and are indoctrinated at the very beginning of their service. Each individual participates in determining what information should be safeguarded.

Not only is this indoctrination given at the time before the individual is even acquainted with the service, but there is the complication of another virtually fourth security classification injected into this indoctrination. The Air Force uses the term "unclassified-sensitive" to designate information which technically does not qualify for marking as classified defense information under the Executive order, but the effect is substantially the same as putting a security classification on that information. It makes it so that information not qualifying under the Executive order for the marking of confidential becomes in the minds of these inductees and it extends on through their service, information that could qualify for the classification of confidential if, under

this unclassified sensitive concept the individual felt it would be necessary to go ahead and use the Executive order system rather than depend upon the understanding of what unclassified sensitive really means.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is that there is quite a dilution even of the intent and language of the Executive order, much less the dilution of the use of the authorized classification symbols in that order.

Here are some additional facts regarding the classification philosophy of the Department of Defense which I believe are quite pertinent to the Subcommittee review.

1. DOD Instruction 5210.47, covering the classification system of the government and its application by the Department of Defense limits original classification authority in the Department of Defense to a relatively few individuals, very highly placed persons in the Department of Defense.

However, the same directive delegates something called "derivative" classification authority to any individual who can sign a document or who is in charge of doing something.

Such individual may assign a classification to the information involved if he believes it to be so much as closely related to some other information that bears a classification. This is called "derivative" classification authority.

In the past several years I have not heard one person in the Department of Defense say that he had no authority to classify information. The restrictions in Executive Order 10501 on delegating authority to classify have virtually no effect.

Incidentally, it might be recalled that some of the complexities in the government's affidavit regarding DOD classification practices which were submitted to the District Court in the Washington Post case included references to "derivative classifications."

2. The majority of people with whom I worked in the past few years reflected the belief that information is born classified and that declassification would be permitted only if someone could show that the information would not be of interest to a foreign nation.

As one of many examples, I have received correspondence from the Air Force Systems Command objecting to possible declassification of items of information unless it could be proved to them that declassification would actually benefit the Air Force.

More recently, I attempted to obtain concurrence of an Air Staff office in declassifying the external view of the fire control equipment being sold to Japan for use on the Japanese F-4 aircraft.

In addition to other reasons for declassification that I was sponsoring, more than twelve of these sets had been lost in foreign territory. But I was told that concurrence could not be given "until there is positive proof that possible enemy countries have had access to this system." Fortunately I was successful in getting that office overruled. The classification requirements on that information were cancelled.

3. Nearly everyone known to me follows criteria for classifying information which are much broader than the criteria in Executive Order 10501. This stems primarily from inadequate limitations in DOD Instruction 5210.47.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense provides for and encourages the use of lists of examples of information which could qualify for classification. Lists include such generalities as "State-of-the-Art," "break-throughs," "new thresholds," "production schedules," "manufacturing data," "performance," and so forth.

As a matter of fact, Air Force Regulation 205-29, as published by the Air Force Inspector General, negates the criteria in Executive Order 10501 in some degree by providing for the classification of scientific or technological information if the information would aid a foreign government.

I was asked recently by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to concur in a proposal to classify all rocket propulsion information that is not presently in open literature. This of course is not a criterion or an approach to the reasons for imposing security restrictions on information that is established in the President's Order.

Another point is that people, all of us really, want a simple list to file and glance at, containing instructions about information qualifying for a classification. This is all they will use for assigning classification markings if you give it to them. Thus, instead of judgment classification, we get file-drawer classification. The Department of Defense simply does not make clear the fact that no item of information, regardless of type, can qualify for a defense classification under Executive Order 10501 unless proper authority determines that its unauthorized disclosure actually could be prejudicial to the defense interests of the nation.

4. It is common practice in various Department of Defense activities to assign a defense classification to documents known by the classifier to contain no item of information qualifying for a classification. The reason usually is that the mere association of items of unclassified information warrants security protection and the classification designation. The individuals involved evidently are not aware of the fact that information truly qualifying for classification cannot be divided into separate unclassified elements. In other words, according to Sections 1 and 3 of Executive Order 10501, zero-classification plus zero-classification can never become confidential. There must always be an additional ingredient warranting that classification.

Let me cite some actions that show how utterly ridiculous the theory of association classification can be in practice. These are not very exceptional. They are quite common.

a. Sometime ago, one of the service chiefs of staff wrote a note to the other chiefs of staff stating briefly that too many papers were being circulated with the top secret classification. He suggested that use of the classification should be reduced. Believe it or not, that note itself was marked top secret.

b. The Air Force Electronics Systems Division at Hanscomb Field, Massachusetts, adopted the following statement for use on selected documents: "Although the material in this publication is unclassified, it is assigned to overall classification of confidential." We attempted some orientation with the definition at this time. I would not say our immediate success lasted too long, because I still see practices of this sort.

c. Not so very long ago, someone in the Navy Department placed the secret marking on some newspaper items of particular interest to the Navy. Subsequently, that action caused some embarrassment to the Department of Defense. As a result, a special directive had to be published to tell people not to classify newspapers. I see recently that practice within the Department of Defense is continuing anyway, the best I can tell from reading the newspapers today about the disclosures in the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Boston Globe.

d. Last year, the RAND Corporation produced a document containing unclassified lists of electronic equipment, including electronic warfare equipment, that is carried on U.S. Air Force aircraft. This was not like the 47-volume document that is so much in the news today. No classified information was used as source material. Nothing was added by the author that could possibly have qualified for protection under Executive Order 10501. For example, here is a portion of the material that was used, not only of the sort I just mentioned, but it even specifies here as being unclassified. However, in the course of a routine review of the RAND listings within the Department of Defense, one Air Staff Office wrote the following: "In our

judgment the document should be classified at the confidential level since it reveals actual electronic warfare configurations of USAF aircraft." Without regard to comments from other offices that the document did not contain classified information, the Department of Defense notified RAND Corporation that the confidential classification should be applied. At the time I retired, my office had not been able to have that classification canceled. You might note the total absence of any thought really as to whether republication of unclassified information would prejudice our defense interests.

Mr. Chairman, I refer again to the government affidavit that was filed in the Washington Post case. That affidavit relating to the use of security classifications and explaining the Executive Order 10501, clearly supported the use of association classifications in the Department of Defense.

5. A great many individuals in the Department of Defense, including highly placed officials, classify or strongly support the imposition of defense classifications on privately owned information, including privately generated applications for patents, regardless of the fact that Executive Order 10501 is clearly limited to official government information. This really spreads classification beyond any possible control. And we can be certain that the tremendous costs which stem from this type of unnecessary classification, as well as all other unnecessary classifications, are charged to all of us as taxpayers.

I could cite numerous recent or current cases involving the assignment of classifications to privately owned information. Here is one example. Nearly two years ago, a West Coast firm published as unclassified a document describing their privately-developed electronic system for air surveillance of missile sites. After considerable effort in obtaining a government license for export, the company distributed the document last year, as unclassified, to numerous foreign countries. Of course, it had wide distribution in this country. Late in 1970, the Army came into possession of the company's information. In December, the Army sent a letter to the Defense Supply Agency in Los Angeles advising that the information required the classification "Secret-NOFORN." Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, that "NOFORN" is an acronym for "no foreign dissemination." The Defense Supply Agency was to conduct an inquiry into the purported "security violation." Incidentally, the Army letter itself contained information marked as confidential.

Subsequently, a report of investigation was forwarded to the Department of Defense for action. In March, this year, my own office submitted comments showing that no government classification should apply. Including in our letter was the following: "The fact that a government activity classifies its own use or knowledge of an officially developed item of information does not constitute any legal basis for attempting to classify and restrict a commercial firm's use or knowledge of its privately-developed information, even though both items of information might seem to be identical."

Nevertheless, the pro-classification position prevailed and the Department of Defense later notified the company that the information was still considered to be classified. I do not know whether this matter has been resolved yet.

5. Here is another very serious problem. Many people hold the view that the classification system can and should apply to information in the public domain. This includes the top security policy officer in the Department of Defense. And, of course, that view is reflected at this moment by the government's proposal to review the New York Times papers of 13, 14, and 15 June and make a decision within 90 days, maybe less, as to whether the top secret classification may be downgraded or canceled.

Let me give you some other examples of cases that are common throughout the Department of Defense:

a. When the secretary of defense presented his statement to the House Armed Services Committee 9 March 1971, on the 1972-1976 Defense Program and the 1972 Defense Budget, one of our Air Staff divisions rose up in wrath about the disclosures made by the Secretary. Here is an extract of the report made by the Secretary of Defense to the House Armed Services Committee.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, in all of this critical review of the Department of Defense, I submit that it does about as much good as anyone could hope for when it comes to releasing information to the public regarding Defense planning. The public release machinery works very effectively, in my opinion, in spite of the weird confusion that exists in the classification system. I believe, sir, that this Department of Defense presentation of 9 March, 1971, is a very good example of what I am talking about.

The division in the Air Staff I am referring to issued a statement of its own that same day, 9 March. It developed a list of elements of information, including some that had been published by the Secretary of Defense. The division then assigned its own classification to those elements of information and sent the list of officials to the offices of the Secretaries of Defense and the Air Force, the Air Staff, and the Air Force Systems Command. In requesting comments about the division's own security classification assignments, the covering letter included the statement, "please disregard what you know has been released or compromised."

This was another matter that had not been resolved when I retired last month.

b. Here is another very significant case. Two years ago, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development advised a subcommittee of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee regarding "the formulation of a concept which involves the capability of the 949 satellite system to both detect missile launches off the launch pad, and forecast their trajectory and combine those data with long wavelength (LWIR) midcourse tracking." This is somewhat of a technical description, Mr. Chairman, but I beg your indulgence. There were some other excellent disclosures but let us consider this performance function of the program 949 Satellite.

After that my office certainly anticipated being able to issue instructions that would have canceled the existing secret classification specified in Air Force documents regarding the fact that Program 949 had any sort of missile detection capability. But, again believe it or not, we could not obtain concurrence of people in the Office of the Under-Secretary of the Air Force to cancel the classification. In the past two years, the Commander of the Air Force Space and Missile Systems Organization, the Commander, Air Force Systems Command, and some other individuals have attempted to obtain authority for cancelling the classification on the general purpose of Program 949. A great deal of information is published periodically in the newspapers about this program. Very little so-called leakage of information however has occurred. The program simply is self revealing to anyone who is interested.

But the philosophy in certain offices in the Department of Defense that nearly everything about space programs must carry a defense classification, regardless of exposure, continues to prevail regarding Program 949 and some other space programs. Incidentally, the DOD Director concerning the classification of space programs was assigned the secret classification when it was issued about 10 years ago. It still had that marking last month.

7. My next case shows how deeply em-

bedded and inflexible the "born classified" concept has become.

In April of 1967, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering—Dr. Foster—proposed to make substantial changes in DOD policy with a view toward actually eliminating overclassification and unnecessary classification of research and development information. It was his conclusion that such information as might require classification could not, as a general rule, be protected for more than two years. At the end of that period, the information was to be declassified with very few exceptions. Also, he proposed that any item qualifying for classification be marked and handled as secret—not confidential, but secret—so that it might be effectively accounted for and protected during the two-year classification period. This proposal for automatic declassification of research and development information after two years, and the other highly constructive proposed improvements in policy, were beaten down by objections from the pro-classification people in the Department. It seemed that too many people would have lost some of their classification prerogatives. I personally thought that Dr. Foster should have been awarded the highest of honors for the proposals he made. It really was, and still is, a disappointment that since the date of my blanket declassification action in 1958, the proclassification people can stymie any effort within the Department of Defense that would make the classification system fully workable.

8. The next problem regarding the application of Executive Order 10501 is the total lack of incentive in the Department of Defense for proper classification. An individual who strives to limit the use of defense classifications to information for which they are authorized in the order run a risk of being accused of and punished for a security violation. To my knowledge, no one in the Department of Defense was ever disciplined for classifying information, regardless of how much the classification cost for unnecessary security protection or what damage resulted from the restriction against releasing the information to the public. But I have seen how rough a person can be treated for leaving classification markings off of information which he knows to be officially unclassified if someone "up the line" thinks that a classification should have been applied.

Mr. Chairman, the foregoing comments reflect the reasons why I have concluded that promulgation of Executive Order 10290 and its reissuance of Executive Order 10501 was a mistake. We can make honest mistakes. I do believe this was a mistake. We should never have been encumbered with a policy permitting an individual to impose, by administrative action and personal choice, any restriction on the dissemination of information to which the people of this country are clearly entitled by the Constitution. I respectfully submit it is my belief that any effort to revise the Executive Order and to require the type of implementing action that might truly serve the interests of the country would be doomed to failure. The fallibility of men and the self-interest we necessarily exercise in our lives simply rule out any hope that administrative choices made as to classification under a new order would be better for the nation than those being made today.

We did not need the broad policy that is in Executive Order 10501 to assure the protection of truly sensitive military information before 1951. Our defense interests could be served better without such a policy.

I respectfully suggest the enactment of legislation for controlling "defense information" or "defense data" similar to that which covers "restricted data" under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The Congress could decide upon appropriate language, sufficiently precise, that would include only those ele-

ments of military information which warrant and must be accorded effective protection against disclosure. We could easily amend the existing order, but we cannot amend people. The use of so-called classifications or other similar labels should be avoided. Any proposed disclosure not authorized by the statute could be stopped, and any unlawful disclosure could be the basis for penalty. The degree of punishment should be made commensurate with the seriousness of the violation, not necessarily a severe penalty.

Mr. Chairman, I again express my deepest thanks for the invitation to come before the committee and present these facts and suggestions.

**AFTER VIETNAM, WHAT? SPEECH OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN**

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and good friend, Congressman JOHN S. MONAGAN, again showed his great talent as a former college English major and a sound thinker when he recently addressed the graduating class at Post Junior College in Waterbury, Conn.

Most of this year's graduation speeches focused on the prospective withdrawal from Vietnam. I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues Representative MONAGAN's talk which goes beyond an emphasis on withdrawal and asks the Nation to consider the larger policy questions we must face after withdrawal. He wisely suggests that we enlarge the scope of our national debate from a date-of-withdrawal preoccupation to an exploration of the overall dimensions of our future problems, both foreign and domestic, with a plea that we not surrender our responsibilities in the world.

I commend to your attention, the following fine address by Mr. MONAGAN.

AFTER VIETNAM, WHAT?

It is a hardy individual today who presumes to make a Commencement Address.

With freedom of thought endemic and personal judgment supreme, these are not times when one mounts the podium to repeat the fulsome generalities of other days or the exhortations to industry, frugality, and optimism that characterized the speeches of bygone Junes. The last decade has produced a deep skepticism of the rhetoric of the past. In our country to dry the adult voice does not command automatic agreement.

While not entirely deifying, the last decade has been an exciting time in which to live. In style it has ranged from the optimistic if inflated Kennedy rhetoric—"We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship"—to the obscenities of the New Left; from the rotund platitudes of Norman Vincent Peale to the scatological broadsides of the Black Panthers.

With the current urge to be different and the uniform tendency to non-conformity, it is perhaps significant that a commencement ceremony is being held here today, and while in these times one may never be able to predict the form it may take, it is heartening to be a part of it.

My own memories of graduations go back to the time when the seniors marched in serried and graduated ranks—coming in to the tune of Mendelssohn's "March of the Priests," concluding with the Doxology, and, at least, until the depression, most of the newly-fledged bachelors promptly left the

groves of Academe for the canyons of the New York financial district.

What a variety of themes have been sounded at commencements since those years. The depression (grit your teeth and hope), World War II (we fight to preserve our way of life), the Cold War (we shall build a strategy of containment of communism), the New Frontier (ask not what your country can do for you).

Commencement moods have ranged during this period from idyllic to blasphemous and the audiences have run the gamut from soporific to unruly. The last few years have marked the high tide of activism and participation—not to mention personal testimony. Only two years ago people were grabbing microphones all across the land, and it was a sorry institution indeed which did not have its closing ceremonies interrupted with an harangue on Vietnam, or a polemic on university investments in South African business.

Now it appears that another change of mood has made its appearance, both on the campus and in the country at large. Students are reviving long-hidden interests in the "non-relevant" areas of study. Marching and violent demonstrations are left to the minority. Student activism remains, but it has turned to more conventional channels of accomplishment. The sudden increase in law school applications evidences this point.

A college newspaper recently carried an ad which read:

"Wanted—suggestions for desirable subjects for demonstrations."

On the whole, the tendency seems to lead toward greater participation and less confrontation. Perhaps the 18 year-old vote has had something to do with this. Perhaps the emptiness of confrontation policies has become apparent. Or perhaps there has developed a greater capacity to distinguish between measured change and revolution.

In any case, the time has come to ask where this activism, the student group, and the country at large should be heading. I have reminisced today about past commencements, but I have not come here to talk about the past. I have come to discuss the future.

For the last five years, we have experienced passion, anger, and frustration over the Vietnam war. This turmoil, though sometimes justified, has often obscured and subordinated the many other critical problems, both foreign and domestic, with which the United States must deal successfully in the years ahead. For several Presidencies, it has been almost literally true that Vietnam has been the only problem on which our Chief Executives have been able to focus. For a generation of students, Vietnam has been an ever more insistent factor for a major portion of their lives. Now that the military commitment in Vietnam is being reduced, the scope of some of these other problems becomes clearer and their urgency becomes more apparent.

And so this is a good time to look ahead and ask ourselves, "After Vietnam, What?" I should like to examine today some of the problems America must face and answer in the coming years.

Perhaps the most significant event of the past year is that the young have been given the opportunity to play a significant role in contributing to the post-Vietnam future. It is difficult to determine the voting patterns which will emerge from the current extension of the franchise, but what is significant is that the youthful citizens now have an effective channel through which to express their opinions.

Voting reform was not passed without reluctance on the part of many legislators and as one who has college-age children, I have had my doubts about its wisdom; but it is now law and the proof of its wisdom lies with those who are its beneficiaries.

An American politician once stated, "In the age in which we live, in this fast age, men mature both in body and mind at a great deal earlier period than formerly." This argument, expressed by Marcus Bickford at the New York State Constitutional Convention in 1867, is the present basis for extending voting rights.

The new voting rights law will make some 11½ million Americans from 18 to 21 years old eligible to vote. Over 900,000 of these will be in high school, 4 million will be in college and 4.1 million will be working full-time. A million of these eligibles will be housewives, and some 800,000 will be in the armed services. Today young people have been provided with unprecedented resources to enable them to share in shaping the American future. They are formally and technically more qualified than their predecessors ever were. Whether they join in exercising this responsibility and in influencing the future course of events rests with them.

The franchise extension does not mean, of course, that the walls of Jericho will come tumbling down at the first blast of the 18 year old trumpet. Democratic government does not guarantee that the views of the individual will necessarily prevail. It does guarantee, however, that they are heard, and that the individual has a chance to persuade the majority of the correctness of his views.

I call attention to the post-Vietnam challenge with the fervent hope that everyone will take advantage of his opportunity to persuade the majority or to join the majority. After Vietnam, what will happen to today's activism? Its momentum must be transferred to exercise of the franchise, or it will go for naught.

The 18 year old vote, of course, has profound implications for our political parties in the immediate future. The Vietnam War has seriously strained our political system, and has split the Democratic Party, bringing defeat to its candidates on state and national levels. However, the necessity of avoiding such splits and of maintaining the two-party system transcends partisan considerations. We have seen what party fragmentation led to in Germany with the rise of Hitler, and now in Holland the old political joke about holding party conventions in a phone booth is no longer a figure of speech but a fact. A decision on the two-party system may be one of the first political judgments of most of those in this graduating class. I urge all of you to examine the alternatives.

The two-party system was not envisaged by the Founding Fathers who drew up the American Constitution. The party system which we know today developed gradually, through experience, to fulfill the particular needs of the nation. Parties grew out of necessity, and in practical terms, they have proved essential to the operation of our democratic politics.

By providing the political process with depth and a broad base, parties successfully brought order out of the great diversity of America. In contrast to factions which provided the dominant structure of political legitimacy prior to the two-party system, parties encompassed a wide range of groups, provided more room for disagreement, and created greater continuity and stability. The two-party system thus successfully overcame the uncertainties of factional politics to provide a workable means of government.

Our political parties are, of course, not perfect. They are often cumbersome and ineffectual. Despite the obvious shortcomings, however, the dual competition of parties has proved workable and essential in this country. The alternative to the two-party system—fragmentation politics—would be disastrous.

In making a judgment on the political system in 1972, I urge new voters to keep this thought in mind. Change the existing party structure where it is deficient, but accept the two-party system for what it is:

the most effective means of fulfilling the political needs of a large and divergent society. Get involved in politics—and get involved in the every-day activities at the ward and district level, not just with the glamour issues and charismatic candidates—but work within the existing party framework.

The domestic answer to the question, "After Vietnam, What?", depends in large part on how responsible our government is made to our own crucial problems. It can be made responsive only through broad individual participation in the party process, and if any one failure leads the way to our national decay, it will be the failure to share in the gritty and mundane chores of citizenship. It should be more clear here that I do not discuss our myriad domestic problems, but excluding them does not mean lack of acknowledgment of their importance.

Finally, what about the problem of Vietnam itself? Over the past five years, the young have been deeply concerned with the course of that war. Once the United States has withdrawn from Vietnam, where shall we go from there, and what will be the fate of that beleaguered country?

I hope first of all that youthful concern with the course of American foreign policy will continue. Throughout our history, the American public has not been sophisticated or informed on the formulation of foreign policy, but the Vietnam War has provided a current reason for public concern in the field of foreign policy and the young have displayed a willingness to study the complexities of Southeast Asia. This interest must continue after Vietnam.

More than this, however, I also hope that the whole nation will raise its sights beyond Vietnam to explore the larger dimensions of our foreign policy. Vietnam has been judged an error, but judging it an error does not constitute the formulation of a global post-Vietnam policy. Judging it an error does not relieve us of the responsibility for proposing programs to deal with its effects and with the variety of other problems which impend. What will be America's role in Southeast Asia after troop withdrawal? How do we deal with the after effects of this war? Should the United States develop a low profile in the world—in Latin America, the Middle East, and in Berlin—to such a degree that we no longer have effective influence, nor ability to help our friends preserve the peace? What I am suggesting in these questions is that the scope of the national discussion be greatly enlarged; that withdrawal from Vietnam be placed in its larger context. Our foreign policy problems will not be solved simply by troop withdrawal from Southeast Asia. Already the Philippines and Singapore are vestive over Chinese revolutionism. It is not enough now merely to acknowledge the mistakes of the past. We must begin to sketch in pieces of the future.

I do not pretend to suggest the final form which our overall foreign policy should take in the coming decade, nor would I attempt to present many facets of such a complex project in so short a time. I do, however, suggest several broad principles which should be used as guidelines as America moves into the post-Vietnam era.

The first of these is that the United States must maintain its responsibility in the world. Vietnam has proved painful, yet the experience must not cause us to withdraw from all obligation. The extent and nature of foreign commitment must be determined through national debate and the protection of our national interests, but some form of commitment will necessarily remain. America must combat the natural tendency toward isolation following war, and maintain a responsible presence in the world for our own security and the preservation of world order.

Having recognized this responsibility, we must at the same time accept a second gen-

eral principle—that other nations, particularly underdeveloped nations, have legitimate aspirations and ambitions which must be encouraged to develop. In our efforts to determine and meet our international goals, we must support these aspirations.

Such aims will not be easy to achieve. My point today is that they will never be achieved if America does not begin consideration of these issues now. An obsession with Vietnam threatens to restrict adequate public discussion. We must instead face the larger questions of foreign policy which will affect us in the decades ahead. We must enlarge the focus of our national debate, or enter the post-Vietnam era unprepared.

Thus, the answer to the question, "After Vietnam, What?", with respect to our foreign policy, lies not in any one individual, but in all of us. It lies in how well we rise above the narrow concentration on Vietnam. It lies in how we debate the larger issues of America's global role. All of us here today are responsible for the future of the nation. The shape that future may take depends on our willingness to face and attack the hard problems which the future will bring.

A NEW CONCEPT FOR DETERMINING THE APPORTIONMENT OF GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, in testimony this morning before the Committee on Ways and Means I proposed a concept for determining the apportionment of general revenue sharing which I do not believe has received much attention to date. This concept centers on the determination of tax effort made by a local government by comparing that community's tax base—the fair market value of all property on which taxes are levied—with the amount of revenue which is actually raised in that community.

I insert my statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE E. DANIELSON

Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the Committee on Ways and Means, I have requested this opportunity to appear before you to give you some of my ideas on the subject of General Revenue Sharing in the hope that they may be of assistance to you in coming to a decision on this very prominent issue.

We all know that local and state governments are in desperate need of new and additional revenues in order to continue in operation and to meet their responsibilities.

Whether or not those new and additional revenues are to come from the current General Revenue Sharing proposal is one of the questions this committee must answer. Assuming that such a plan is adopted, we must then be certain that it is equitable in the manner that it shares—or distributes—the revenues, and that it places the shared revenues where the need is greatest.

MATCHING THE MONEY TO THE NEED

One of our first concerns must be to match the money to the need.

When the Administration's revenue sharing proposal was first presented, being curious as to its effects within my own District, I ran a rough computation as to how my home county and the cities within my Dis-

trict would fare. The results were shocking. Then I extended the same computation to most of the cities in my county. This resulted in the table of proposed allocations which was printed in the Congressional Record of March 18, 1971, on page 7031, and showed such gross distortions as per capita allocations of \$47.78 in the City of Commerce, and \$24.30 in the City of Beverly Hills, but only \$1.31 in the City of Cudahy. The cities that needed the most help received the least; while those which needed the least, received the most.

The fault lay in the overly simplified Administration plan which would share the revenue in proportion to the ease with which the various local governments were already able to raise their revenues. This would freeze into law—would crystallize—the old principle of bad government which provides that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

That result would be unconscionable! The justification for revenue sharing is that it is necessary in order to help local governments meet their needs. We must match the money to the need.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS IN GENERAL REVENUE SHARING FORMULA

1. The "local government base" for general revenue sharing should include all local government taxing authorities.

2. The "local government sharing formula" should recognize the existing tax effort of each local government.

As to the "local government base", the Administration's plan excludes revenues raised to support independent school districts and all special districts from revenues used to determine the shares for eligible receivers. When closely examined this is manifestly unjust, since there is no uniform manner of organizing local governments and their functions—either throughout the nation or throughout the individual states. In many places school districts are organized as "dependent school districts, being a part of local government. In my own state of California nearly all—if not all—of our 1,239 school districts are organized as "independent" districts. They and their revenues would be excluded from the computations under the Administration's plan.

Likewise, in my state, for the purpose of efficient operation, many traditional government functions are performed by special districts which may overlap or contain two or more cities or counties or both. These perform such necessary functions as fire protection, sanitation, and the like.

As "special districts" revenues used to support them would be excluded by the Administration's formula, while local governments performing the same identical functions as part of their municipal organization would receive "credit" for and share revenue based upon their tax efforts to support such functions.

My recommendation is that all revenues raised by all types of local governments should be included in the revenue sharing base. To be absolutely clear, taxes raised to support all school districts and all special districts performing governmental functions should be included.

As to the "local government sharing formula", the greatest fallacy of the Administration's plan is that it simply allocates the greatest amount of shared revenue to those who already are able to raise the most revenue with the greatest ease.

The gross error is that it fails to recognize true tax effort.

It is axiomatic that a local government with a "rich tax base" can raise a given amount of revenue with a lesser "tax effort", while a local government with a relatively "poor tax base" must make a far greater effort to raise the same amount of revenue. This clear and marked difference in tax ef-

fort must be recognized if "revenue sharing" is to accomplish its intended purpose and if revenue is to be shared equitably.

I propose that in working out the formula for local government sharing, the revenues now being raised by each local government be weighted and adjusted to reflect the percentage of its tax base which is currently being consumed to raise its revenues. The "weighted" or "adjusted" figures would then be the basis for local allocation.

SHARING BETWEEN COUNTIES AND OTHER UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITIES)

I propose:

1. That the share of each city be allocated on the basis of all revenues collected from its tax base, within its boundaries, excepting only the revenues collected by the county for county purposes.

2. That the share of each county be based upon the sum of all revenues collected on the county's tax rate throughout the county (both within and without city boundaries), plus all revenue collected by special districts in unincorporated county territory—i.e., outside of the boundaries of cities.

The two above proposals would go a long way toward lifting the present heavy burden on real property taxpayers throughout the land. Everyone is a property taxpayer, either directly or indirectly.

WEIGHTING AND ADJUSTING THE TAX EFFORT AND ALLOCATION THEREON

I. Formula for distribution directly to local governments, based on taxes and tax effort:

This procedure would allow for adjustment of total local taxes collected (including a pro rata share of payments to special districts by residents of a local government) to reflect the effort or burden on local taxpayers.

1. *Standard tax effort.* The statewide standards for taxes collected by all units of local government, expressed as a percentage of the total fair market value of all property within the tax base of all local governments.

2. *Local government tax effort.* For each local government, the tax effort represented by all taxes collected from its tax base, (including special districts and school district taxes, but excluding county taxes in the case of cities), expressed as a percentage of the fair market value of all property within its tax base.

3. *Weighted tax effort factor.* For each local government determine the ratio between its "tax effort percentage" (step 2, above) and the state "standard tax effort" (step 1, above). This ratio is the weighted tax effort factor.

The amount of taxes collected by each local government would then be weighted and adjusted by the weighted tax effort factor (step 3, above).

5. The percentage for adjusted taxes for each local government in relation to the sum of adjusted taxes for all local governments would be determined.

6. Each local government would receive a share of the revenue sharing funds equal to its percentage of adjusted taxes as determined in step 5 above.

II. Alternate formula for distribution through counties and to independent cities:

This procedure would establish the counties as distribution agents between the state and the local governments. Instead of determining a tax effort indicator for each local government, a tax effort measure would be necessary only at the county, or independent city (city and county), level. It would work as follows:

1. The procedure outlined above for allocation to all local governments would be followed, but instead of determining the allocations for cities, data only on a county basis (or independent city if applicable) would be considered.

2. The county would retain the portion of the allocation equal to the percentage its taxes represent in relation to the total taxes

of the county and all units of local government combined.

3. The remaining revenue sharing funds would then be distributed to local governments based on population.

Some of the advantages of this second method of allocation are that taxes paid to special districts would only have to be pro-rated at the county level instead of at the local government level, and population would be used to indicate need.

For either of the above methods, terms such as "taxes collected," or "tax effort" should be defined carefully to be sure they include special district taxes, as well as local collections. In addition, a distinction between "units of government" (including special districts) and "local governments" meaning a municipality, county, or township should be included in the description of the allocation procedure.

One problem is likely to arise in connection with the data used to derive "tax effort"—fair market value of property. Since for each state this would be determined locally there could be a wide variation in the methods used to determine fair market value. In addition, this evaluation process might be conducted irregularly, or infrequently. Provision must be made to assure an accurate definition and determination of "fair market value."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee.

NEEDED: FAIR TRADE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, students of economics are taught that under a free-trade system, the "invisible hand" about which Adam Smith wrote would reward efficient producers of goods and ultimate savings to consumers in every country.

Only the most naive person would suggest that we operate under a free-trade system. While we have played the rules of the game, our trading partners have professed adherence to the rules while undermining them.

The U.S. share of expanding world exports has been declining while imports have been mounting, and our position is getting worse. Foreign governments provide direct and indirect subsidies to exports and barriers to imports.

How are we supposed to compete with countries whose governments are in partnership with industry and labor? Obviously by changing the rules under which we have been operating.

I have received a letter from Mr. Paul Armstrong, vice president of Armstrong Bros. Tool Co. in my district. He enclosed a letter he received from a Japanese firm which shows how closely the government works with industry. The Japanese proposed to Mr. Armstrong that they be allowed to manufacture his product under his brand, which could be done much cheaper in Japan.

Mr. Armstrong rightly points out although the invitation is tempting, acceptance would ultimately result in a loss of thousands more American jobs. He asks that fair trade be the order of the day, and offers some important suggestions

on how American manufacturers can compete with other countries if we change some of our laws, such as anti-trust, and let our trading partners meet standards that we require and if not, pay a tax for noncompliance.

The timely letter from Mr. Armstrong merits strong consideration from Congress. We can no longer wait for voluntary compliance from our trading partners to reduce their exports to the United States. In fact, voluntary reduction of quotas from the Japanese has been a joke.

An orderly marketing mechanism is needed now to regulate the flow of imports into the United States which are rapidly displacing American production and employment, and we should press for international fair trading standards in world trade. Our laws should be examined in light of present-day realities.

Mr. Speaker, the correspondence from Mr. Armstrong follows:

ARMSTRONG BROS. TOOL CO.

Chicago, Ill., June 22, 1971.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PUCINSKI: Enclosed is a copy of the letter we recently received from a Japanese marketing organization. I hope you will take time to read it over very carefully, since it's an excellent example of the type of competition American manufacturers face from Japan (and to some degree from other countries as well).

If a group of American manufacturers got together and divided up their markets, organized their marketing, and standardized their production in the way these people are doing—at the suggestion and with the financial help of their government—the anti-trust suits would fly like bullets!

From previous correspondence we've had, I believe you are as concerned about the import problem as I, and I felt a copy of this letter might be of some help to you. Let me also suggest one way in which our government could help American manufacturers.

We should make overseas producers subject to the same basic laws domestic manufacturers face—anti-trust, pollution control, safety, minimum wage, etc. Each country should be rated, and an equalization tax applied—at our border—to offset "non-compliance" with these laws (I'm sure a good use could be found for the taxes so collected).

We would have no objections to other countries' applying this same set of standards to us, assuming it was applied fairly. But if something of this nature is not done there will eventually be few—if any—manufacturing firms left in the U.S.A.

I guess what I'm suggesting is not "Protectionism" or "Free Trade", but what might be called "Fair Trade", and I think there are a lot of people in this country who would favor it.

Yours very truly,

PAUL ARMSTRONG,

Vice President.

P.S.—The invitation to have our products private branded in Japan is, I must admit, very tempting. By doing it we'd likely force our immediate competitors to do the same, so we're talking about the export of possibly 2,000 jobs.

SHIN-NIHON TOOLS CO., LTD.,

Osaka, Japan, June 2, 1971.

Messrs. ARMSTRONG BROS. TOOL CO.,
Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

DEAR SIR: We know your company very well as the leading manufacturers of tools for industrial machinist use and we have

been wanting to write you for long time. We are very interested in establishing business relation with your esteemed firm.

First of all, we wish to explain you about our organization as follows:—

Recently, four leading manufacturers of handtools in Japan, namely Asahi Kinzoku Kogyo Co., Algo Kogyo Co. Ltd., Mishima Mfg. Co. and Toyo Kiko Mfg. Co have formed a group name Shin Nihon Tools Group, according to suggestion and financial help of Japanese government. The purpose of their forming group are: 1) Rationalize of distributing system. 2) Level up of production technique. 3) Modernize of equipments by financial help of government.

Before, each manufacturer used to handle sales of their products respectively. It was very uneconomical and inefficient and they could not render good service to the customers. In order to solve such problem, it has been decided to establish a sales organization to handle their products intensively. We are the company who have been established for that purpose under joint investments of the above makers. We are formed by experts of tools and foreign trade, and so we are very sure that we shall be able to render you very quick service.

For your reference, we are sending you a leaflet of our products. As you will find in the leaflet, there are wide range of tools and we are very sure there will be some items which you are interested.

Among the all items mentioned on the leaflet, tools for industrial use, such as Striking face wrench, structural box wrench, hook spanner and spanners for heavy industrial use are very well accepted among the customers. In fact, we have been delivering large amount of these items to American Government according to Federal Specification. We are proud of our quality of these items.

We know well that these lines are of your products, as we have one of your catalogue, and we are very sure you are manufacturing these items.

We have heard that production cost of these items in U.S.A. are very expensive compared with those in Japan. Now we wish to propose you one idea, as follows:

If you find the quality of our products quite well which is well compared with your products, and if you find our prices are lower than your production cost of your products. You may pick up our products with your own brand. It will be more profitable for you. If you agree with our above proposal, please write us by return so that we shall send you our quotation and samples.

Thanking you in advance for your favorable reply.

Yours faithfully,

BALLOONING PESTICIDE SALES BUGGING CONGRESS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, The Christian Science Monitor of June 22, 1971, carried a news report under the heading, "Ballooning Pesticide Sales Bugging Congress," which I would like to share with my colleagues. Therefore, I insert the text of the news report at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BALLOONING PESTICIDE SALES BUGGING CONGRESS

(By Peter C. Stuart)

WASHINGTON.—DDT, 2,4-d, 2,4,5-t. "Weed-B-Gon Spot Weeder." "Kills bugs dead." Aero-

sol cans. Spray guns. Lawn spreaders. Crop-dusting airplanes.

Welcome to the pesticide society.

Americans are said to carry in their bodies average pesticide residues greater than their government permits most foods to carry in interstate commerce.

Civilization's pesticides have penetrated to even remote Antarctica and dust high above the Indian Ocean.

Yet these well-traveled chemicals are only now beginning to reach perhaps the most sheltered enclave of all—the agriculture committees of the U.S. Congress.

ACTION IN THE WIND

In both the Senate and House of Representatives, these committees are quietly putting finishing touches on new legislative controls. Reform, however slight, is in the wind.

"I'm frankly surprised," confessed one long-frustrated reformer. "And encouraged."

The agriculture committees, dominated by congressmen from rural constituencies, preside over the nation's pesticide laws as protectively as a cotton farmer might guard his season's supply of DDT.

"I think it is a special responsibility of this committee," House Agriculture Committee Chairman William R. Poage (D) of Texas, who was raised on a ranch, emphasized in opening pesticide hearings earlier this year, "to develop and encourage agricultural programs and practices which will assure that all Americans receive adequate supplies of food and fiber. . . ."

EFFICIENCY DEFENDED

"I think [the use of chemicals] plays a considerable part in giving us the efficient agriculture which we have in the United States."

The nation's basic pesticide law—with the mouth-filling name of Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act—hasn't been systematically overhauled since written in 1947. Meanwhile, annual pesticide production has ballooned to roughly five pounds per person, with sales leaping from 13 percent a year.

"Inadequate to protect the public," the law has been branded by a spokesman for none other than the Department of Agriculture, which administered most of it until creation of the Environmental Protection Agency last December.

Some blame the Agriculture Department itself for many of the inadequacies. Chief among them:

Poor enforcement. The department failed to initiate a single criminal prosecution under the law for 13 years, despite evidence of repeated violations, Congress's watchdog General Accounting Office charged in 1968.

Slow procedures. After the Agriculture Department decided to ban some nonfarm uses of DDT in 1969, six months later even the first appeals step hadn't been completed. The issue wasn't resolved until January, 1971, when the new environmental agency declined a broader ban.

Insufficient safety. Many pesticides—185 in fiscal year 1969 alone—have been registered over the objections of federal health officials, investigators for a House committee found in 1969.

PROPOSALS DRAFTED

As remedies, the congressional committees are weighing reforms such as these:

Tightening controls on uses of pesticides by assigning each a classification. The Nixon administration's bill, leading spokesman for which is Sen. Robert W. Packwood (R) of Oregon, proposes three classes—"general use," "restricted use," and "use by permit only."

Speeding up procedures for barring dangerous pesticides. Hearings and reviews would be cut from the present 400 or more days to 150 days under the chief Democratic bill—offered by two Wisconsin lawmakers, Sen.

Gaylord A. Nelson and Rep. David R. Obey.

Broadening federal controls from only pesticides in interstate commerce to those made, sold, and used within a single state.

Stiffening enforcement by permitting citizens to bring court action against any person, company, or governmental agency violating the pesticide law.

The Agriculture Committee in the House is expected to act first—any day now.

How far the lawmakers choose to go in curbing pesticides may affect not just the safety of Americans, but the prices they pay for food. One House committee member, Graham Purcell Jr. (D) of Texas, warns that a total ban (which no one is proposing) could boost consumer food costs "as high as 200 percent."

A federal study group recently concluded, however, that pesticides influence only about 1 percent of retail food costs.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join other Members in extending congratulations to the U.S. General Accounting Office and to the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, the distinguished public servant who heads it as Comptroller General, on the Office's completion of 50 years of service to the Federal Government.

As a member of the Joint Committee for Reduction of Federal Expenditures, my interest for years have coincided with the basic duty laid on the General Accounting Office by law to seek out means of achieving greater economy and efficiency in public expenditures. Those interests, of course, are equally vital to me in my capacity as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—since a dollar saved is a dollar earned.

The Comptroller General's annual reports to the Congress consistently show substantial measurable savings that are directly attributable to the General Accounting Office's work. The reported savings represent amounts collected as well as reduced expenditures and over the past 5 years have averaged nearly \$200 million a year. These amounts actually are on the conservative side since they do not include substantial savings attributable to current-year actions that will accrue in future years on the many continuing programs involved.

Aside from the reported measurable savings, the record shows that there are many other substantial economies as a result of the General Accounting Office's work. These take the form of desired results achieved at reduced cost, more or better results for the same money, and reduction or elimination of planned activities. They are based on actions taken by the Congress or its committees that reflect information and recommendations provided by the General Accounting Office, and by agency heads as a result of General Accounting Office recommendations. As an example of the former, the Appropriations Committee in

1970 reduced programmed defense funds by other \$100 million after considering General Accounting Office reports and recommendations regarding the activities involved.

On the other side of the coin, the General Accounting Office has been instrumental, through its reports, in unearthing for the Congress information regarding literally billions of dollars of underestimates of program costs; cost overruns; unnecessary costs borne by the Government; revenues foregone; and uneconomical, inefficient, and ineffective use of resources in terms of accomplishing legislated objectives.

The General Accounting Office directly assists the Congress, its committees, and Members by performing special audits, investigations, or reviews. Although required by law to do so only for the committees concerned with revenues, expenditures, and appropriations, this service is extended as a matter of course to all committees and, to the extent staff is available, to Members. The General Accounting Office also: First, assigns members of its professional staff to congressional committees; second, testifies before congressional committees on matters within its special competence; third, analyzes and furnishes comments on proposed legislation; and fourth, maintains continuing liaison through personal contact with staff members of the various committees.

In anticipation of the increasingly critical need of the Congress for more and better information upon which to base its decisions, the Comptroller General several years ago began diversifying the General Accounting Office's basic professional skills to include additional disciplines in engineering, economics, systems analysis, statistics, automatic data processing, and actuarial science. He thus got a running start in responding to the needs of the Congress for more complex and sophisticated information as required of him by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

Changes in social, ecological, economic, and political awareness, advances in technology, and turbulence in international affairs have occurred with kaleidoscopic speed. They have tremendously increased the difficult job of distinguishing between wants and needs, and establishing equilibrium between needs and the wherewithal with which to satisfy them, while maintaining economic and fiscal stability. In the short 5 years of the present Comptroller General's incumbency, as the wants and needs have increased, heretofore accepted order has been disturbed, and choices between alternative paths have multiplied both in number and difficulty. Congress' need has become critical for complete, reliable, and especially, unbiased information to solve the complex equations involved.

The General Accounting Office's activities, augmenting as they do the congressional committee and staff capabilities, are invaluable and will become even more so. They affect both the needs and resources sides of those equations, for any change on either side has a directly proportional effect on the other. Programs proposed in budgets must be

weighed among themselves and against their effect on the entire economic spectrum in terms of benefits, costs, and effectiveness.

It is for these reasons that, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I am vitally concerned with the General Accounting Office's performance. Whenever, as the result of their activities, the Congress or agencies are able to reduce an appropriation, curtail a program, provide for collection of more revenues, or accomplish more than anticipated, the savings ultimately reflect in reduced consumption and needs for resources relative to the overall needs of the Nation. This is so, even though the savings be absorbed by or diverted to another need.

A half century has demonstrated the soundness of the original idea of exercising control over the public purse through the General Accounting Office as an agency of the Congress. That concept and the agency have been sufficiently flexible to adapt to the drastic changes that have occurred during this period. The General Accounting Office has kept pace with those changes and with the extension of its responsibilities in laws enacted in the interim by developing new professional techniques and upgrading its staff.

If I were called upon to point with pride to the wisdom of the Congress over the years, I am certain that the creation of the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller Generalship, both as a concept and in actuality, would come high on the list. I believe that my colleagues in the House will concur with this view and join me in wishing the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office continued success and in assuring them of our deep respect and appreciation for their fine assistance over the years.

GLASS RECYCLING COLLECTION HITS A NEW MONTHLY HIGH

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are fully aware of the growing threat to our environment caused by increasing amounts of solid waste which are thrown away and not reused. Recycling of these materials has been demonstrated to be one valuable solution to this problem, and I am proud and delighted to learn of an organization in my district which has adopted this method of action. The Bloomfield Area Environmental Action Group has organized a recycling collection which has produced excellent results.

This process, and the group's success, are described in the following article which appeared in the Bloomfield Independent Press:

GLASS RECYCLING COLLECTION HITS A NEW MONTHLY HIGH

Over 23,000 pounds of glass and 247 pounds of aluminum were collected last Saturday by the Bloomfield Area Environmental Action Group at its monthly recycling pick-up at

the School Administration Building parking lot at Broad street and Bellevue avenue.

This is more than two-and-a-half times the amount that was collected in May causing Mrs. Peggy Whittman, chairman of the recycling committee, to say, "I guess we've finally caught on." The committee stages the collection on the third Saturday of every month from 8:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. The next one will be on July 17.

The collection was expanded this month to include aluminum and Mrs. Whittman reiterated that the cans, which can be identified by the fact that they have rounded bottoms and no side seams, should be rinsed and flattened. (The petite recycling chairman does this by stepping on them.)

Glass, she said, should also be cleaned (labels do not have to be removed) and metal rings should be clipped off.

The work at the collection sites is done by volunteers from the BAEAG and other groups using town trucks to carry the glass and cans to the recycling center. The town donates the use of the trucks and the BAEAG pays the town drivers out of the proceeds of the day's collection.

The BAEAG, which recently registered as a non-profit corporation, adopted a constitution and elected officers for 1971-72 at a meeting on June 3 at the Bloomfield Public Library.

The officers are: Tom Heiser, president; John Mola, vice president; Bernard Zweben, treasurer; Mrs. Robert Karg, projects coordinator; Mrs. William Whittman, recycling chairman; Debbie Sheehan, corresponding secretary; Vivian Maglio, recording secretary; Mrs. Pamela Gosner, public relations coordinator. Brooks Van Sant, a founder of group, will be permanent member of the executive board.

CLASSIFICATION AND PRIOR RESTRAINT HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is quite true, as Mr. Reston says in the following column, that—

The fuss over the Pentagon Papers is only a symbol of a much larger problem.

The whole subject of classification—assigning a secret label to material that may or may not have a genuine security aspect—requires careful review and probably clarification by legislation.

Surely no newspaper, even the redoubtable and esteemed New York Times, should have the right to consider itself the ultimate classification reviewing authority. In the same context, there ought not to be a classification of material for the purpose of keeping it from the public when its publication would not harm the national security.

Intentional disclosure of properly classified secret material is a criminal act. Yet it is elementary in the law that the injunctive powers of the courts may not be used to prohibit the commission of crime lest the offender be denied trial by jury—contempt is not for the jury in ordinary circumstances.

Perhaps the Times ought first to have sought declassification before commencing publication of documents otherwise classified. Whatever may be the ultimate outcome of disposition of the "Pentagon

Papers," so-called, the unfortunate part of this matter is that disregard of classification by a prominent newspaper does not contribute to public respect for Executive orders, general law or the media in general.

Of course whatever background of the tragic involvement in Southeast Asia that contributes to a better public understanding of how that involvement came to be and how it can be avoided in the sense of repetition, is a plus. But in the process it would be well to take care that our codes are not compromised and that from all this furor we can genuinely improve our methods of classification and declassification for the future.

The following column by the distinguished columnist James Reston appearing in the Sunday Times, is worthy of careful reading.

The column follows:

A TROUBLED FRIEND
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—A troubled friend wants to know why the newspapers don't leave the questions of secret documents and national security to the President. Let us suppose that we did.

Presidential power is now greater than at any other time in the history of the Republic. Ever since the invention of atomic weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles, it is clear that the nation could be mortally wounded before the Congress could ever be assembled on Capitol Hill.

Accordingly, the balance of decisive power in the foreign field—but not over internal policy—has passed from the Congress, where it lay before the two world wars, to the White House. This may or may not have been what we wanted but it was clearly what we had to do.

Other inventions tipped the balance of political power toward the President, especially nationwide television. It is at his disposal whenever he likes, with a studio in the White House. He has instant communications with the people and the world, all of which is necessary. The Congress cannot compete with him in the use of these modern instruments in the conduct of public policy.

But these unavoidable facts raise serious questions. Should such power not be subject to review by the representatives of the people? Should the Congress not know what is going on? Should the executive be free to use the power it needs to deal with the threat of nuclear war in undeclared wars like Vietnam? Should the press shut its eyes to any documents, even old historical documents, the executive chooses to mark top secret?

The fuss over the Pentagon Papers is only a symbol of a much larger problem. It is true that these papers raise questions of "national security," but the greatest threat to national security in this time is the division of the people over a war they have had to fight in accordance with decisions of governments that didn't tell them the truth. The nation is seething with distrust, not only of the Government but of the press, and the issue of the Pentagon Papers is merely whether we should get at the facts and try to correct our mistakes, or suppress the whole painful story.

Fundamentally, this is not a fight between the Government and the press. It is not even a fight over the President's decisive power to defend the nation in an age of nuclear missiles. Congress has submitted to the scientific facts on the ultimate questions of nuclear war.

But now it has been asked, in the name of "security," not even to look at a historical analysis of a war it has financed but not declared, not to question the unelected members of the White House staff, who had

access to the papers Congress could not see, and to respect the Administration's right to stamp "secret" on any documents it likes, and to keep them secret years after the event, when officials long out of office are writing their own versions of history out of the "secret documents."

My "troubled friend" has good cause for anxiety. He is right to wonder whether the press knows enough and is responsible enough to publish things the Attorney General wants suppressed. He is right to concern himself with the security of the nation.

But what is being exposed here is not primarily some Government documents that might cause "irreparable damage" to the defense of the nation, but a system of secrecy, of Presidential presumption, of influential staff advice by men who cannot be questioned, of concealment and manipulation, all no doubt with the best motives, but nevertheless a system which has got out of hand and could really cause "irreparable damage" to the Republic.

No doubt the press itself is often poorly informed and clumsy in its efforts to expose the dangers of this system, but the greater the power in the hands of the executive, the greater the need for information and skepticism on the part of the Congress and the press.

My anxious friend might be careful about weakening the instruments of information and review at such a time. No doubt they are blunt instruments, often misused, but in this case of the Pentagon Papers, or so it seems here, the greater danger is the system of executive secrecy, and the greater danger to the security of the nation is the mistrust this system of secrecy and contrived television propaganda has caused.

James Madison summed up the problem at the beginning of the Republic:

"Among those principles deemed sacred in America, among those sacred rights considered as forming the bulwark of their liberty, which the Government contemplates with awful reverence and would approach only with the most cautious circumspection, there is no one of which the importance is more deeply impressed on the public mind than the liberty of the press.

"That this liberty is often carried to excess; that it has sometimes degenerated into licentiousness, is seen and lamented, but the remedy has not yet been discovered.

"Perhaps it is an evil inseparable from the good with which it is allied; perhaps it is a shoot which cannot be stripped from the stock without wounding vitally the plant from which it is torn. However desirable those measures might be which might correct without enslaving the press, they have never yet been devised in America."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, due to medical reasons, I was unavailable for the vote today on Mr. HÉBERT's motion to table a motion by Mr. WHALEN of Ohio to accept the Mansfield amendment to H.R. 6531, the Selective Service extension. The amendment which passed the Senate last week called for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces within 9 months subject to the release of American prisoners of war. If present, I would have voted against Mr. HÉBERT's motion to table as I favored instructing the House conferees to accept the Senate amendment.

"NEW PICTURE OF UNWED"

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article concerning the unwed mother, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press on June 28, 1971. Written by Helen May, Free Press staff writer, the article gives some interesting insights into the facts surrounding this problem in our metropolitan areas and the various cultural aspects between the black and white unwed mother. The article follows:

YOUNG, POOR AND BLACK: NEW PICTURE OF UNWED MOM
(By Helen May)

Lucretia Scott is a young black girl who looks about 13. She is slightly built with sparkling eyes. She has a cautious way of pausing between her sentences, then speaking softly.

Lucretia (which is not her real name) is 16, however, and has a four-month-old child. She is not married. She didn't use contraceptives because she didn't plan sex. "I was unlucky and got caught the first time," she said. She had no idea that getting pregnant was so simple.

"I was a total failure, especially to my mother," says Lucretia. "I really disappointed her, let her down." Her mother supports Lucretia, her three brothers and sisters and the new baby. Her dad, a disabled veteran, does not live with them.

Lucretia stayed at home until delivery when she went to Booth Memorial Home Hospital for five days "that seemed like five years."

During her pregnancy, she missed her friends at sports—games like hockey and baseball, and dances—"Now that this happened the guys might think I'm loose, so I stay away," she said. At present she's finished school and trying to get child support from her former sweetheart.

They split up when she got pregnant. He's since finished high school, but has no job and no money for child support.

Lucretia, a real girl with a fictitious name, is typically Detroit's unwed mother—young, poor and black. These are girls, who have had to leave school, who can't seek work, and are in a major crisis.

In Detroit, and across the country, there have been programs for unwed mothers for a long time—maternity homes and adoption services. But these have neither stemmed the tide of the number of illegitimate births nor met the needs of the girls.

In fact, the number of illegitimate births has increased while at the same time fewer and fewer girls are using the maternity homes.

For this reason, the Florence Crittenton Maternity Home closed March 31. But the United Community Services (UCS) board of directors approved the creation of an entirely new agency last week for a New Crittenton Program.

It is indicative of the new understanding and new approach to the old problem.

The New Crittenton Program will have a black community board of directors and a flexible full-service program for the unwed mom, her child, its father and their families.

CONCEALMENT NOT NEEDED

Why did UCS create a new agency when there's already a proliferation of social service agencies? What is behind UCS action? Why did it move in this direction first? Why not move simultaneously to give greater support to white girls?

For one thing, many white girls no longer seek to conceal their pregnancies. For another the overwhelming number of illegitimate births occur to black girls—6,164, or 66 percent of all illegitimate births in the tri-county area in 1969 were to non-whites.

But sheer numbers is not the only reason. Surveys show that in most cases the crisis the black girls face is even greater than that of the white girl.

Traditional assumptions too are proving wrong:

Attitudes on morality are changing. Maternity homes were created to hide women from society's scorn, but many girls no longer seek concealment. Betty Diehl, director of the former Crittenton Maternity Home, says: "Most girls now come here to continue their education, not to hide their pregnancy."

(Unwed mothers still find it hard to continue in school. Detroit's Continuing Education for Girls (CEG) program is limited to only 110 girls per semester. And Michigan's new law requiring every school district to provide such education has never been funded.)

Popular assumption has been that girls have a child out of wedlock because they want to. To satisfy their egos or to get back at their boyfriend, their parents or society. However, Dr. Phillips Cutright, Ph.D., of Indiana University, who has studied the patterns of illegitimacy, says the opposite is true.

Today's teen, he says, is sexually more active than other generations. However, she does not realize how easy it is to get pregnant. And even if she did, she has no recourse to contraceptives from the community.

Popular belief is that unwed mothers and illegitimate children swell the welfare rolls. However, Detroit's UCS Illegitimacy Study shows less than one third of the children on welfare are illegitimate.

Popular assumption has been that Black culture accepts illegitimacy while the white community does not. More Blacks do have babies out of wedlock than white girls and thus some people calculate that Detroit's increase in the number of illegitimate births has increased with the increased number of Blacks in the city.

Statistics indicate, however, it's more a matter of economics than race. For as the socio-economic level of Blacks goes up, the incidence of illegitimacy goes down.

WHY BLACKS DON'T MARRY

Mrs. Charles F. Whitten, chairman of the UCS Illegitimacy Study Committee cites facts that are involved in Black illegitimacy.

For one thing, she says, the pregnant white teenager is frequently pushed into marriage since her boyfriend can more readily get a job and support her and the child. The Black girl doesn't marry, since her young boyfriend finds it almost impossible to get work. A 1970 Federal Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) study showed that at least 42 percent of all teen marriages came after the girl's pregnancy.

Also, the poor—Black and white—have no options of abortion, or of trips to faraway places as do the affluent. Says Mrs. Whitten, "There's no measure of what may be called 'illicit sex.' But we know that the affluent have access to contraceptives, to private doctors, who don't record illegitimate births, and to abortion.

"The poor live with the results, while the affluent have ways to get out of the situation.

"For the black mother, her daughter's pregnancy is the end of the world. But she adjusts realistically—as a survival technique.

There are other differences between the black and white unwed mother.

The white unwed mother has always had the option of putting her child up for adop-

tion. But black children were labeled "hard to place." This meant, of course, they were hard to place in the white community.

However, Homes for Black Children has demonstrated the opposite. In the first year of its existence over 100 black babies were placed with Black families. "We have proven that black families will adopt children if they feel comfortable with the agency," says Mrs. Shirley Burnett, a co-director of HBC. (If homes are available, the black girl wants to place her child for adoption as readily as a white girl.)

LITTLE PRIVACY IN THESE HOMES

Another difference between the races which has bearing on illegitimacy stems from the difference in economics. The blacks with poorer housing have less privacy in their homes.

As Mrs. Burnett says: "With a three room flat, kids can see sex between parents—it's an expression of love. There's no such thing as separate bedrooms."

But there are similarities between the black and white unwed mother. Both need medical services and both are too frightened to seek help. There is the inclination to feel that if the pregnancy is ignored, it will go away.

Many wait until their sixth month before telling their parents or seeking pre-natal help. Some never get medical assistance.

And regardless of race, a girl having a child out of wedlock is a girl in a crisis. She is usually a "child having a child."

"The average age of the pregnant teen is 15-15½," says Nancy Boykin of the Detroit Board of Education's Continuing Education for Girls (CEG) program for pregnant teens. "And that's an age when the girl is still in a very pliable, formative stage. Her needs have much to do with helping her establish life goals and direction.

"And I have usually found that a girl who has conceived out of wedlock has a very low self-esteem and needs building up to cope with life."

The New Crittenton Program is slated to get underway by September and at that time the on-going social services still operating out of the old Crittenton Home will shift to Webb House, which Crittenton has deeded to UCS.

It is a first step in future directions being studied by UCS for the care of all unwed pregnant girls, including an attack on prevention of illegitimacy.

And it comes at a time when statistics show that in 1969 there were 9,395 illegitimate births reported for the tri-county area. Macomb County accounted for 564, Oakland County for 1,108, and Wayne County for 7,723. And the highest concentration of these births is in the urban center of each county, Warren in Macomb, Pontiac in Oakland and Detroit in Wayne.

The 1970 figures are expected to hit 10,000 for the tri-county area.

THE ROLE OF ELECTRIC POWER IN MINIMIZING TOTAL POLLUTION FROM ENERGY USE

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Energy and Resources, of which I am chairman, and the House Republican Task Force on Nuclear Affairs chaired by my distinguished colleague (Mr. HOSMER) have met in joint session to investigate means

for reducing pollution resulting from the production and use of energy. One approach currently under investigation by the task force is electrical substitution in future energy patterns. Dr. James H. Wright, a member of the Sierra Club and the National Wildlife Federation, is the director of Environmental Systems Department for Westinghouse Electric Corp. He has proposed an analysis of the possible reduction in pollution which could be achieved by energy substitution. I am pleased to present Dr. Wright's analysis for the benefit and appraisal of my colleagues:

THE ROLE OF ELECTRIC POWER IN MINIMIZING TOTAL POLLUTION FROM ENERGY USE

(By Dr. James H. Wright)

Environmental quality is now a national objective. While this concern encompasses all aspects of the national scene, the problem of environmental deterioration is most severe in the urban centers with air pollution, sewage and solid waste disposal problems leading the list of environmental offenses. This paper examines the role of energy use patterns and their impact on air and heat pollution.

SOURCES OF AIR POLLUTANTS

While the increasing rate of energy use¹ has been at 5 percent during the last few years, the average growth of total energy use between 1940 and the present is approximately 3 to 3.5 percent per year. Energy use patterns have shifted continually to show increasing fractions in electric power production.^{2,3} In 1970 approximately 70,000 trillion (70 × 10¹²) Btu of energy was used. The production of electric power and transportation each accounted for about 23 percent of the energy, process heating about 22 percent, and space heating about 17 percent; hot water heating and other smaller uses accounted for the remainder.

It has been estimated¹ that energy use in the year 2000 will be about 170 to 190 × 10¹² Btu per year or about 2.5 times the present rate.

Energy derived from burning fossil fuels for energy burdens the atmosphere with materials harmful to the human population and to certain elements of the natural eco-system. The five air pollutants common to energy production are the oxides of sulfur and nitrogen, particulate matter, unburned fuel, and carbon monoxide.

Each of these pollutants has a somewhat different effect on biological systems. Sulfur dioxide, for example, appears to cause damage to flora in the form of diffuse chlorosis at concentrations where measurable effects on fauna cannot be detected. Sulfur dioxide, even at low concentrations, in combination with particulate matter causes stress in the respiratory tract of animals. Carbon monoxide is a systemic toxin and appears to affect the central nervous and circulatory systems. Low dose levels of carbon monoxide are currently attracting considerable attention and concern in public health research.^{4,5}

In order to quantify the pollutant emissions from various energy uses, a common denominator must be applied. A pollution index in units of pounds of pollutants per million Btu is determined and used in this paper as the common denominator.

In 1966 The National Air Pollution Control Agency prepared an inventory of air pollutant emissions⁶ for the year 1965. By combining energy use data with the pollution inventory information, the pollutant index for different uses may be determined. Table 1 provides a statistical average pollutant index for various forms of energy use in 1970.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 1.—POLLUTANT INDEX IN ENERGY USAGE FOR 1970
[Pounds per million B.t.u.]

	Electricity production (fossil)	Transportation	Process heat	Space heat
Nitrogen oxides.....	0.64	0.88	0.37	0.18
Hydrocarbons.....	.21	1.76	.74	.18
Particulates.....	.64	.15	1.10	.18
Sulfur oxides.....	2.57	.15	1.65	.53
Carbon monoxide.....	.21	9.79	.37	.35
Total.....	4.27	12.64	4.23	1.42
Delivered efficiency (percent).....	33	15	50-60	50-60

¹ Considers that all energy use for power production is fossil fuel: a composite pollutant index for power generation which includes hydro power would be 3.65 lb per million B.t.u.

Power generator is a factor in both the problem and the solution to the problem. The two principal types of steam electric generation plants—fossil and nuclear—emit to the environment small quantities of radioactivity and large quantities of low-grade heat. Fossil plants also emit quantities of sulphur and nitrogen oxides and particulate matter.

Power is generated from many fossil fuels and the statistical average pollutant index in 1970 for various fuels is given in Table 2.

TABLE 2.—POLLUTANT INDEX IN POWER GENERATION FOR 1970
[Pounds per million B.t.u.]

	Coal	Oil	Gas	Lignite
Carbon monoxide.....	0.019			0.020
Hydrocarbons.....	.008	0.025		.020
Nitrogen oxides.....	.800	.820	0.470	.700
Sulfur oxides.....	5.100	2.000		1.860
Particulates.....	4.160	.027	.018	4.300
Total.....	6.087	2.872	.488	2.900

- ¹ 3 percent sulfur.
² 1.2 percent sulfur.
³ 0.7 percent sulfur.
⁴ 99.5 percent flyash removal.
⁵ 97.5 percent flyash removal.

The production of electric power uses 23 percent of the nation's energy but accounts for only 13 percent of the air pollutants. A solution to the environmental problem, therefore, requires a systems study of pollutant emissions from all areas of energy utilization.

Without considerable improvement in emission control, the year 2000 would realize almost 500 million tons of pollutants in the air.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL IN POWER GENERATION

Electric power plants have been involved for most of this century in improving air pollution control equipment. A number of flue gas desulfurization processes⁷ are currently in various stages of development. It is assumed that reduction in sulfur oxides will occur in three phases:

- (1) 1970 to late 70's—mix of high and low sulfur coal
- (2) Late 70's to 1990—flue gas desulfurization, 80 percent effective
- (3) 1990 on—flue gas desulfurization, 90 percent effective

Presently, the composite of all coal plants is about 90 percent effective in removing fly ash while new units being put into operation are 99 percent effective.

Most power plant boilers placed in operation during the last 10 years were designed for maximum fuel efficiency in producing high temperature, high pressure steam. These characteristics inadvertently also maximized the production of nitrogen oxide. Present designs, however, have reduced the

fixing of nitrogen somewhat by two-stage combustion and minimizing excess air and flame temperatures.⁸ Both oil and coal, however, contain naturally occurring nitrogen compounds which limit the effectiveness of boiler design in NO_x control.

Power plants represent a large energy use at a single location and, for that reason, present the most feasible and economic means for air pollution control.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation, while utilizing about the same amount of energy as power production, produces most (60%) of today's air pollutants.

In a recent report, The Georgia Department of Public Health estimates that over 70 percent of that state's air pollution problem is from the automotive group. Land, sea and air forms of transportation all contribute to the national inventory of pollutant emissions, but the land form is the most important to the urban center. While federal standards call eventually for a 90 percent reduction in automotive pollutants, it is difficult to believe that 100,000,000 automotive units can actually be regulated from an administrative standpoint, even if the technology and the industry's willingness are present. For the purpose of this study, it has been assumed that a 5 percent per year reduction would occur through the year 2000 for a pollutant index of 3.7 in that year.

Electric substitution offers an attractive alternate in urban transportation systems. A whole new look at transportation suggests that electrified mass transit systems have great potential for solving both people and pollution problems. Furthermore, it is not apparent that the electric auto has been given a fair chance to find its way into the urban life style.

Functional specifications used in many electric auto development programs seem designed to produce a one-for-one replacement of today's luxury sedan rather than being geared to short hauls with low pay load. The electric car has no place on the highway at sustained speeds nor should it be required to have constant use of all auxiliary equipment, such as the simultaneous operation of both heater and air conditioning.

In the year 2000, over 40,000 trillion Btu of energy will go into transportation systems of which about 60 percent will be on land and for local travel. Considering both the optimally designed auto for low pay load, short hauls and an extensive electrical mass transit system, electrical substitution in urban transportation will not only significantly reduce air pollution but should provide for savings in raw energy requirements.

PROCESS HEAT

Process heat currently uses about 22 percent of this country's energy and produces almost 20 percent of all air pollutants, for a pollutant index of 4.2 pounds per million Btu. While the unit pollutant emission from energy use in process heat is about equal to that from electric power production by fossil fuel processes, there are considerable differences in the prospects of pollution control. Process heating involves thousands of individual units, each involving somewhat different types of emissions. From all standpoints—cost, technical development, administrative control—pollution abatement from process heat is much more difficult.

In the model assumed in this paper, the pollutant index projected for the year 2000 is 2.5. Assuming no alteration in energy use patterns, process heat would contribute about twice as much pollutant emission, in the year 2000, as now, even assuming the projected abatement improvement. Reductions in pollutant levels and energy can be accomplished by the substitution of electricity and discharge heat for certain applications. The process heat requirements at the turn of the century will be over 40,000 tril-

lion Btu per year. In general this heat can be subdivided between low temperature heat (drying of pulp paper, for example) and high temperature heat (steel making). Electrical energy substitution in steel making is already on the upswing. Over the years the major steel making processes have evolved from the Bessemer converter, to the open hearth, to the basic oxygen furnace and, now to the electric furnace. The percentage of steel produced by the electric furnace will continue to grow with the demand for specialty metals and with the increasing use of recycle scrap iron.

New applications of discharge heat to processes are currently being developed in agriculture, aquaculture and sewage treatment.¹⁰ In the past the cost of energy has been but a small part of the total processing cost of most production, and heat conservation practices have not been of major concern except in electric power production where the cost of energy input has been almost one-half the product cost. Increasing costs of raw energy and environmental considerations will tend to increase activities in energy management including the use of discharge heat.

The longer range solid waste problems of our society will necessarily emphasize the recycle aspects of our solid waste materials. Indeed, essentially every pollution control process adds to the requirement for electrical power. Electricity should find an expanding role in providing this pollution limiting form of energy in accomplishing waste recycle.

Approximately 40 percent of the process heat requirements in the year 2000 could be provided for by electrical energy and discharge heat. This substitution could reduce the air pollutants by 30 to 40 million tons per year, depending on the type of power plant used.

SPACE HEATING

A few years back (1940) when uncontrolled coal combustion was the principal source of home heating the pollutant index in space heating was about 15 lb per million Btu, a factor of 10 higher than with today's systems using mostly natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas. Electric power offers three exciting new opportunities for energy and environmental conservation to the new city planner:

- (1) Power plant discharge heat to both heat and cool urban centers.
- (2) Electrically driven heat pumps for both heating and cooling—when the heat effects are two to three times greater than the electrical energy input.
- (3) Sophisticated radiant electrical heat-systems which provide equivalent "creature comfort" without equivalent ambient temperatures.

While space heating is required primarily during only one-half the year, electrical production occurs the year round, more or less uniformly.

The use of discharge condenser heat for space heating can be accomplished at an overall efficiency of 50 to 60 percent (heat loss and pumping power) but this value represents total waste energy unless used in some fashion. In the present energy use pattern, if all power plant discharge heat was used for space heating, it would provide only 2/3 of all space heat requirements.

The remaining 1/3 percent in the current energy use pattern is used for heating water and other miscellaneous applications for which the current pollutant index is about 4.5 lb per million Btu. It is projected that this pollutant index will be reduced to about 3.5 by the end of this century.

ELECTRICAL SUBSTITUTION IN FUTURE ENERGY PATTERNS

If the same energy use patterns prevail in the year 2000 as today, a total energy requirement of from 170 to 190 x 10¹⁵ Btu per year will be required. With no improvement in

Footnotes at end of article.

pollution control, this would involve a pollutant emission inventory of about 500 million tons per year. If the improvements in pollution control suggested in this paper are achieved, the pollutant emissions at the turn of the century will be about 220 million tons per year or about 50 percent greater than at present with the present energy use pattern.

An alternate pattern of energy use can also be developed by the substitution of electricity and power plant discharge heat in various energy usage components as suggested in Table 3.

TABLE 3.—ENERGY SUBSTITUTION-OPTIONAL ELECTRIC

Primary energy use replaced	Electrical substitution (percent)	Discharge heat substitution (percent)
Transportation.....	60	None
Process heat.....	30	10
Space heat.....	25	25
Other.....	30	30

These substitutions, defined as Optimal Electric Patterns, are incorporated in Table 4 and compared to energy use patterns for the year 2000.

TABLE 4.—ENERGY USE PATTERN IN THE YEAR 2000

	1970 pattern	Optimum electrical substitution
Percent use of primary energy:		
Electricity production.....	23	160
Transportation.....	23	8
Process heat.....	22	15
Space heat.....	17	10
Other.....	15	7
Total energy used, 10 ¹⁴ B.t.u./year.....	190	165
Total pollutant emissions, million tons per year:		
No improvement.....	500	160
As forecast.....	225	110

¹ The source of power generation in the year 2000 is 60 percent nuclear, 30 percent coal, and 10 percent oil.

By incorporating additional electrical substitution and using discharge heat in future energy use patterns, two important environmental advantages will accrue:

(1) Less total raw energy will be required (10 to 15 percent less).

(2) Pollutant emission levels will be reduced by more than 50 percent.

In this energy pattern approximately one-third of the power plant discharge heat is beneficially used in process heat, space heating, hot water supply and other energy requirements of society. While it is conceptually feasible to use all of this low-grade heat for substitution where low temperature heat is required, it was assumed that the limiting condition would be the rate at which such systems would be constructed. Assuming that all urban dwellings incorporated power plant discharge heat after 1985, it would mean only 30 percent of the dwellings in the year 2000 would be heated in this fashion, if there was no backfitting.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY IN THE URBAN CENTER

While gross emissions provide some index to the dimensions and alternatives on the natural scene, the plight of the industrialized urban center needs more specific focus.

TABLE 5.—URBAN ENERGY USE PATTERNS
(In percent)

Year.....	1970		2000	
	Population	4,000,000	6,000,000	
Energy use pattern.....	1970	1970	Optimum electrical	
Primary energy used.....	10.8 × 10 ¹⁴ B.t.u./year	33.0 × 10 ¹⁴ B.t.u./year	28.5 × 10 ¹⁴ B.t.u./year	
Electric power.....	25.0	25.0	66	
Transportation.....	18.3	18.3	1	
Process heat.....	23.0	23.0	14	
Space heating.....	18.3	18.3	10	
Other.....	15.4	15.4	9	

The energy use pattern in an industrial city differs from the national scene in two principal ways:

(1) About one-third of all transportation energy is expended in nonurban areas.

(2) It is assumed that all of the power production and process industries are located randomly within the city.

These assumptions provide the basis for the following model:

In the optimum electrical case, essentially all the urban transportation energy requirements are met by electrified vehicles. An index of some of the environmental quality features could be estimated from the emission inventory calculations and a simplified meteorological program.

TABLE 6.—ENVIRONMENT FOR A FUTURE CITY, 1970 EQI = EQUALS 1.000

Year.....	1970 Reference	2000 1970	2000 Optional electric ^b
Ambient air quality:			
Sulfur oxides.....	1.000	1.8	0.7
Nitrogen oxides.....	1.000	2.4	.8
Unburned fuel.....	1.000	1.4	.5
Carbon monoxide.....	1.000	.9	.1
Particulate matter.....	1.000	1.7	.6
Composite, all pollutants.....	1.000	1.4	.4
Ionizing radiation ^c	1.000	1.00006	1.00032
Atmospheric heat:			
Flux from energy use ^d			
B.t.u./hr./ft. ²	18	*55	*35
Index.....	1.000	3.1	2.0

^a Environmental quality index.

^b Assumes continually improving pollution control.

^c Includes all sources except medical.

^d Average solar flux 58 B.t.u./hr./ft.², maximum solar flux 380 B.t.u./hr./ft.².

^e Assumes unused power plant discharge heat is removed by river.

In summary, this examination of urban ambient air quality shows a more significant environmental advantage of optimum electrical energy patterns than does the national scene taken as a whole. With the current energy pattern, the year 2000 would likely find 50 to 100 percent worsening air quality in all pollutants except carbon monoxide which would drop quickly. The optimum electric pattern would develop air quality having less than half the ambient pollutant concentrations as in 1970, even though nearly three times as much energy is used. Oxides of sulfur and nitrogen would show the least improvement (20 to 30%) and the principal contributor at that time would be from process heating. Further air quality improvements could be accomplished by zoning process industries away from the cities.

The increase in ionizing radiation levels for this city would be on the order of 0.0006 to 0.003 mrem per year for the nuclear plants located in the city to meet the growing needs for energy with minimum pollution. When considered in the light of a natural background radiation level of 100 to 200 mrem per year, the radiation from the nuclear plants at these levels is truly insignificant. If reduction in ionizing radiation to the population is a major consideration, an attractive alternate exists in developing and applying codes for building materials for homes and office buildings. Total radiation exposure could be reduced by 20 percent or more (index 0.8003 with building codes and nuclear plants versus 1.0000 with no nuclear plants) in this manner.

The heat flux into the atmosphere from man's use of energy is shown to be somewhere around 1/2 of the average solar flux at present and in the year 2000 could be almost equal to the average solar flux over the 200 square mile area of the city, if an extension of present energy use patterns are forecast. These averages, however, do not allow a look in detail at the seasonal variation. In the winter when the solar flux is lowest, man's use of energy is at its peak and could be more than twice the solar flux.

In the summer, when the solar flux is maximum, man's energy use is usually down by 15 to 20 percent.

It is possible that improving the air quality, as described herein, could have measurable effects on the micro climate of the city,¹¹ possibly resulting in somewhat larger temperature swings between night and day, and somewhat greater visibility.

CONCLUSION

While considerable progress has been made in reducing air pollutants from energy use, particularly from fossil-fueled power plants, it is clear that much additional effort must be applied just to prevent matters from becoming worse as more energy is consumed by our society. This paper suggests the systems planning of energy use patterns as a practical method of improving environmental quality, particularly in the urban centers.

Increasing electric power as a primary energy converter by a factor of three over present patterns should cut pollutant emissions nationally by more than 50 percent and in the urban center by as much as a factor of 3 or 4. Only with this energy pattern can nuclear power play a really significant role in improving environmental quality.

The added use of electricity and the use of discharge heat from power production in space heating and certain process industries, should provide an annual savings of 10 to 15 percent in this nation's total energy requirements.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The Economy, Energy, and the Environment, Joint Congressional Economic Committee, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Sept. 1970.

² Energy, R&D and the National Progress, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1964.

³ Environmental Effects of Producing Electric Power, Part 1, Hearings Before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1969.

⁴ Beard, Rodney R., *Journal of the Air Pollution Control Association*, Vol. 19, No. 9, Sept. 1969.

⁵ Goldsmith, J. R., and Seymour, I. Cohen, *Journal of the Air Pollution Control Association*, Vol. 19, No. 9, Sept. 1969.

⁶ The Sources of Air Pollution and Their Control, Dept. Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1966.

⁷ Maurits, P. G., and J. Janakin, *Chemical Engineering*, April 1970.

⁸ Bartok, W., et al., *Combustion*, 42 No. 4, Oct. 1970.

⁹ James, D. W., *Electrical World*, Feb. 1971.

¹⁰ Electric Power and Thermal Discharges, Eisenbud, M., and Gleason, G., P. 417 (J. A. Nutant), Gordon and Brach, New York, 1969.

¹¹ Landsberg, H. E., *Science* 1970, Dec. 1970.

ENGLAND HONORS OUR FOURTH OF JULY AND SELECTS A ST. LOUISAN TO SPEAK AT THE CEREMONY AT WESTMINSTER ABBEY

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the British have, down through the years, recognized the Fourth of July with programs, speeches, and church services. In fact, it has become an outstanding celebration. In doing so, the British remind the Americans that George Washington was an Englishman.

This year, when the Fourth of July falls on a Sunday, one of the most important ceremonies will be held at Westminster Abbey and a St. Louisan, Dr. Edmond

LeBeaume Cherbonnier, currently the head of the Department of Philosophy and Religion at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., who is on a sabbatical year in London, has been tendered the honor of preaching the Fourth of July sermon at the Abbey.

Dr. Cherbonnier was born and reared in St. Louis and graduated from St. Louis Country Day School. He attended Harvard University where he graduated cum laude and served as a Navy pilot in World War II. After the war, he studied at Cambridge University in England, where he received a degree, and later a degree from Columbia University in New York and an honorary degree from the University of Vermont. He is the author of a book on the subjects he teaches at Trinity, titled "Hardness of Heart."

St. Louis is honored to have one of its native sons selected for the high honor of preaching the Fourth of July sermon at the historic and renowned Westminster Abbey and I am sure he will be an outstanding representative of our great country.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of uninsurability is a very real one according to the testimony received at the recently held Minneapolis health hearings.

Rev. Roger Heimer of the First Christian Church testified that he is unable to obtain insurance for his wife who had eye surgery and is now legally blind.

Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Cossetta are both over 60 and uninsurable because of the present state of their health. They were unable to be present at the hearing due to their poor health but submitted a statement for consideration.

H.R. 22, the Health Security Act of 1971, now pending before Congress, would meet and solve the problem of uninsurability by removing the reliance on preexisting conditions and statistical soundness in favor of a system that covers the health needs of our citizens:

TESTIMONY OF REV. ROGER HEIMER

My personal experience with medical insurance has shown me that the best available insurance does not cover "pre-existing conditions" of medical need or medical risk.

I have spent an inordinate amount of time trying to discover a way to insure my family and particularly my wife's greatest health risk. No individual or group policy could be secured or developed.

My experience must be typical of a sizable group of persons who are unable to insure themselves against what they know to be their greatest health risks. Since private and fraternal insurance have been proved inadequate, provision of insurance through the Social Security system or through some other federal system is now essential.

ST. PAUL, MINN.
March 2, 1971.

HON. DONALD FRASER.

DEAR SIR: I wanted so bad to go to that hearing you had at MPL's about health insurance. But just could not. I am writing

this letter to let you know I am very interested. I am 64 and my wife is 61. We are both listed as uninsurable, she has bad heart and kidney and I a bad heart and we cannot buy health insurance. There must be a lot more like us. We sure would be thankful if you would help try to get a health bill passed for the uninsurables.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK COSSETTA.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks we have witnessed the blatant and ill-conceived efforts by the administration to prevent the dissemination of information regarding our senseless and costly involvement in the Vietnam conflict. We have seen the freedom of the press stifled by those very forces sworn to uphold constitutional rights and freedoms and the inept attempts to prevent the Congress from having access to information critical to its work in considering and passing on appropriations for the Vietnam war and the conduct of our policy there.

Earlier this month the noted and highly respected commentator, Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, furnished a timely and very perceptive analysis of the current furor over the documents on Vietnam. I believe Mr. McCaffrey's observations are most pertinent and deserve our fullest and most careful consideration. I urge our colleagues to heed his remarks and I am pleased to present his commentary herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

COMMENTARY OF JOSEPH MCCAFFREY

In the current legal fight over the documents on Vietnam, there is one issue facing both the Government and its people: should the people be told about how we fumbled, bumbled and bulled our way into the debacle of Vietnam? It might be well for the reputation of some Americans that this not be revealed. But we cannot use the top secret rubber stamp to cover up official incompetence and duplicity.

Nebraska's Senator Carl Curtis is probably one of the most cautious men in the United States Senate. Yet Senator Curtis has a feel for what makes the system work: an informed public. So the Senator says, "Let's get all those papers out so that all of us can read them and find out the background of this endless war." Senator George McGovern says we probably owe Senator Barry Goldwater an apology for the way he was treated in the 1964 campaign. One thing about Senator Goldwater, he was honest.

One wonders if this has now become so rare a political commodity that we will now build shrines to the few men who can qualify as honest. And have we learned our lesson about being the quote moral leader unquote of the world?

We agreed to prevent elections in North and South Vietnam for fear Ho Chi Minh would win. One can now wonder if things would be any worse for Vietnam had Ho won; would there be as much destruction, would there have been as many dead? One can wonder. It is about time that we were allowed to read our own history.

We shouldn't be advised as a well known retired general told us on television the other

night that we should just be told what those in charge think we should be told, and little more.

One wonders what a really great military man like George Catlett Marshall would have thought about that approach to what we think of as a peoples government. And if we really want to speculate, we can wonder what Thomas Jefferson would have thought of the establishment which, even now after the fact, seeks to keep the American people from learning how they ended up in a war which has cost them 55,000 young American lives, plus billions and billions of dollars.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the recently concluded Minneapolis health care hearings, Pauline Berryman represented the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association. She pointed out the need for additional funds for child care training programs. She stated that there may be up to 4,000 unlicensed day care homes in Hennepin County alone. In short, Mrs. Berryman presented a cogent statement dealing with the broadly defined health needs of our children. Her statement follows:

STATEMENT MADE FOR THE GREATER MINNEAPOLIS DAY CARE ASSOCIATION
(By Pauline Berryman, Chairman)

Good Child Care Is Preventive Health Care. My concern is for the health—mental, physical, emotional—of the children whose mothers are forced to work or who choose a life style that includes their working. What happens to our children strongly affects the present and future health of our community. If the present situation is allowed to continue, we will have deprived children becoming deprived adults in ever-increasing numbers in our community.

Old alternatives for child care are disappearing as women without young children are returning to the work force. New alternatives are not being created fast enough for the mothers who must or decide to work. Without adequate care available, desperate mothers turn to unsatisfactory solutions. Infants and young children are left alone. Older children are taken out of school to care for siblings, or lounge on the streets after school hours when no one is at home. Children are left with adults unfit to care for them. Day care centers often have too few funds to pay for qualified or adequate staff, room, or materials, creating the danger of developing "institutionalized" children like those damaged in the now-discarded orphanage settings. Innovative programs for optimum child care have difficulty being established. Federal money is limited to target areas, work-training programs, or persons in welfare programs. Child development training programs are last priority for child care funds.

These problems exist because our attitudes about providing child care services are many years behind the needs. We think of child care as a welfare cost to get AFDC mothers off the welfare roles. We think in terms of baby-sitting instead of the finest kind of life-preparation we can provide. We do not think of child care as a life style resource, an educational advantage or need. We do not think this care should be made available for every person who needs or chooses such a resource. To say that a mother should stay

at home with her children is trying to decide for a family what their life style will be and is unrealistic in light of the inner and outer demands of the world in which we live. I have discovered a growing resentment among women who pay taxes which help provide child care service for others which they also need and cannot receive. Mothers of all economic classes are frustrated by the small number of child care programs that promote the total well-being of the child, which includes being sensitive to the needs and cultural background of the family. The day is gone when we, as a community, can ignore the need for child care services that are supportive of the family and that reinforce the family strength.

The Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association is a community organization created to speak and work for the community needs and wishes for good child care services. We represent parent and civic groups, as well as private individuals, united to provide the best child care settings we can provide for everyone who wants or needs them. We believe that these settings, instead of creating more incapable adults as the present system too often is doing, will stimulate the growth and capacity to responsibly cope with the world we live in.

Recommendations which need national support for realization:

1. Health complexes responsive to and cooperative with child care services.
2. Enactment of legislation that will make financial resources available.
 - a. Such resources to be made available to more than target areas and welfare recipients.
 - b. Scholarships to low-income and minority persons to receive child development training.
 - c. Money for training programs, including those that develop support for the cultural background of the persons served.
 - d. Financial support of psychiatric and child development research that will enable communities to understand what kind of programs will be healthful for the child and family.
 - e. Tax laws allowing a realistic deduction for child care costs for working parent.
 - f. Continued support of Headstart programs.
 - g. Support of innovative programs that will create new answers for child care problems.

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS ENDORSES ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS MEASURE

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the public demand for relief from the grip of unemployment grows with each passing day. The Public Works Acceleration Act, S. 575, designed to provide just this relief, is now on the President's desk awaiting his signature. I am proud to be one of the originators of this legislation, and earnestly entreat the President to sign S. 575, which will create nearly 420,000 jobs.

A manifestation of the growing support of S. 575, the recent endorsement of the measure by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, is described in the following article in the Modesto Bee of June 16:

MAYORS ASK OK OF McFALL WORKS BILL

WASHINGTON.—The US Conference of Mayors, meeting in Philadelphia today, urged President Richard Nixon not to veto a \$2 billion accelerated public works measure designed to provide federal aid and jobs for hard-hit areas of high unemployment in Northern California and elsewhere around the country.

Rep. John J. McFall, D-15th, Stanislaus, San Joaquin and Merced Counties, District in California, said he was notified by phone this morning of the passage of the resolution. He is the author of the legislation which passed the House this week as part of an over-all \$5.5 billion appropriations bill for Appalachia and Economic Development Assistance.

The prospect of a presidential veto arose during earlier Senate consideration of the bill when administration supporters pushed for a less-expensive substitute to the McFall program.

The House adopted the \$2 billion measure by more than the two-thirds vote which would be required to override a veto. But the Senate approved the McFall measure by less than a two-thirds margin.

McFall's measure would help areas of Sacramento, Fresno, Stanislaus, San Joaquin and other Northern California counties which have experienced high unemployment over an extended period of time.

CROSS-PURPOSES

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD today an editorial statement from the June 22, 1971, Knoxville, Tenn., Journal concerning the \$12 billion bill which includes agriculture, environmental, and consumer protection programs:

CROSS-PURPOSES

Friday the House Appropriations Committee approved a \$12 billion money bill which covers agriculture, environmental and consumer protection programs. The bill also well illustrates how the federal government often seems to operate at cross-purposes, with one program designed to correct situations which are either caused or intensified by another program.

The measure approved Friday included \$3.6 billion to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its price support and production and marketing activities. In simplified terms, the bulk of this money goes for paying American farmers various amounts to supplement payments they received on the open market or to replace the income they would have received if they had not kept their land out of production.

With consumer prices on food and related items sky-high, it is anomalous that these same consumers should have to finance through their tax dollars programs designed to keep farm prices at certain levels. On the surface the farm and consumer programs appear to be working against each other.

A partial answer, of course, is that the American farmer has not received the major portion of the higher food prices. The middle men—those who ship, pack and retail food items and who themselves have been hit by soaring labor and materials costs—have claimed the lion's share.

INCREASING THE APPROPRIATION FOR THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which was created by Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1957, has been for 14 years in the forefront of the movement to achieve and implement civil rights legislation. In its early years the Commission documented the need for civil rights laws to protect the rights of America's minorities. In recent years the focus of civil rights activity has shifted from legislation to administration and enforcement, and again the Civil Rights Commission has, through its research, hearings, and reports, produced invaluable information on the means of achieving more effective implementation of existing civil rights legislation.

The Commission, which is chaired by the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, who also serves as the president of the University of Notre Dame, has requested sufficient funding to restore it to its operating level of 1968. This funding level of \$3,397,000 would support a staff of 177, a barely adequate number to fulfill the extensive mandate of the Commission, which includes the investigation of complaints that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote, the study and collection of information on the denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution, the appraisal of the Federal laws and policies respecting their impact upon civil rights, and the preparation of reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress on the securing of equal protection of the laws. The amount contained in this bill, \$460,000 less than requested by the administration, would be insufficient to maintain the Commission at its present operating level, and would force the Commission to totally abandon its plans for new programs.

Father Hesburgh, in testimony given yesterday before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, told how that in meetings with four successive Presidents, he has been told by each that civil rights is the No. 1 domestic priority, yet he has had to note with irony that the Civil Rights Commission, with all of its responsibilities in this area, has been funded at a level of less than one-half the cost of one fighter plane. And now we have before us a proposal to cut even this small appropriation.

The Civil Rights Commission plans the development of an Indian Rights program and a study of the administration of justice in the Nation's prisons during the next year. I can think of no two more important areas of concern, and believe that it would be a national tragedy if we are denied the research which the Commission will bring to bear

on these areas. The Indian and the prisoner of any race share a deprivation of rights which must be the concern of the Commission under its mandate, but the Commission will not be able to investigate the denial of rights to Indians or the abominable conditions in our prisons involving denial of rights to prisoners unless the cut in its appropriation is restored.

The Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice is threatened with a cut of \$600,000 in its requested appropriation. The Community Relations Service, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, provides assistance to local communities in the resolving of racial disputes. In its 7 years of existence it has proven itself as an effective mechanism for the defusing of community tensions. In light of the increasing polarization and violence between the races in several communities around the Nation in recent months, there should be an increasing of the ability of the Community Relations Service to perform its functions rather than a cut in its requested appropriation for the next fiscal year.

The Community Relations Service requested \$5,830,000 and 300 staff positions for fiscal 1972. Instead, it has been given only \$5,250,000 and a ceiling of 250 positions has been imposed. The Community Relations Service requested 63 new positions, 52 of which would be in the State liaison program. The State liaison program provides Community Relations Service personnel to the States to help State governments meet racial crisis in their local communities. The Service has a State liaison program now active in 21 States though in nine States the service representative works only on a part-time basis because of lack of funding. The Community Relations Service planned during the next fiscal year to increase this part-time assistance to full-time and to appoint full-time representatives in five new States, bringing the total number of States in which the Community Relations Service will be active to 26. In addition, the Service has established six regional offices to provide support services for its field representatives in the local communities. These field support offices need additional professional personnel in order to adequately serve existing field workers, and if the cut in appropriations is not restored, all available new positions will have to be assigned to these offices in order to maintain even the present level of services. This will mean that there will be absolutely no new field workers at a time when the Community Relations Service's function is increasingly vital to the well-being of many local communities.

Another severely disturbing implication arising from the cut in the Community Relations Service appropriation is the impact such cut will have on the Service's National Service Division. This Division was formed last year to deal specifically with problems of the Spanish-speaking minorities. It has currently a staff of only eight and there is an intention to add six staff members to bring the total to 14. This will not be possible

because of the cut in the Service's appropriation. To think of only 14 staff members having primary responsibility for Spanish-speaking minority problems in an agency with a function as important as the Community Relations Service is ludicrous; to further diminish this number to the present eight by accepting this cut in the Service's appropriation would border on criminal negligence.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has suffered a reduction of almost \$5,000,000 in its requested appropriation. The Commission, which investigates complaints of discrimination in employment, was created by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1954. Since its inception the Commission has had an increasingly heavy caseload of complaints against employment discrimination and now desperately needs a larger staff to deal not only with this increase, but with its very large backlog of cases, which now is approximately 14,000 in number, some going back as far as 2 years. The requested appropriation of \$26,620,000 would allow for an increase of 670 positions; the committee's suggested appropriation would permit only 346 new positions. Thus 324 positions, all of which would have been applied by the Commission to backlog programing, have been cut, leaving the bleak prospect of an increasing backlog of cases and perhaps inadequate personnel to deal with the ever-increasing current caseload. It is estimated by the EEOC that it will be receiving over 31,000 annual complaints of employment discrimination by the end of 1972. In 1970, 14,000 complaints were received; the projection for this year is 23,000 complaints. The caseload is growing at an extremely rapid rate, and unless the Commission obtains the staff it needs to investigate the complaints it is obvious that many complaints will not be investigated because they will have grown too stale by the time the Commission gets to them.

It is very true that justice delayed is justice denied. If those who suffer from discriminatory employment practices cannot obtain relief through the channel provided for such relief by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, then they will have no recourse. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will no longer function as the Congress intended unless it obtains sufficient funding to provide staff to enable it to keep up with its caseload. We must act to protect the credibility and viability of the EEOC by restoring its appropriation to the requested level.

As Father Hesburgh so eloquently stated in his testimony yesterday, and as he has so often shown us as Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission in the numerous reports and studies issued by the Commission during his chairmanship, there is a tremendous gap between promise and performance in the enforcement of the civil rights of this Nation's minorities. We on the Committee on the Judiciary have recently been struck by the manner in which administrative inaction in the voting rights area is threatening the hard-won gains we thought had been guaranteed by the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The appropriations process is

another means of failing to enforce the civil rights commitment which we as a Congress have made through the civil rights legislation of the past decade, and we must be on guard against the type of nation which will leave this commitment as nothing more than empty rhetoric. Such action is the proposed cutting of the appropriation requests of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, the Community Relations Service, and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. These funds must be restored to enable these agencies to carry forth their legal mandates. Failure to restore their appropriations to the requested levels will bring into question the commitment of this body to the enforcement of civil rights legislation.

THE POOR AND PUBLIC HOUSING

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, "Which of the Poor Shall Live in Public Housing?" That is the provocative question addressed by Mr. Roger Starr, executive director of New York's Citizens Housing and Planning Council in a recent article which appeared in the Spring, 1971, issue of the Public Interest.

Mr. Starr argues persuasively that New York City's public housing projects are in grave danger of going the way of projects in other cities which have become virtually uninhabitable. He also makes the point that doctrinaire thinking on the part of those who want to help the poor may sometimes actually hurt them.

I sincerely believe that Mr. Starr's article is must reading for any one interested in the future of our great cities. The article follows:

WHICH OF THE POOR SHALL LIVE IN PUBLIC HOUSING?

(By Roger Starr)

New York City's public housing projects—which many people claim they can identify at sight, but which they often confuse with partially subsidized "middle-income" cooperatives and rental complexes, and sometimes even with self-styled "luxury" developments—contain about 155,000 families. No one knows how many people this amounts to, but a fair guess puts the number at 600,000. This makes the publicly-housed population of New York City greater than the total population of any other city in the state.

A single trait distinguishes the public housing tenants, however; practically all of them are poor. This does not mean that all of the poor people in New York City live in public housing. There simply isn't that much public housing. The great majority of the city's poor continue to live in old, privately-owned structures. One of the critical questions for public housing management in the city thus becomes: *which of the poor shall live in public housing?*

At this writing, the New York City Housing Authority has a waiting list exceeding 100,000 names. Thanks to such persistent demand, the Housing Authority has some leeway in choosing its tenants. That freedom, however, has been steadily dwindling under pressure from local and national politics, and more

recently from the federal judiciary which is insisting that such decision-making be circumscribed by "due process." There is reason to believe that restricting the freedom of the Authority in choosing its tenants may threaten the very existence of its projects.

Anyone who looks at a public housing project is entitled to his own view as to whether it "works" or not. Eschewing all complex value judgments, let us agree that New York City's housing projects "work" by the simplest of all possible criteria: more people want to get into them than are willing to move out of them. This is notably not the case in St. Louis, Jersey City, Chicago, and Washington, D.C., as well as a number of other cities, where vacancies have occurred on a large scale and where some public housing projects have actually been abandoned and padlocked.

Why does public housing work in New York City? Is New York's stock of low-rent private housing worse than in other comparable cities? Not demonstrably. Is its public housing architecturally superior? Few architectural critics would accept that proposition. Is the spirit of the place more sympathetic to public ownership of home and hearth? Surely not in the home-owning sections of Queens, Brooklyn, and the Bronx. A more general explanation was suggested in *The Public Interest* two years ago by George Sternlieb, who observed that New York public housing has historically provided "a major source of housing for the working class." In other words, New York's public housing is acceptable to the working poor while in other cities public housing has become the home primarily of the non-working, dependent poor.

In a recently revised edition of Supplementary Paper No. 26 of the Committee for Economic Development, "Who Are the Urban Poor?" Anthony Downs divides all households living in poverty in the metropolitan areas into five categories. He finds that about one-third of the individual persons who are members of poverty households belong to male-headed households in which the head of the household is working—but not earning enough to bring the household out of poverty. To this group, one could add a second: the elderly, who constitute some 18 per cent of the poor in the central cities, and most of whom were once part of the working force. In addition, a significant fraction of the 10 per cent of the poor in metropolitan areas who are either in households headed by disabled or unemployed males should also be thought of as "working class families."

These three categories can be contrasted with what might be called "the dependent poor." This latter category is mainly composed of the female-headed households; such households contain approximately 40 per cent of the individuals living in poverty in the metropolitan area in 1968, according to Downs. It would be clearly unfair to assume that all female-headed households lack a working-class ethos and pattern of behavior; Downs' own statistics indicate that 15 per cent of the female household heads work full time, while another 25 per cent work part time. It is nevertheless clear, conversely, that 60 per cent of the female household heads do not work at all, and presumably are supported by the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program. Downs tells us that a 1966 survey of the mothers receiving help under this program indicated that, even if they were freed of the responsibility of their children, 70 per cent of the mothers involved would be unable to earn more money by working than they received as welfare payments; their low skills and motivation marked them as being outside the working class.

The difference between the two groups—the working poor and the dependent poor—is not merely economic: the difference finds

expression in a whole set of attitudes toward work and life, and in different patterns of behavior. The distinction between the working poor and the non-working poor may escape the middle-class observer, and most especially it seems to escape the observer bent on social reform. But it is clear enough to all members of the working class, and to the poor generally. It is the fatherless households that cause the most vandalism, are responsible for the greatest amount of crime, both on the streets and inside the housing projects.

I must admit that I used to inveigh against the Housing Authority for its reluctance to admit female-headed households into the projects unless it had reason to believe that a specific household was relatively stable. My mind was changed, not by any statistics from the Authority, but rather by the complaints of the tenants themselves at the way their housing project was being disfigured by the activities of alcoholics, junkies, and young delinquents—mostly members of AFDC families. It became clear to me after a while that only the safe middle class can afford to ignore the distinction which the working poor do draw, between themselves and their poor, non-working-class neighbors.

The New York City Housing Authority, catering to only a fraction of the poor has relied on two devices for keeping its non-working class population within limits that would be acceptable to the working-class population of the housing projects. The devices are simple enough, if one assumes that the public housing program will not be big enough to accommodate all poor families. First, the Authority tries to keep out those families whose past records indicate the probability that they will be troublesome to their neighbors and a threat to the physical maintenance of the buildings. Second, the Authority has, over the years, refused to renew the month-to-month tenancy of unruly and destructive tenants who had—to the satisfaction of the Authority's own officials—given evidence of an unwillingness or an inability to live peaceably with their neighbors and in accordance with the rules of the Authority. The possibility of eviction therefore becomes vital to the successful operation of the projects.

Approximately ten years ago—in 1960—the New York City Housing Authority, which had two years earlier been reorganized from a part-time voluntary authority to a three-man, full-time, paid board, took steps to regularize its lease terminations. The Tenant Review Board, which had been established in 1953, was enlarged to include representatives of various branches of the Authority. If a project manager decided that one of his tenants constituted a menace to his neighbors, the tenant in question was called into the manager's office for a conference. If the conference failed to convince the manager that the tenant would or could mend his ways, the tenant would be given notice of the intention of the Authority to terminate his tenancy. The notice described the reasons for the termination, and notified the tenant of his right to appear, with counsel, before the Tenant Review Board to contest the intention of the Authority to evict him, and to offer whatever exculpatory evidence of statements he might wish to plead.

If the decision of the Tenant Review Board went against the tenant, the Authority went into the Civil Court to obtain a summary warrant of dispossession in an action to recover the apartment. If the Authority were a private landlord, there could be no defense against such an action in any court, except under the terms of special legislation like New York City's rent control law from which the Housing Authority is concededly exempt. But because the Authority is, obviously, not a private landlord but a government agency, the tenant can institute proceedings in the Supreme Court of the State of New York

to require a judge of the court to determine whether the Authority had acted capriciously or arbitrarily in terminating a tenancy. A series of decisions in New York consistently upheld the New York Housing Authority's procedures as being neither capricious nor arbitrary.

So matters stood in New York City until 1968. Meanwhile, the rest of the country, in which evictions were far more summarily made, sought to catch up with the New York's liberal and humane procedures. In 1967, the Department of Housing and Urban Development issued a circular to the Local Housing Authorities which, like the New York Authority, own and operate housing projects for low-income families built with federal financial support. The circular, dated February 7, 1967, directed the Authorities to tell a tenant, "in a private conference or other appropriate manner, the reasons for the eviction, and (give him) an opportunity to make such reply or explanation as he may wish." The New York City Housing Authority's procedures—including the Tenant Review Board, the statement of the intent to dispossess, and the right of representation by counsel—clearly surpassed the requirement of HUD.

But by 1968 a new issue had been raised in New York City by three teams of lawyers, each representing a different agency funded, at least in part, by the Office of Economic Opportunity. These lawyers sought to challenge the eviction procedures of the Authority on the grounds that they contravened "due process" of law which, under the Fourteenth Amendment, must be afforded any person if he is legally to be deprived of property. This challenge depended on the definition of the right of tenants to occupy apartments in publicly-owned housing projects as a form of "property." Because the issue rested on constitutional grounds, it was brought on in the Federal Court. On October 31, 1968, District Judge Sylvester Ryan of the Southern District of New York dismissed the complaints in all three cases (*Escalera, Rolle, and Humphrey et. al. v. New York City Housing Authority*). Judge Ryan said in his opinion: "the act of termination of the tenancy is the final step in a sequence of procedural steps taken with the fullest regard for the tenant's right and those of the other tenants."

That would probably have ended the matter, except for another case which, by chance, also arose in New York City, and also involved a constitutional challenge to an administrative decision, on the ground that property had been taken by an arm of the state without due process. This case—*Goldberg v. Kelly*—was decided by the District Court in favor of the petitioner, Kelly, and against the public official, Jack R. Goldberg, Commissioner of Social Services (read Welfare Department) of the City of New York. The facts were hardly in dispute. Commissioner Goldberg decided that Kelly, who was on welfare, was not in fact entitled to receive the benefits he was being paid; Goldberg, under the regulations then in force, immediately and without notice cancelled Kelly's welfare payments. While the case was making its way through the courts, the Department of Social Services amended its procedures to include a requirement that seven-day notice of an intention to terminate benefits must be given to the welfare client. Under the new procedure, welfare benefits could not be cut off until the client had been given an opportunity to submit a written protest to an official of higher rank than the one who made the decision to terminate his benefits. The new regulation continued, however, to provide that this official may terminate the benefits, and that only after the benefits are terminated may the former beneficiary demand a so-called "fair hearing" at which he might present evidence orally and cross-examine adverse witnesses.

The District Court ruled that the post-termination hearing was not an adequate substitute for a pre-termination hearing at which the beneficiary could present evidence and cross-examine the witnesses opposed to him. The United States Supreme Court, in an opinion written by Justice Brennan, supported (though not unanimously) the District Court's decision. Justice Brennan quoted favorably an excerpt from the lower courts' decision: "While post-termination review is relevant, there is one overpowering fact which controls here. By hypothesis, a welfare recipient is destitute, without funds or assets . . . suffice it to say that to cut off a welfare recipient in the face of 'brutal need' without a prior hearing of some sort [emphasis mine]—R.S.] is unconscionable, unless overwhelming considerations justify it." Justice Brennan then continued to announce the Supreme Court's support of the District Court's ruling. He stated very precisely where the constitutional question lies in the view of the court's majority: "The city's procedures presently do not permit recipients to appear personally with or without counsel before the official who finally determines continued eligibility. Thus a recipient is not permitted to present evidence to that official orally, or to confront or cross-examine adverse witnesses. These omissions are fatal to the constitutional adequacy of the procedures."

Justice Hugo Black, in an interesting opinion, dissented from the majority of the court. He was joined by Chief Justice Burger and Justice Potter Stewart. Justice Black said:

"I would have little, if any, objection to the majority's decision in this case if it were written as the report of the House Committee on Education and Welfare, but as an opinion ostensibly resting on the language of the Constitution I find it woefully deficient. Once the verbiage is pared away it is obvious that this Court today adopts the view of the District Court that to cut off a welfare recipient in the face of . . . 'brutal need without a prior hearing of some sort is unconscionable,' and therefore, says the Court, unconstitutional . . . Today's balancing act requires a 'pretermination evidentiary hearing' yet there is nothing that indicates what tomorrow's balance will be . . . While today's decision requires only an administrative, evidentiary hearing, the inevitable logic of the approach taken will lead to constitutionally imposed, time-consuming delays of a full adversary process of administrative and judicial review. In the next case the welfare recipients are bound to argue that cutting off benefits before judicial review of the agency's decision is also a denial of due process. Since, by hypothesis, termination of aid at that point may 'still deprive an eligible recipient of the very means by which to live while he waits' . . . I would be surprised if the weighing process did not compel the conclusion that termination without judicial review would be unconscionable . . ."

In his prediction that the rule established in this welfare case—*Goldberg v. Kelly*—would be broadened, Justice Black's prophetic gift was confirmed. *Goldberg v. Kelly* was decided by the Supreme Court on March 23, 1970. On April 29, 1970, the Federal Court of Appeals reversed Judge Ryan's decision in the several housing cases that he had tried more than a year earlier, applying to them the precedent of *Goldberg v. Kelly*. The Federal Court indicated that unless the tenant facing eviction could be granted an evidentiary hearing at which he would have an opportunity to confront the opposing witnesses, he could not constitutionally be evicted from a public housing apartment.

There are a number of ironies in this decision. In the first place, if the Housing Authority were a private landlord, there would be no question whatever of its power to terminate a tenancy on due notice at the end of any 30 day lease period. Second, the *Goldberg*

v. Kelly case was decided explicitly on the grounds that the beneficiary had no means of support other than his welfare benefits: the lack of alternative income describes his 'brutal need' of welfare benefits. Yet the need to remain in public housing in the United States cannot be equated with the need for welfare support, because public housing constitutes only a small fraction of the total housing supply in the city of New York; thousands, in fact hundreds of thousands of families in economic and social conditions identical with those of the public-housing tenants live in private accommodations. If the Congress of the United States saw fit to provide the funds with which to build all the housing (or even a very substantial part of the housing) available for people of low income, permission to reside in a publicly-owned project would indeed have the same "brutal" quality as the need for welfare sustenance. But the Congress hasn't, nor can any court appropriate the needed funds. Third, the housing cases involve a party at interest other than the two parties involved in the welfare cases: that party is made up of the other tenants in the project from which the Authority seeks to evict the litigating tenants. Thus, in balancing the equities, the Court merely decided that the suffering of the cut-off welfare client would be worse than that of the government forced to spend a little more money than properly it should. But who measures the suffering of the other tenants in the project as a result of the misbehavior of a tenant whose case awaits a full "evidentiary" review? Who compensates the parents of a neighboring child who has been introduced to drugs by a released, convicted narcotics peddler living in the building? Who pays for the pocketbooks taken by youthful muggers, the children of a family resisting eviction?

The court's answer would, no doubt, be that the Authority should be able to provide its proof by the direct testimony of neighbors under cross examination. But there lies the difficulty. The witnesses are, in fact, neighbors. After presenting their testimony they cannot go home safely anonymous and thus protected against possible retaliation at the hands of the family across the hall, or the friends of that family. Many officials of the New York City Housing Authority believe that the requirement of confrontation will discourage a large majority of witnesses from appearing. They point also to the cost of the procedure; unfortunately, the cost of operating the public housing projects is borne by the tenants themselves, not by the national nor the local government.

At the present moment, attorneys for the Housing Authority and the plaintiffs in the three cases simultaneously reversed by the Federal Court, are seeking to work out a decree setting forth new procedures which will satisfy the court's definition of due process. Whatever the final form of the decree, it will surely provide for direct confrontation between the Authority's witnesses and the tenant against whom they are complaining. The probable effect of this will be to discourage complaints on the part of tenants, and to dampen the interest of housing managers in maintaining a decent quality of life in their projects. It will, ultimately, tend to speed the departure from the projects of the working poor.

This would be disagreeable enough a prospect even if the New York City Housing Authority were not simultaneously under political pressure to accept a constantly growing percentage of the non-working poor.

First, the Authority has been forced to abandon its list of 22 eligibility criteria. This was a set of categories of personal history episodes, such as recent conviction of a felony, or a common-law marriage only a few years old. The Authority always maintained that a negative answer to any of the

criteria did not necessarily preclude admission to public housing, but only that the family situation had to be evaluated by the social service staff of the Authority. In practice, however, that staff was so busy, and the list of applicants so long, that applicants with a negative history enjoyed only a guarded prognosis as to final admission. Some offenses did, in fact, constitute absolute bans to admissions.

Pressure from neighborhood groups, particularly with the help of poverty program workers, ultimately produced a change in the list of criteria. Instead of a long list of specific offenses which required evaluation, the Authority set forth general and rather broad grounds on which it could reject a prospective candidate for admission as a tenant. The more general criteria could have been used to cover precisely the same list of behavior traits that had been set forth explicitly in the now-banned list. The change would have had little significance—had it not been for the more important fact that the Authority, since the development of the poverty program, has been under a new set of pressures to accept tenants from public improvement sites, and from families on welfare.

These pressures have come about as the result of the growing abandonment of private buildings in New York City—a cultural and economic phenomenon which has made the relocation of families from public improvement sites much more difficult. The pressures have come also from the stirrings of a taste for "community control." The New York City Housing Authority is by definition a Bureaucratic Monster, unresponsive to the Wishes of the People. Perhaps even more important, it has a habitation in which sit-ins can be staged (unlike most of the private landlords who own buildings in the worst sections of the city). Furthermore it offers a target to people who are not actually living in it, and one of the most obvious motivations for attacking it is its failure to admit people whom the local group can readily believe are the victims of prejudice. This popular pressure is added to the governmental pressure for taking in site tenants to make way for public improvements and for quieting neighborhood protests rather than get the name of the agency into the newspapers. It is scarcely astonishing that the Housing Authority has stopped looking too hard at its applicants.

In addition to these reasons, there is one other which is peculiar to New York City. Because the city has to pay only 27 per cent of the rent bill for welfare eligibles—the remainder coming from federal and state governments—the city Department of Social Services has been willing to pay higher rents in public housing for welfare families than other families pay in identical apartments. The surcharge paid by the city to the Housing Authority runs as high as 60 per cent. At a time when the Authority is running badly in the red, welfare tenants provide it with some financial relief.

The results of these pressures emerge in the New York City Housing Authority statistics. Ten years ago, households receiving public assistance constituted about 16 per cent of the public housing tenancy in New York City. The present public assistance level is over 26 per cent. Current admissions are 56 per cent welfare families—about half of them broken families.

None of this means that every welfare family suffers from the kinds of psychological problems that make it a menace to its neighbors. Many welfare families consist of reasonably stable working people victimized by economic events or by personal tragedies over which they have no control. Yet George Sternlieb's study of New York's housing indicates that, for whatever reason, the only variable consistently associated with sub-

standard housing was the presence of welfare families in the building. The Chairman of the Housing Authority himself has noted the growth in crime rates and vandalism in the projects, and the voluntary move-outs by non-welfare families as the percentage of welfare tenants has risen. He has asked the Human Resources Administration to design "supportive social programs" that might help to minimize the problems associated with the risen in the welfare family load; ironically, on the very day of a meeting held to explore these possibilities, the Community Service Society—New York's oldest and largest casework agency—announced that it was phasing itself out of the casework business. Individual family counseling doesn't seem to be effective. And no one has any idea what might be effective.

If the trend to welfare tenancy continues, and the working families stay out of New York City Public Housing, there will be a consequent deterioration of the projects. There will also be, as a further consequence, a growing unwillingness of the federal government to build more low-cost housing. And the major impetus to this disaster will have come from those who have dedicated their lives ostensibly to helping "the poor." In effect, this too often means that they are helping one group of poor at the immediate cost of another group; generally, the disorganized, non-working poor will be favored because their afflictions seem greater, and their dependence on public sources makes it easier to do something about their condition. The net result is that destructive behavior is encouraged and excused at the expense of the law-abiding poor. It is as though we have, in the interest of justice, provided a system for destroying the incentives to, and the rewards for socially normal behavior. Regrettably words like "socially normal" have come under general scorn. To the committed reformers, they smack of middle-class standards and bureaucratic inhumanity. But their meaning is perfectly apparent—and very welcome—to the tenants in public housing who wonder why they have to bar their doors at night and why a feeling of fear that is coming close to terror is growing in the projects.

DO INCREASED WAGES IN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY CAUSE INFLATION?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a very informative and clarifying analysis of the impact of wage increases on inflation prepared by Richard Prosten, research director of the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department appeared in the Government Standard on June 11.

It shows clearly the fallacy of the administration's methods of holding down wages as a way of combatting inflation while, at the same time, granting corporations a tax writeoff.

I request the careful attention of my colleagues to this article as the administration will no doubt again call on us to approve their method of holding down wages and employment programs by telling us it is in the best interests of our economy.

INFLATION: WHY ARE THE VICTIMS BLAMED FOR THE CRIME?

Last year the 91st Congress passed Wage Board legislation urged by AFGE, but Presi-

dent Nixon vetoed it on "grounds" that the modest pay increases it would have yielded would have been "inflationary."

Yet, days later, by Executive Order, he granted corporations a tax write-off that will cost the Treasury an estimated \$2 billion, or more, each year, and greatly increase business profits.

Not a word was said about "inflation" when the write-off was announced.

Once again, the wage earner was blamed for "inflation," while the business community was declared not guilty.

What really causes "inflation"?

In this article, reprinted from IUD viewpoint, AFL-CIO Industrial Union Dept. Research Dir. Richard Prosten explains some of the causes and the propaganda which unjustly—but successfully—makes the public swallow the myth that the wage-earning victims of "inflation" are the responsible criminals.

During the last decade, after-tax profits have more than doubled, but take-home pay increased by less than 50 per cent.

During every period of pronounced inflation since World War II, it has been suggested by people who must know better, that the victims are the criminals.

We are treated to speech after speech telling us that workers' demands are "inflationary" and that everything would come up cherries if only working people weren't so "damned unreasonable."

Currently, the effort at shifting the blame has suggested an additional culprit—the consumer.

Perhaps you've seen that ad on TV where the lady of the house is described as a cause of inflation because she buys a new dress. While her sin is being described to us, we see her appearance change to that of a pig.

Obviously, this lady is not the real cause of inflation, nor is the worker who is running as fast as he can in a futile attempt to maintain his economic position.

Inflation has been such a constant factor in American economic life that its opposite—deflation—has become an endangered species, as far as words go.

Indeed, public discussion of inflation consists mainly of applying modifying terms to describe its strength: "moderate" inflation, "rapid" inflation, "skyrocketing" inflation, and so on.

The best that any of us can remember are some brief periods of "relative price stability." Since "relative" is a reference to times of astounding price increase, even these periods of respite are unusually unacceptable.

Currently, non-labor economic discussions of inflation revolve around two broad generalizations which tend to exclude from blame the near-monopoly capital and business interests that dominate our economic life.

The theory that is employed most often to hit workers over the head is the "wage-price spiral" or "cost-push inflation."

It suggests that labor demands so such from employers that the beleaguered businessmen must raise prices to stay in business.

The usually implicit, and many times explicit, corollary to this theory is that Unions are so strong that they can easily dictate the size of economic settlements.

Those who push this theory, however, cannot explain why it is that the average family-man factory worker has less purchasing power (take-home pay adjusted for increases in the consumer price index) today than a few years ago.

Also ignored is the fact that during the last decade the after-tax profits of manufacturing corporations more than doubled, while weekly take-home pay for manufacturing employees increased by less than 50 per cent.

"Demand-pull" is the other stylish explanation of inflation.

It suggests that like the lady who bought the dress, we are all running around glutton-

like, consuming so much that prices must be raised in order to control and/or reallocate demand.

Such a theory might have some credibility if industry was operating at 100 per cent of capacity and unable to meet the demands being placed on it. But this is not the case. Industry is currently sitting on a large, unutilized capacity.

The reality is that there is no one explanation of, or solution to, economic inflation.

Each inflationary period since the great depression has had its own causes and different types of inflation that may require different solutions.

During World War II (1939-1945), the average increase in consumer prices was 4.5 per cent per year.

In part, this increase represented the economy's price and growth recovery from the depression, as well as economic speculation which manifested itself in pre-control price increases.

Coupled with tremendous increases in the level of Federal spending and deficits, these factors led to an overstrained economy.

Productive capacity was utilized to the fullest degree possible, and unemployment fell to below 1 per cent.

Since so much production was being diverted from consumer goods to military items, there was intense competition for available goods and services.

The problem was handled by formulating and enforcing wartime controls that, however imperfect, had a more equitable impact than many contemporary proposals.

Between 1946 and 1948, there was another sharp rise in prices.

War production was not quickly enough being replaced by consumer-oriented production, which was required to absorb the large amounts of deferred consumption—savings—that had accumulated during the war.

Moreover, the removal of wartime controls led to large-scale profiteering by big business.

From 1949 to 1951, there was an average rise in consumer prices of about 4.5 per cent per year.

Many economists attribute this rise to scare-buying by those who were afraid that the Korean War would produce shortages similar to those that occurred during World War II.

In both of these post-war situations, however, most of the blame for rising prices was leveled at working people.

After World War II, when Unions sought to recoup wages lost to inflation, they were attacked for being disruptive institutions.

In the general atmosphere of charge and counter-charge, Congress chose to follow the lead of those who blamed Labor for the nation's troubles, by passing the Taft-Hartley Act.

Prices remained stable between 1952 and 1955, with the average increase in consumer prices running under one-half of 1 per cent per year.

Between 1955 and 1958, however, the average annual increase in consumer prices climbed to 2.6 per cent.

The Eisenhower Administration attempted to counter the problem by bringing real economic growth almost to a halt, while unemployment soared.

Again, workers were forced to foot the bill for stopping inflation.

Unfortunately, the then Vice President Nixon must have missed the point, because when he entered the White House in his own right, he hastily recreated this scenario of recession and inflation.

From 1958 to 1966, we enjoyed a period of economic stability, with annual consumer price increases averaging less than 1.5 per cent per year.

With unemployment at lower levels, this period falsely suggested that we had learned to deal more scientifically with the economy.

During these years, the Government experimented with "wage-price guideposts," which represented a small scale attempt to institute an incomes policy in the United States.

Incomes policies are now being actively considered by the Administration as a cure for inflation.

Because the guideposts did not affect all Union and employees with equal force and affected some not at all, they were foredoomed.

In order to have been effective, they would have had to go beyond wages and prices and have created a system of more equitable distribution of incomes.

The current inflationary period began at about the time we became heavily involved in Vietnam.

At first, the Government thought that the war would be short and would not require additional taxation to support it.

But as the war dragged on, a 10 per cent surtax was levied on all taxpayers on an across-the-board basis.

The tax was really not sufficient to fight inflation (that is, it did not drain enough money out of the economy), but given the lack of popularity of the war, it was all that seemed politically feasible.

More unfortunate yet, it treated all taxpayers—individual and corporate—alike, as if they were some sort of economic equals.

The problem became even more complex when, in an absurd approach to stopping inflation, the Nixon Administration forced a very severe stagnation upon the economy.

Inflation grew worse and its agony was compounded by severe unemployment.

The resultant chaos deriving from economic stagnation and inflation has been labeled "stagnation" by some critical economic pundits.

Unfortunately, the "stagnation" triggered even more price increases by businessmen who wanted to keep sales figures high and offset decreasing volume.

Hopefully, this episode may have disproved forever the ridiculous theory that massive unemployment is the appropriate cure for inflation. In all of these inflationary periods, it has been workers who have unfairly had to bear both the blame and the burden of erroneous economic policies.

The "wage-price guideposts" didn't really apply to the salaries of corporation executives.

The Vietnam surtax made no distinction between corporate giants with huge profits and individual taxpayers struggling with their day-to-day cost of living expenses.

Engineered "cooling off" of the economy removed from employment, in its initial phases, the workers who could least afford it.

Moreover, it is the poor and minority group workers who are the last to be rehired when employment picks up.

A worker is tied to his job by a complex set of incentives. To transfer his job is to lose his seniority, vacation, shift assignment, and perhaps even pension rights.

Thus, after those who live on fixed incomes, working men and women are among the most vulnerable to inflation.

Three-year labor contracts are pretty much the rule in industry, and contracts running less than two years are indeed infrequent.

Yet, when they do negotiate and attempt to recoup their losses and perhaps win protection against future inflation, Union actions and policies become grist for the propaganda mills of all the anti-labor fat cats throughout the nation.

It is cruel in the extreme to blame the victims for the crime—but for some in our society, it is much easier to point the accusing finger at labor than to tell it like it really is.

SLOWLY WORKING ON THE RAILROADS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, just recently Congress was again forced to pass emergency legislation to ward off the disastrous effects of a nationwide railway strike. The simple fact that congressional intervention beyond that provided for by the Railway Labor Act has been resorted to seven times since 1963 indicates that Congress has failed to meet the need for effective remedial legislation.

H.R. 9089, a bill in which I have joined in cosponsoring, is a bipartisan effort to give the President an effective means of preventing national emergencies which are spawned by labor disputes in the transportation industry. This legislation would no longer make it necessary for Congress to step in at the last hour to prevent a crippling nationwide strike—thereby eliminating the cumbersome, uncertain state of labor negotiations as they presently exist in this field.

I would like to bring the following Wall Street Journal editorial, dated June 6, 1971, to the attention of my colleagues. It points out the inadequacies of our present situation and the need for some definite action on the part of Congress:

SLOWLY WORKING ON THE RAILROADS

The Senate Labor Committee, in desultory fashion, has begun considering revision of the Railway Labor Act to handle transportation strikes. Labor Secretary James Hodgson testified this week, and next month there will be another hearing. In September the committee may listen to the views of labor and management witnesses.

It isn't easy to come to grips with the Railway Labor Act, and Congress for years has simply ignored its shortcomings. The act, which in one form or another has been around for nearly half a century, supposedly required labor and management to make every reasonable effort to settle the differences between themselves by peaceful methods. But the law also provided federal mediation, emergency boards and other forms of intervention that, for more than two decades, have made peaceful settlements increasingly rare.

Once the government steps in, collective bargaining usually stops. Unions and management, understandably enough, become much more concerned with presenting their sides of the case to federal officials than in settling their differences with each other.

Eventually, all of the complex procedures of the act are exhausted. The government then improvises, trying to come up with some sort of ad hoc solution. Since World War II, in fact, no rail labor dispute of consequence has been settled without federal intervention beyond the Railway Labor Act. Collective bargaining on the railroads is being replaced more and more by cloakroom haggling in Congress.

A recent Supreme Court case provides a fine example. In the early 1960s the railroads were arguing that they could easily operate trains with fewer employees than were required by union rules. Not surprisingly, the arguments met firm union resistance, even though the railroads were willing to make reasonable arrangements for the welfare of the unneeded workers.

After the Railway Labor Act's provisions were exhausted, a national strike was threat-

ened. Congress then passed a law requiring arbitration, and the arbitrators agreed the railroads could indeed get along with fewer workers. The award, however, expired in 1966 and the United Transportation Union since then has been demanding restoration of many of the unnecessary jobs.

The Chicago & North Western Railroad balked, and the federal government intervened under the Railway Labor Act. Once again the act was of no great help, and a strike loomed. The railroad then went to federal court for an injunction, claiming that the union was not complying with the act's requirement to seek a peaceful settlement.

So what else is new?

True, the Supreme Court can't settle cases with sarcasm. Instead the majority, in a 5-to-4 ruling, held that when the parties don't bargain seriously, as they seldom do, it can be perfectly proper for a federal court to enjoin a strike. Justice John Harlan, writing for the majority, conceded that the decision "falls far short of that definiteness and clarity which businessmen and labor leaders undoubtedly desire" in such areas.

About all that is definite is that the Railway Labor Act does not work and the Supreme Court has empowered federal courts, if they choose, to enjoin labor and management to make it work. No matter how powerful the injunction, it does not have the power to compel the impossible.

Justice Harlan went on to worry that labor and management might now "structure their bargaining positions with an eye on the courts." They probably will, but it's hard to see how this poses a distinctly new danger, since the parties for years have been engaging in so-called bargaining with their eyes primarily on the government.

It should be clear by now that the basic trouble lies in the Railway Labor Act itself; it should at the least be drastically rewritten. The administration last year proposed new legislation to handle transportation labor disputes, and it's surely time for Congress to give the matter more than current snails'-pace consideration.

The Railway Labor Act is far past the point where it can be saved solely by injunctions.

U.S. SUBSIDIZES CONFRONTATION—UNO AND ISRAEL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last week's passage by a vote of 337 to 10 of H.R. 9272, which contained our U.N. contribution of \$52,437,700, must be considered in keeping with the President's international commitment to full support of this perpetual war-making undemocratic body where 10 percent of the world's population can constitute two-thirds of the votes.

Yet as we continue our U.N.-English-OAU sanctions against Rhodesia and ignore U.N. sanctions against Red China and Israel, we exhibit a strange double standard of support and cooperation.

The American people are now advised by the President's Jewish Affairs adviser that Congress will shortly approve of a loan to Israel. This again raises the question of how the United States can rationally support both the U.N. and Israel when the U.N. has condemned Israel in 12 instances since 1966 and has repeatedly deplored its failure to abide by U.N. resolutions.

Since the American people are not permitted to read in the newspapers what has been predetermined to be not in their interest, it is doubtful that many are aware of the U.N.-Israel confrontations—let alone our inconsistency in supporting and financing both.

I include two newsclippings and the text of the U.N. declarations against Israel from the U.N. Chronicle following my remarks. I had earlier commented on U.S. funding of the U.N. at pages 21880-21882 of the RECORD for June 24, 1971:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 27, 1971]

\$500 MILLION IN AID FORECAST FOR ISRAEL

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—President Nixon's Jewish affairs adviser said yesterday Congress will approve this year \$500 million in aid to Israel—\$200 million as a grant and the rest as a loan.

Max M. Fisher, of Detroit, who also is head of the United Jewish Appeal fund-raising mission for Israel, said in an interview Nixon's Mideast policy was unchanged and that he was still sworn to preserve the arms balance and help preserve Israel's existence.

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1971]

UNITED STATES SAYS ISRAEL VIOLATES GENEVA CONVENTION

(By Terence Smith)

The State Department says Israel violated the 1949 Geneva Convention by constructing large apartment projects in the former Jordanian sector of Jerusalem.

Charles W. Bray, the Department spokesman, said yesterday the United States continues to oppose any action by the Israeli government in occupied Arab territories which "could prejudice a peace settlement."

He specifically mentioned the sprawling apartment projects that have been constructed in the hills and valleys on the eastern side of Jerusalem, calling them a violation of the 4th Red Cross Convention on the protection of civilians in wartime that was signed in Geneva in 1949.

The convention, to which Israel is a signatory, prohibits an occupying power from transferring part of its population into occupied territory.

"We interpret this to include construction of permanent facilities which have the intent of facilitating a transfer of population," Bray said.

Despite American and international objections, Israel has formally annexed the former Jordanian sector of Jerusalem. Israeli citizens already have moved into the area that was under Arab control from 1948 until the June 1967 war.

Brady's remarks came in response to a question about whether Israel was using U.S. aid funds to develop the occupied areas. He said that the United States is satisfied that the funds were not being used for that purpose.

The spokesman said he had no specific knowledge of the reported construction of an Israeli factory in the Golan Heights, Israeli-occupied Syria, but that such an installation also would constitute a violation of the 1949 convention if it were built.

The United States first voiced its objection to the Jerusalem housing projects in February. The protest incensed many Israeli leaders and the minister of housing, Zev Sharef, promptly announced Israel's intention to proceed with the construction.

[From UN Monthly Chronicle, June 1970]

RECORD OF THE MONTH

SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Security Council Condemns Israel for Action Against Lebanon.

The Security Council on 19 May con-

demned Israel for its premeditated military action against Lebanon on 12 May in violation of its obligations under the Charter and deplored its failure to abide by Council resolutions of 1968 and 1969. The resolution condemning Israel, sponsored by Zambia, was adopted by a vote of 11 in favour to none against, with 4 abstentions (Colombia, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone, United States).

The Council declared in the resolution that such armed attacks could not be tolerated and warned Israel that, if repeated, it would consider taking adequate measures, in accordance with the relevant articles of the Charter, to implement its resolutions. It also deplored the loss of life and damage to property inflicted as a result of the violations of Council resolutions.

On 12 May, the Council voted unanimously to demand the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory, when it adopted a proposal presented by Spain as an interim measure, without prejudice to further consideration of the matter.

The Council met on 12 May at the request of the delegations of Lebanon and Israel.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION 280 (1970)

THE SECURITY COUNCIL,
Having considered the agenda contained in S/Agenda/1537,

Having noted the contents of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon (S/9794) and of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Israel (S/9795),

Having heard the statements of the representatives of Lebanon and of Israel,

Gravely concerned about the deteriorating situation resulting from violations of resolutions of the Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 262 (1968) of 31 December 1968 and 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969,

Convinced that the Israeli military attack against Lebanon was premeditated and of a large scale and carefully planned in nature,

Recalling its resolution 279 (1970) of 12 May 1970 demanding the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli armed forces from Lebanese territory,

1. Deplores the failure of Israel to abide by resolutions 262 (1968) of 31 December 1968 and 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969;

2. Condemns Israel for its premeditated military action violation of its obligations under the Charter;

3. Declares that such armed attacks can no longer be tolerated and repeats its solemn warning to Israel that if they were to be repeated the Security Council would in accordance with resolution 262 (1968) and this resolution consider taking adequate and effective steps or measures in accordance with the relevant Articles of the Charter to implement its resolutions;

4. Deplores the loss of life and damage to property inflicted as a result of violations of resolutions of the Security Council.

[Record of the Month, July-August 1969]

POLITICAL AND SECURITY SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST—SECURITY COUNCIL CENSURES ISRAEL

The security Council on 3 July voted unanimously to censure in the strongest terms all measures taken to change the status of Jerusalem and deplored the failure of Israel to show any regard for General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on that city.

The Council had begun consideration on 30 June of a complaint by Jordan against Israel regarding measures taken in Jerusalem. The complaint stated that the measures were contrary to the Security Council resolution of 21 May 1968 concerning that city, and to the United Nations Charter.

The Council, in the resolution—which was submitted jointly by Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia—urgently called once more on Israel to rescind all measures tending to change

the status of Jerusalem and refrain from all actions likely to have such an effect. It confirmed that all legislative and administrative measures and actions purporting to alter the status of Jerusalem, including expropriation of land and properties, were invalid and could not change that status. The Council requested Israel to inform it without further delay of its intentions regarding implementation of the resolution. The Council, in addition, determined that, in the event of a negative response or no response from Israel, it would reconvene without delay to consider further action. Finally, the Council requested the Secretary-General to report to it on the implementation of the resolution.

The paragraph calling on Israel to rescind all measures tending to change the status of Jerusalem was voted on separately and was adopted by 14 votes in favour to none against, with 1 abstention (United States).

TEXT OF RESOLUTION 267 (1969)

THE SECURITY COUNCIL,

Recalling its resolution 252 of 21 May 1968 and the earlier General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) of 4 and 14 July 1967 respectively concerning measures and actions by Israel affecting the status of the City of Jerusalem,

Having heard the statements of the parties concerned on the question,

Noting that since the adoption of the above-mentioned resolutions Israel has taken further measures tending to change the status of the City of Jerusalem,

Reaffirming the established principle that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible,

1. Reaffirms its resolution 252 (1968);
2. Deplores the failure of Israel to show any regard for the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions mentioned above;

3. Censures in the strongest terms all measures taken to change the status of the City of Jerusalem;

4. Confirms that all legislative and administrative measures and actions by Israel which purport to alter the status of Jerusalem including expropriation of land and properties thereon are invalid and cannot change that status;

5. Urgently calls once more upon Israel to rescind forthwith all measures taken by it which may tend to change the status of the City of Jerusalem, and in future to refrain from all actions likely to have such an effect;

6. Requests Israel to inform the Security Council without any further delay of its intentions with regard to the implementation of the provisions of this resolution;

7. Determines that, in the event of a negative response or no response from Israel, the Security Council shall reconvene without delay to consider what further action should be taken in this matter;

8. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of this resolution.

[Record of the Month, April 1969]

POLITICAL AND SECURITY SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Security Council Condemns Israeli Air Attacks.

The Security Council on 1 April voted to condemn the "recent premeditated air attacks launched by Israel on Jordanian villages and populated areas in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions". It warned Israel that if such attacks were repeated "further more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter" would have to be considered, and deplored the loss of civilian life and damage to property.

The Council acted by adopting a revised text of a draft resolution submitted by Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia. The vote was 11 in

favour to none against, with 4 abstentions (Colombia, Paraguay, United Kingdom, United States). The draft, which was submitted on 29 March, was revised to include an operative paragraph reaffirming Council resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968). Previously, the Council had considered complaints by Jordan and Israel at six meetings held between 27 and 29 March.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION 265 (1969)

The Security Council,
Having considered the agenda contained in document S/Agenda/1466,
Having heard the statements made before the Council,

Recalling resolution 236 (1967),
Observing that numerous premeditated violations of the cease-fire have occurred,

Viewing with deep concern that the recent air attacks on Jordanian villages and other populated areas were of a pre-planned nature, in violation of resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968),

Gravely concerned about the deteriorating situation which endangers peace and security in the area,

1. Reaffirms resolutions 248 (1968) and 256 (1968);

2. Deplores the loss of civilian life and damage to property;

3. Condemns the recent premeditated air attacks launched by Israel on Jordanian villages and populated areas in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions and warns once again that if such attacks were to be repeated the Council would have to meet to consider further more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such attacks.

[Record of the Month, December 1968]

POLITICAL AND SECURITY SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

SECURITY COUNCIL CONDEMNS ISRAEL

The Security Council condemned Israel on 31 December "for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter and the cease-fire resolutions" following an attack against the civil International Airport of Beirut, Lebanon, on 28 December.

In a unanimously adopted resolution, the Council considered that such premeditated acts of violence endangered the maintenance of peace. A solemn warning was issued to Israel that "if such acts were to be repeated, the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions". And the Council considered that Lebanon was "entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction it suffered, the responsibility for which has been acknowledged by Israel".

The Council had been called into urgent session three days earlier at the separate requests of Lebanon and Israel. Both requests were included in the revised agenda adopted by the Council. Also before the Council for its consideration were communications from the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), regarding an inquiry conducted at the Beirut Airport on 29 December by United Nations Military Observers (UNMO). The Council debated the substance of the complaints by Lebanon and Israel on 29 and 30 December, adopting the resolution the following day.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION 262 (1968)

The Security Council,
Having considered the agenda contained in document S/Agenda/1462,

Having noted the contents of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Lebanon (document S/8945),

Having noted the supplementary information provided by the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization contained in documents S/7930/Add.107 and 103,

Having heard the statements of the representative of Lebanon and of the representative of Israel concerning the grave attack committed against the civil International Airport of Beirut,

Observing that the military action by the armed forces of Israel against the civil International Airport of Beirut was premeditated and of a large scale and carefully planned nature,

Gravely concerned about the deteriorating situation resulting from this violation of the Security Council resolutions,

And deeply concerned about the need to assure free uninterrupted international civil air traffic,

1. Condemns Israel for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter and the cease-fire resolutions;

2. Considers that such premeditated acts of violence endanger the maintenance of the peace;

3. Issues a solemn warning to Israel that if such acts were to be repeated, the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions;

4. Considers that Lebanon is entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction it suffered, responsibility for which has been acknowledged by Israel.

[Record of the month, May 1968]

POLITICAL AND SECURITY SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

SECURITY COUNCIL CALLS ON ISRAEL TO RESCIND MEASURES ON JERUSALEM

The Security Council on May 21 called urgently on Israel to rescind all measures already taken which tended to change the legal status of Jerusalem and to desist forthwith from further action of that kind. The Council took this action when it adopted a resolution sponsored by Pakistan and Senegal in a vote of 13 in favour, none against, with 2 abstentions (Canada, United States).

In the resolution, the Council deplored the failure of Israel to comply with General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V) on Jerusalem, adopted in July 1967, and stated that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tended to change the legal status of Jerusalem, were invalid and could not change that status. The Secretary-General was asked to report on the implementation of the resolution.

The Council, which on April 27 called unanimously on Israel not to hold a military parade scheduled for May 2 in Jerusalem to mark the anniversary of its independence, was informed on that date by the Secretary-General that the parade had been held as scheduled. The Council then adopted a second resolution by unanimous decision stating that it deeply deplored the fact that Israel, disregarding the Council, decision of April 27, had held the parade.

At meetings held from May 3 to 21, the Council continued consideration of Jordan's complaint about the situation in Jerusalem.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

(S/RES/252 (1968))

THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Recalling General Assembly resolution 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-4) of 4 and 14 July 1967,

Having considered the letter (S/8560) of the Permanent Representative of Jordan on the situation in Jerusalem and the report of the Secretary-General (S/8146),

Having heard the statements made before the Council,

Noting that since the adoption of the above-mentioned resolutions, Israel has taken further measures and actions in contravention of those resolutions,

Bearing in mind the need to work for a just and lasting peace,

Reaffirming that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible,

1. Deplores the failure of Israel to comply with the General Assembly resolutions mentioned above;

2. Considers that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid and cannot change that status;

3. Urgently calls upon Israel to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tends to change the status of Jerusalem;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the present resolution.

[Record of the Month, March 1968]

POLITICAL AND SECURITY

SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Security Council condemns Israeli Military action.

The Security Council on March 24 voted unanimously to condemn the military action launched by Israel on March 21 on the territory of Jordan "in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions."

The Council, which met on March 21 to take up complaints by Jordan and Israel of renewed fighting in the Middle East, stated in its resolution that it "deplores all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire and declares that such actions of military reprisal and other grave violations of the cease-fire" could not be tolerated and that it would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts.

Deplored the loss of life and heavy damage to property, the Council called on Israel to desist from acts or activities in contravention of resolution 237 of June 14, 1967, which asked it to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place. Finally, the Council requested the Secretary-General to keep the situation under review and to report to the Council as appropriate.

An earlier draft resolution, submitted on March 23 by India, Pakistan and Senegal, which would have had the Council condemn the military action launched by Israel "in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions" was not pressed to a vote. Under that proposal, the Council would also have warned Israel that military reprisals could not be tolerated and that it would have to consider measures envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts; call upon Israel to desist from acts or activities in contravention of the Council's resolution 237 of June 14, 1967; and request the Secretary-General to keep the situation under review and to report to the Council as appropriate.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION (S. RES. 248 (1968))

The Security Council,
Having heard the statements of the representatives of Jordan and Israel,

Having noted the contents of the letters of the Permanent Representative of Jordan and Israel in documents S-8470, S-8475, S-8478, S-8483, S-8484 and S-8486,

Having noted further the supplementary information provided by the Chief of Staff of UNTSO as contained in documents S-7930-Add.64 and Add.65,

Recalling resolution 236 (1967) by which the Security Council condemned any and all violations of the cease-fire,

Observing that the military action by the armed forces of Israel on the territory of

Jordan was of a large-scale and carefully planned nature.

Considering that all violent incidents and other violations of the cease-fire should be prevented and not overlooking past incidents of this nature,

Recalling further resolution 237 (1967) which called upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place.

1. Deplores the loss of life and heavy damage to property;

2. Condemns the military action launched by Israel in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions;

3. Deplores all violent incidents in violation of the cease-fire and declares that such actions of military reprisal and other grave violations of the cease-fire cannot be tolerated and that the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts;

4. Calls upon Israel to desist from acts or activities in contravention of resolution 237 (1967);

5. Requests the Secretary-General to keep the situation under review and to report to the Security Council as appropriate.

[July 1967]

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Resolution 2254 (ES-V), as proposed by 8 powers, A/L.528/Rev. 2, adopted by Assembly on 14 July 1967, meeting 1554, by roll-call vote of 99 to 0, with 18 abstentions, as follows: *

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 2253 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967,

Having received the report submitted by the Secretary-General,

Taking note with the deepest regret and concern of the non-compliance by Israel with resolution 2253 (ES-V),

"1. Deplores the failure of Israel to implement General Assembly resolution 2253 (ES-V);

"2. Reiterates its call to Israel in that resolution to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council and the General Assembly on the situation and on the implementation of the present resolution."

Abstaining: Australia, Barbados, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iceland, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, United States, Uruguay.

Resolution 2256 (ES-V), as proposed by 3 powers A/L.529/Rev. 1, adopted by Assembly on 21 July 1967, meeting 1558, by a roll-call vote of 63 to 26, with 27 abstentions, as follows:

The General Assembly,

Having considered the grave situation in the Middle East,

Considering that the Security Council continues to be seized of the problem,

Bearing in mind the resolutions adopted and the proposals considered during the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly,

"1. Requests the Secretary-General to forward the records of the fifth emergency session of the General Assembly to the Security Council in order to facilitate the resumption by the Council, as a matter of urgency, of

its consideration of the tense situation in the Middle East;

"2. Decides to adjourn the fifth emergency special session temporarily and to authorize the President of the General Assembly to reconvene the session as and when necessary."

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cuba, Guinea, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

Abstaining: Cameroon, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Kenya, Malta, Nigeria, Panama, Portugal, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, Uganda, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

[July 4, 1967]

Resolution 2253 (es-v), as proposed by 6 powers, A/L.527/Rev. 1, adopted by Assembly on 4 July 1967, meeting 1548, by roll-call vote of 99 to 0, with 20 abstentions, as follows:

The General Assembly,

"Deeply concerned at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City,

"1. Considers that these measures are invalid;

"2. Calls upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council on the situation and on the implementation of the present resolution not later than one week from its adoption."

Abstaining: Australia, Barbados, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Dahomey, Gabon, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Malta, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, United States, Uruguay.

[July 4, 1967]

Resolution 2252 (ES-V), as proposed by 26 powers A/L.526, adopted by Assembly on 4 July 1967, meeting 1548, by roll-call vote of 116 to 0, with 2 abstentions, as follows:

The General Assembly,

"Considering the urgent need to alleviate the suffering inflicted on civilians and on prisoners of war as a result of the recent hostilities in the Middle East,

"1. Welcome with great satisfaction Security Council resolution 237 (1967) of 14 June 1967, whereby the Council:

"(a) Considered the urgent need to spare the civil populations and the prisoners of war in the area of conflict in the Middle East additional sufferings;

"(b) Considered that essential and inalienable human rights should be respected even during the vicissitudes of war;

"(c) Considered that all the obligations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of 12 August 1949 should be complied with by the parties involved in the conflict;

"(d) Called upon the Government of Israel

to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who had fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities;

"(e) Recommended to the Governments concerned the scrupulous respect to the humanitarian principles governing the treatment of prisoners of war and the protection of civilian persons in time of war, contained in the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949,

"(f) Requested the Secretary-General to follow the effective implementation of the resolution and to report to the Security Council;

"2. Notes with gratitude and satisfaction and endorses the appeal made by the President of the General Assembly on 26 June 1967;

"3. Notes with gratification the work undertaken by the International Committee of the Red Cross, the League of Red Cross Societies and other voluntary organizations to provide humanitarian assistance to civilians;

"4. Notes further with gratification the assistance which the United Nations Children's Fund is providing to women and children in the area;

"5. Commends the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East for his efforts to continue the activities of the Agency in the present situation with respect to all persons coming within his mandate;

"6. Endorses, bearing in mind the objectives of the above-mentioned Security Council resolution, the efforts of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugee in the Near East to provide humanitarian assistance, as far as practicable, on an emergency basis and as a temporary measure, to other persons in the area who are at present displaced and are in serious need of immediate assistance as a result of the recent hostilities;

"7. Welcomes the close co-operation of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, and of the other organizations concerned, for the purpose of co-ordinating assistance;

"8. Calls upon all the Member States concerned to facilitate the transport of supplies to all areas in which assistance is being rendered;

"9. Appeals to all Governments, as well as organizations and individuals, to make special contributions for the above purposes to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and also to the other inter-governmental and non-governmental organization concerned;

"10. Repeats the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, to report urgently to the General Assembly on the needs arising under paragraphs 5 and 6 above;

"11. Further requests the Secretary-General to follow the effective implementation of the present resolution and to report thereon to the General Assembly."

Abstaining: Cuba, Syria.

[June 1967]

Resolution on humanitarian aspects of problems arising from hostilities; S/7968/Rev.1-3. Argentina, Brazil, Ethiopia: revised draft resolution.

Resolution 237 (1967), as proposed by 3 powers, S/7968/Rev.3, and orally amended by Mall, adopted unanimously by Council on 14 June 1967, meeting 1361.

The Security Council,

"Considering the urgent need to spare the civil population and the prisoners of war in the area of conflict in the Middle East additional sufferings,

"Considering that essential and inalienable human rights should be respected even during the vicissitudes of war,

*At the same meeting, the representative of Malaysia stated that had he been present at the time of voting, his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

"Considering that all the obligations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of 12 August 1949 should be complied with by the parties involved in the conflict,

"1. *Calls upon* the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities;

"2. *Recommends* to the Governments concerned the scrupulous respect of the humanitarian principles governing the treatment of prisoners of war and the protection of civilian persons in time of war contained in the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949;

"3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to follow the effective implementation of this resolution and to report to the Security Council."

[November 1966]

Resolution 228 (1966), as proposed by Mali and Nigeria (S/7598) adopted by Security Council on 25 November 1966, meeting 1328, by 14 votes to 0, with 1 abstention (New Zealand).

"The Security Council,

"Having heard the statements of the representatives of Jordan and Israel concerning the grave Israel military action which took place in the southern Hebron area on 13 November 1966,

"Having noted the information provided by the Secretary-General concerning this military action in his statement of 16 November and also in his report of 18 November (S/7593 and Corr. 1 and Add. 1),

"Observing that this incident constituted a large-scale and carefully planned military action on the territory of Jordan by the armed forces of Israel,

"Reaffirming the previous resolutions of the Security Council condemning past incidents of reprisal in breach of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan and of the United Nations Charter,

"Recalling the repeated resolutions of the Security Council asking for the cessation of violent incidents across the demarcation line, and not overlooking past incidents of this nature,

"Reaffirming the necessity for strict adherence to the General Armistice Agreement,

"1. *Deplores* the loss of life and heavy damage to property resulting from the action of the Government of Israel on 13 November 1966;

"2. *Censures* Israel for this large-scale military action in violation of the United Nations Charter and of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan;

"3. *Emphasizes* to Israel that actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts;

"4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the situation under review and to report to the Security Council as appropriate."

S/7603. Note of 29 November 1966 by Secretary-General.

S/7656. Letter of 30 December 1966 from Israel.

LITHUANIA

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it was 31 years ago that communism was brutally forced upon the Baltic States of Lithuania.

In the Eastern European struggle against forced Russian domination, Lithuania has severely suffered. Families have been broken and separated, there is a continuous fear of governmental repression and the demoralizing memories of three decades of slavery.

Nevertheless, the Lithuanians are still vigorously seeking the rights and dignity of freedom. I sincerely hope that these valiant people will continue to carry on their cause until someday they, too, shall share in the freedom we all too often take for granted.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commentary on the Nation's defense spending:

Everybody wants to reduce government spending. The tough question is "where?"

The suggestions are often vague, although many point immediately to our space and foreign aid programs. Without arguing the merits of these programs, it is apparent that they represent only a miniscule part of the total budget of \$200 billion-plus. Last year, space expenditures accounted for about 2 percent of the budget; foreign assistance, about 1.8 percent.

If the Congress is really going to make substantial budget cuts, it cannot ignore our defense expenditures, which represent annually nearly 50 percent of the total Federal budget. This year, the President is asking for an increase in defense spending for fiscal year 1972—\$76 billion, as compared to about \$72.5 billion last year.

The request for increased military spending comes despite a de-escalation of our involvement in Vietnam and promises to set the stage for a sharp debate between the doves and the hawks of the Congress. The parameters of the debate on what is needed to satisfy our defense objectives are likely to range from cutting costs as much as 20 to 30 percent (to about \$53 billion) to giving the military maximum priority (about \$85 billion.)

The focus of debate will be in two broad categories of defense spending. They are:

1. Strategic forces. Funds for this category maintain our nuclear deterrent power, which presently is comprised of a "triad" of sea-based missiles, land-based missiles, and long-range bombers.

The primary consideration in considering funding levels for our strategic forces is one of deciding what kind of "mix" of deterrent weapons we need to maintain. Those opting for a low strategic force budget (\$13 billion) argue that we can safely rely on sea-based, nuclear missile-carrying submarines. An intermediate budget (\$15 billion) would support a sea-based force plus one survivable land-based force of either missiles or bombers. A high budget, which could be as much as \$27 billion, would maintain, and modernize our sea-based force, plus both bombers and missiles.

2. General purpose forces. Funds for this category maintain our tactical land and sea forces which protect this country and our interests and commitments overseas. These forces can be equipped with either tactical, nuclear or conventional weapons.

Our general purpose forces now command about 65 percent of the military budget. Funding level considerations for this category of defense spending center on the kinds of contingencies we must be ready to expect. For example, should we be prepared to fight simultaneously the Warsaw Pact countries in Europe, China and its allies in Asia, and still be able to contend with an outbreak elsewhere? Or should we maintain a force adequate for meeting a major attack in either Europe or Asia, but not simultaneously in both?

Those who support the "two and a half war" contingency plan would allocate expenditures of \$58 billion to maintain our general purpose forces. Those who would reduce our contingency strength through troop reductions and more reliance on our nuclear deterrence, would allocate from \$37 to \$40 billion.

The uncertainties of defense spending make any budget consideration difficult, however. Defense requirements are sensitive to all sorts of external pressures—new communist pressures at points of ferment and crisis around the world; a possible military buildup near a sensitive area, our changing estimates of the external threat, or a breakdown in Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), to name a few.

As weapon technology changes, the defense budget is strongly affected by internal cost pressures such as cost overruns and weapons modernization to keep them from becoming obsolete. Perhaps the most significant pressure is that of increasing manpower costs, as illustrated by the fact that military pay increases have largely offset the military cost reductions from our de-escalation in Vietnam.

The money we allot to military spending dominates all other budget considerations by the Congress. Everyone agrees we must spend enough on defense for national security. The tough question is: "how much military spending is enough?"

HEALTH CARE FOR OUR NATION

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the maternal and child health program and crippled children's services established as part of title V of the Social Security Act of 1935 were intended to promote the health of mothers and children and to provide services to crippled children in all States. Since the Labor-HEW subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is presently considering these programs, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the invaluable services these agencies are providing and the inadequacy of administration appropriation requests for their continuation and expansion.

In the maternal and child health program, States use Federal funds, together with the State and local funds, for early detection and prevention of serious illnesses. This involves such services as prenatal and postpartum clinics, visits by public health nurses to help with infant care, well-child clinics for examination and immunizations, and conferences where mothers receive health care information.

The crippled children's services, which

began primarily as a program for children with orthopedic handicaps capable of surgical correction, has expanded to include mentally retarded children, children with multiple handicaps, children with congenital heart defects and children with such handicaps as cystic fibrosis, hemophilia, and leukemia.

In an attempt to extend the benefits of this program to rural areas, many State agencies periodically travel from town to town to locate handicapped children, provide diagnostic evaluation, and then give each child the medical treatment, hospitalization and any necessary continuing care. Nearly half a million crippled children are reached annually. In both the maternal and child health program and the crippled children's services, success can be largely attributed to the efforts of State agencies working in close cooperation with the Federal Government.

We in Michigan are proud of the work that has been done with project grants to the State department of public health. Programs are in operation to provide coordinated medical aid for children with multiple handicaps, to promote the training of badly needed medical personnel and to develop modern techniques for helping child amputees.

The appraisal center at Detroit's Children's Hospital is staffed with a team of specialists to provide a complete and coordinated appraisal of a child's physical, mental, and emotional status. For children with multiple handicaps, this team works to plan the course of treatment and provides periodic reevaluation of the child's progress.

A project at the University of Michigan Medical School, funded by these appropriations has worked to expand and continue training for professional personnel in the care of mentally retarded children. The project involves the education of students for multiple health disciplines and the postgraduate teaching of practicing professionals.

Another Michigan project taking advantage of these funds is the area child amputee program at Grand Rapids. The objectives of the program include the application and evaluation of new prosthetic devices for children, development of standardized procedures for clinical management, fostering and extending specialized educational opportunities to those working with child amputees and the provision of services necessary for diagnosis, treatment and training in the use of prosthetic devices.

Because of the scarcity of available funds, Michigan is experimenting with a new program to deliver services to more children. By using a pediatric home nursing service, they hope to reduce the length and frequency of hospitalization of crippled children.

The goal of all of these projects is to meet the challenge presented to us by the 1965 Social Security Amendments: That service should be made available to all children in each State by 1975. If this feat is to be accomplished, we must be willing to make the necessary financial commitment.

Unfortunately, administration appropriation requests for fiscal year 1972 are

desperately inadequate. The minimal increases proposed by the President are far too small to compensate for the drastic effects of inflation on health care costs. The President's recommendation of \$119.65 million for formula grants represents an increase of barely 3 percent for the Crippled Children's Services and no increase at all for maternal and child health programs.

Because of skyrocketing medical costs, the results of these sparse budgetary allotments will be substantial decrease in real resources available at a time when State agencies financial squeeze, resulting in many instances in the delay of services, the loss of program personnel, and the elimination of services.

The coalition for health funding has recommended an increase of \$38.6 million over the President's request for formula grants. They contend that if the programs are to be successful this increase is absolutely essential. I concur in this belief and urge my colleagues to act to provide these funds which are so critical in improving health care for our Nation's children.

PROMISES, PROMISES: BREZHNEV'S PROPOSAL TO NATO

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently emphasized the need to move with great caution in any diplomatic, economic, or cultural exchange with Communist nations; this caution should especially apply to dealings with the Soviet Union. This point is well emphasized in the lead article of the summer 1971 American Bulletin published by Czechoslovak National Council of America. I believe this commentary is especially timely and appropriate.

The article follows:

PROMISES, PROMISES—BREZHNEV'S PROPOSAL TO NATO

There is a "mysterious mushiness" in the political climate in Washington today, wrote Stewart Alsop in his article in Newsweek magazine on May 31, 1971. Analyzing the present situation, Mr. Alsop pointed out that Soviet power is growing steadily, but that some of our leaders on Capitol Hill tend to dismiss the hard evidence. In fact, the recent Mansfield amendment was to cut the American troop commitment to NATO in half. It was defeated, said Mr. Alsop, "with a big assist from Leonid Brezhnev, after the Administration had mustered all the elder statesmen, from the 'strong horse' period, including old Harry S. Truman himself." In Mr. Alsop's view, should this trend continue, the United States could lose its primacy and cease to be the world's No. 1 power, and should the Russians then decide to exercise their power, "our country will suffer some sort of traumatic shock" and "this will have a therapeutic effect," like the electric shock treatment. "But I am not at all sure this is a good guess. There is a curious new flaccidity, a mysterious mushiness, about American life and thought that may be incurable."

This is a very pessimistic outlook and Mr. Alsop hopes that he is wrong. Without a doubt, Mr. Brezhnev's courtship requires

careful scrutiny. An editorial writer in the Wall Street Journal "wonders why Brezhnev is so generous in his proposal on troop reductions to the NATO countries." Brezhnev volunteered to explain "if anything is not clear to somebody." The Wall Street Journal thinks that "there are so many things that aren't exactly evident. Maybe one point the Russians could clarify is whether they are ready to renounce imperialism and any future acts that would be akin to their 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia and its continued occupation. A plain answer to that question could form a very solid foundation for troop-reduction talks. But we're still not sure that Mr. Brezhnev means to make things quite that clear."

REMOVAL OF FOREIGN TROOPS FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Czechoslovak National Council of America voiced its apprehension to the Department of State in its letter of May 26, 1971:

The Czechoslovak National Council of America, speaking on behalf of Americans of Czech and Slovak descent, wishes to make known its concern:

Currently, there are indications pointing to a new Soviet interest in mutually agreed troop reduction in Europe and the creation of a new European security system.

The NATO Powers are similarly interested in a development which might alleviate the burden of military expenditure. Furthermore, the NATO Powers sincerely wish to ease the existing East West tension along the Iron Curtain. Hence a dialogue may ensue which could lead toward a new military situation in Europe.

Presumably, in any such discussions, the so called legitimate interests of both sides shall be duly respected. The presence of Soviet (or any other Warsaw Pact) troops on the territory of Czechoslovakia has never been recognized as a legitimate interest of the Soviet Union or the Warsaw Pact Organization. On the contrary, it represents an evil, unacceptable to the West, which would have to be removed before any serious talks could even be considered.

If the genuine interest of the Soviet Union in any agreed settlement of the pending questions is to be given any credence, the Soviet Union should, first of all, be required to cause the removal of all foreign troops from the territory of Czechoslovakia. Only if this pre-condition were met could the NATO Powers believe that the Soviets intend to enter into meaningful negotiations.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America submits this urgent request: that our Government should insist upon the evacuation of all foreign arms and armed units from the territory of Czechoslovakia as a precondition to any negotiations concerning troop reductions, to be mutually agreed upon, and the creation of a new European security system.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 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?

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Jesse F. Bone, Department of Veterinary Medicine, Oregon State University in Corvallis, Oreg., published the following article on "Academic Freedom":

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

There is a certain amount of truth in the statement that educators are the ultimate egotists. Their demands for "academic freedom," which are actually demands for privilege have no reasonable justification in modern society since educators are neither persecuted nor muzzled. As a class, educators have the innocent conceit that they are experts on (almost) everything and that a specialist in limnology can abandon his shallow ponds and move confidently and expertly through the deeper, more troubled waters of university administration and national policy. As long as this conceit does not spill over into reality, it is amusing but not harmful. But when this concept of academic freedom involves such curious statements as have appeared in Forum papers, such as: "Faculty should be encouraged to freely teach, publish and discuss their views on any issue," and to be responsible but not accountable for "the examination of controversial issues throughout the university, including classroom discussions," it is time to examine an instructor's role in education.

It is disturbing to note that academic-freedom statements virtually all contain the expressed or implied idea that an instructor should have the privilege of abandoning his subject matter and promoting personal attitudes, prejudices and opinions on subjects which may be entirely outside his field of expertise. This is not academic freedom. This is academic license.

It was Dr. Jerome Bruner of Harvard University, I believe, who stated that both the process and the goal of education was disciplined understanding. To attain such ends requires a considerable amount of rectitude on the part of both instructors and students. It involves for the instructor, the professional and moral obligation to stick to the subject matter and refrain from wandering into fascinating bypaths of opinion, and for the student an obligation to learn. It is a two-way street of mutual interaction for the purpose of disseminating and acquiring information and acquiring a methodology for examining, evaluating, storing and utilizing it.

A classroom is not a public opinion forum. It is a narrowly organized assembly gathered together to pursue a specific aspect of human knowledge. In essence, it is a captive audience which has been assembled more or less voluntarily with the implied qualification that the material listed in the syllabus or the catalogue will be the material which is taught. It is, therefore, proper academic conduct for both instructor and students to attend to business. Inappropriate discussion or comment is undisciplined behavior that neither promotes the process nor the goal for which the class is assembled.

I do not wish to convey any idea that I am opposed to freedom of assembly, conscience or speech. I am merely saying that there is a proper time and place for teaching and for pontification and that I oppose the kooky concept that academic freedom is some special kind of license that allows its possessor to commit mayhem in the classroom. Everyone—including academicians—is entitled to the freedoms guaranteed by the law of the land, but no one has any right to inflict personal opinions or attitudes upon a

captive audience that has not been assembled by force.

As long as the choice of subject matter is more or less a matter of student option and departmental requirement, it is the responsibility of the teaching faculty to stick to the subject and reserve exotic opinions for specific seminars, the quad, the coffee shop, the faculty senate, the soapbox and the press. Education is too serious a business for either faculty or students to take liberties with it.

I could not let the occasion pass without sharing this very cogent and timely article by Professor Bone with my colleagues and all who are interested in this serious subject.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS AT BLACK CAUCUS DINNER

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the congressional black caucus dinner was historic not just because it attracted some 2,800 supporters from all parts of the Nation, but because it signaled a new era of solidarity, coupled with a renewed determination to make the American political system have relevancy for black Americans. From every part of the country and from all walks of life, men and women came to rededicate themselves to the concept of liberation politics.

The magnificent program was climaxed by a keynote address from one who spoke from a deep commitment to the concept of total justice for every man, Mr. Ossie Davis. Those in attendance came away with the clear understanding that America's racism, not our reaction to it, is the real threat to the Nation's survival.

Mr. Davis's stirring remarks reminded us that the Government operates under several crippling disabilities: A coalition of conservatives who effectively block progress and reform; corporate interests and their lobbyists who exert powerful pressures in the pursuit of profit; a two-party political system which fails to present the electorate with discernible differences between candidates; and an electorate which on occasion has been deliberately misinformed by a calculated management and suppression of information about what its Government is doing domestically and internationally.

Perhaps it is the task of the caucus to address itself to these glaring deficiencies in the body politic and to form a nucleus around which to project major reform in this country.

Mr. Davis's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY MR. OSSIE DAVIS

Ladies, gentlemen. Brothers, sisters. And friends. This is an historic occasion. A moment we have dreamed and worked and fought for longer than we ourselves have been alive. The light that kept our fathers and our mothers tuned in to possibilities of a better future when they were slaves.

The insights they gleaned, the hopes they hoped, the prayers they prayed, have come one step closer to being answered by what

you have collectively done by your presence here tonight. I have been told that there are 2,800 of us here and we occupy facilities which were meant for 2,400. That's a pretty good indication of what price we place on our freedom and on the men and women who are dedicated to fighting for it.

You might have wondered why, I who am an actor and a performer, among other things, was chosen to give the keynote address tonight. And I myself, when called upon to do so, had moments of hesitation and doubt and I wondered, why choose me for such an important task? I guess the one reason which makes sense is that I represent that aspect of Black culture which began in Africa with the storytellers and came down to the great rhetorical giants who have stirred us by their words in the past.

But I think the time has, perhaps, come when rhetoric will begin to take a back seat. And I was so stirred by that possibility that I decided tonight to give my few remarks a subject, a title, a text which I want you to listen to very carefully. The text is very simple: It's not the man, it's the plan. And, for those of us who need more explicit information, those of us still caught up in the dreams that rhetoric will solve our problems, let me state it another way . . . It's not the rap, it's the map.

We have been blessed in our past with many great leaders. Leaders whose qualifications have been proven by what they did and what they said and even by the fact that when the time came they didn't hesitate to give their lives. And their dedication and their hard work has been borne to fruition . . . bears fruition by where we are tonight.

And I don't call for a moment of silence and gratitude for what the fathers have given us, but we shouldn't go forward without remembering that we are a continuous chain. We celebrate tonight, but we don't celebrate the past. We celebrate the future and if anybody has a right to celebrate the future, I'm sure that we must be that particular people.

We have had great leaders in the past who have stirred us with their words, with their hopes and with their dreams. I remember coming to Washington in 1963 when Dr. Martin Luther King stood at the Washington Memorial and he said to the world and to the Congress and to the nation, "I have a dream!" Now that dream of 1963 was not realized then, it was not realized at the time of his death and it has not been realized now.

At the time when Dr. King died in 1968 he was in the process of organizing his forces and calling upon his people to come one more time to Washington, D.C. And I have a feeling that had he come that time would not have said, "I have a dream", he would have said, "I have a plan." And I feel that that plan that he had might have made the difference.

You know, it might do us good to examine what some of the plans our previous leaders have had actually worked and perhaps it is a great misfortune that we never had a chance to get from them either individually or collectively just what the plan was that they had in mind.

And that's why tonight, the burden of my appeal to you, to the 13 Congressional Black Caucus members, to give us a plan of action. Give to us a "10 Black commandments," simple, strong, that we can carry in our hearts, and in our memories no matter where we are and reach out and touch and feel the reassurance that there is behind everything we do a simple, moral, intelligent plan that must be fulfilled in the course of time even if all of our leaders, one by one, fall in the battle, somebody will rise and say BROTHER! Someone will rise and say, "Our leader died while we were on page 3 of a plan, now that the funeral is over, let us proceed to page 4."

You know, what we call for is not without precedent. When Moses led the children of Israel out of Egypt, they had to wander around for a long time in the wilderness trying to get it together. In fact, it took Moses 40 years and a stone tablet beating him in the head every day trying to make Jews out of them. If it took Moses, with God's direct help, 40 years, certainly we can give ourselves a few more days to get our thing together. But, Moses did have the plan and Moses took the plan and he taught it to the children as best he could.

And that's what we need from our leaders now. From our noble 13, we need that they think the problems out, that they investigate the possible solutions, that they codify their results and they present their programs to us, the people, so that we may ratify what they have thought and organized and left to us as a program of action. Now we need a plan because we stand at a dangerous but exciting junction of history.

We might remind ourselves tonight that we are at a spot where the Irish were some hundred years ago. The Irish had the distinction, of course, of being the "niggers" of their day and they responded rather angrily and violently to that classification. I don't know if you were around in 1863, but in July of that year the Irish pitched a dinger in New York which cost the lives of 1,000 people. *New Life* magazine has given us the credit of having created the biggest riot in the United States but they forgot that in 1863 there was a riot in New York where over 1,000 people died. At that time, the Irish were so embittered by the treatment they received, that they blackened their faces and put on women's clothes and went into the mines and they blew them up and they shot people and they hung people. They did all kinds of bad things. The Molly McGuire's wrote quite a considerable chapter in our history and not all of it was nonviolent.

But the Irish had to learn an additional factor before they were able to walk into the promised land and that factor was that it wasn't enough just to be violent. The Irish had to have a plan. And they had their plan and they got it together in a little town called Boston. They got their thing together. They planned it out and they said to themselves, now look, there's a lot of us Irishmen here in Boston, a whole lot of us and we've been petitioning the white Anglo-Saxon Protestants for years about better schools and better houses and jobs and the drug problem and the drinking problem and what we're going to do for the future and we don't get no response from them. So why don't we Irishmen get together and put our votes into one place and see what we can do if we take power to City Hall. And do you know that that's exactly what they did. They put their votes together according to the plan and they came up with one man, the first Irish-Catholic mayor of Boston whose name was John Fitzgerald. And you can see where I'm heading because that's the first two names of the first Irish-Catholic president who was his grandson—John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Now, if it happened to the Irish, who certainly don't represent 25 million people, why can't it happen to us? But the Irish had a plan. They thought it out and they got all the Irish together and they said we're going to knock heads and we're going to wield shillelaghs until we get one solid body of Irish opinion. And we might think tonight that we are at that particular junction. And in some degrees we are. We have become hip to the meaning of political power and that's why we're here. This is an exercise in power tonight—we've eaten a good meal, we've paid good money for it. We've had good fellowship. We've heard good music and entertainment. But brothers and sisters, the name of the game is power, and if you ain't playing power, you're in the wrong place.

But at this particular junction in history, the Irish example is not nearly quite enough. Because the circumstances in which we live in our society economically, socially, politically, have qualitatively changed from what they were even 20 years ago, and it is that change which makes our fight different and vital and any plan that we make must take an account of the facts of that particular change that happened in American society. I refer very simply to a very simple but profound phenomenon which has affected our people more than anybody else.

To make it clear, let me go back in history a little. We came to this country not of our own free will. We came over in the boat as slaves. And we became slaves in the South and in the North and that was our designation and that was our station. And no matter what you might say against slavery, how much you might abhor it, as an economic system, slavery did have one advantage—it had 100 percent job security. Now I see you're beginning to get the message. Well, when we had the second American revolution in the 1860s and we wiped out slavery, we changed the title of our labor, but we didn't change the constitution of it very much. We stopped being slave labor, but we became cheap labor. And all of the jobs that nobody else wanted to do were the jobs that were ours by right. We had a right to the dirty jobs. Nobody could keep us from cleaning out the john. Nobody stood between us and cooking the grits for Miss Ann in the morning. Nobody stopped our PhDs from hustling baggage down at the Pennsylvania station. All of the dirty jobs, the hard-working jobs, the unskilled jobs were ours. All of the jobs at the bottom of the pile were ours. And as long as we were content to stay at the bottom, there was a place for us in America—economically, politically, socially and otherwise. And sometimes when we forgot that place, there was a cadre of friends of the Black people called the Ku Klux Klan whose job was to remind us what our place was and to put us back there—our place on the bottom.

But however horrendous that place was it did offer us some kind of economic purchase in our country. And out of those small jobs that we did have, we could send our children to school. We could build our churches, support our newspapers, organize our social clubs. It wasn't much we had, but what little we had, did help us keep going as a people.

But a strange thing has happened to the economy of our country and it's happened very quietly and over a short period. I understand that four years ago, 95 percent of the cotton in Mississippi was picked by a machine. And when you consider that we were brought to this country to pick that cotton, we were tied to that cotton culturally, economically, socially and politically, consider the implication of that single fact. Ninety-five percent of the cotton in Mississippi was picked by machines. What happened to those Black folks who used to pick that cotton? What became of them, half of them stayed on the plantation and rotted; the other half came North and you will find them now in the central cities and that is the source of one of the problems we face, and this is one of the problems which we must solve.

What I'm trying to say is that, ladies and gentlemen, in our . . . among our people, out of every four jobs in the past, three have been in the classification of unskilled, the rough, the jobs that required very little education. Those three jobs out of every four are the natural target of the automation and mechanical revolution by which the country now produces more and more goods every year with the use of less and less manpower. But what I'm trying to tell you is that the Black man and woman in the Black family stand directly in the path of automation and the mechanization of our economic life in

this country and this is an irreversible process.

The end results of it now you see on the welfare rolls in our cities. In New York, one out of every five citizens is on welfare. Now you may think that somehow we'll come up with a solution and solve the problem and one day eliminate welfare, but I doubt if that is true. I think the whole process is one way that welfare is the society's answer to its economic dislocation, to its endemic unemployment for which it has no solution, nor the determination or the will to find a solution.

If the masses of Black people who at least did have a place on the bottom of society now suddenly find that even that place is denied us, what recourse have we except what you find already in the inner cities—the fires of rebellion are burning brightly because human beings can only be repressed and ignored and maltreated for so long. Then they must rise.

What is the response of the Black people in our inner cities to this endemic unemployment? What happens to our youth who suffer from 25 to 50 percent unemployment? Some of them take to drugs. Some of them take to crime. Some of them apply themselves and say the solution to the problem is education.

The solution is preparing ourselves to deal with an automated society. To deal with a computerized economy. There are others who say that the society has no alternative, nothing to give me but a tour of duty in Vietnam. Still others say the only recourse is revolution—to change the society in any means we can before the society decides that because we are expendable and Black and poor and dejected and despised that they would rather see us in the ovens of Dachau than solve the problems as rational men.

I do not say that the society is already organized to exterminate Black people—by no means. I say that we must from now on begin to consider all possibilities and to prepare for all eventualities ourselves. If, when the other immigrants came to our society, they at least had the hard jobs to do—the ditches to dig, the baggage to hustle, the docks to wallop, the immigrants who came—the Hungarians, the Jews, the Irish, the Germans—these are the people who came and could work in the ditch, could find the hard work, could make enough with their hard work and their labor so that their children could climb on their backs into the outer society. That if we still had that opportunity we would do likewise.

But what I'm trying to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, is that those ditches that they dug are no longer diggable. That the economy which they fed no longer needs that kind of labor and that even though we now have on our law books many, many more rules and regulations regarding the freedom of the Black people, until we can solve the economic problem of how we get around the fact that people do not climb up as groups in American society by digging ditches anymore, we are in serious trouble. It may be, members of the Congressional Black Caucus, that you may be called upon to prove once and for all that work is an outmoded commodity in America. That men deserve dignity and an income and a definition as valuable citizen whether they have a job or not. It may be that you will have to define work, citizenship, ownership and property in a totally brand new life. That may be your assignment. That may be what history requires of you. Brothers and sisters, I repeat: It's not the man, it's the plan!

We've had great leaders and we loved them. We admired them. And they brought us where we are. But rhetoric will not do it now. Rapping alone will not make it. What we need from you, our honored leaders, and I choose the word advisedly, our honored leaders, what we need from you are your best thoughts, your sincerest dedication, the long

thoughts. We need from you a reassurance that there is a needed political alignment even in the Black community now.

We no longer elect our leaders by the value we find that they bring to us or the good they can bring to us in the white community. We elect leaders who represent what we are and what we can do, and if we can spend a quarter of a million dollars on a dinner here, there's a lot that we can do. I think for instance, that the Black Caucus should have a dinner like this in every major city where Blacks are gathered. I think it would be good if they went into the communities as a group to be seen by the Black people so that the Blacks in all areas, in all cities, can participate as you participate here tonight.

Let me say in closing that though I look at the economic structure of our society and I see the unemployment figure creeping higher so that even now executives face an unemployment rate of six percent—and I know what that means in the Black community—though it is dire, though we see drug addiction, we see our inner cities decaying, we see the imminent collapse of much that we've held dear, still, Black Congressmen, you are not without power even at this moment.

When you consider that every Monday morning, the preachers in Harlem bank \$1.5 million, maybe you Black Congressmen might tell the preachers, "Brother, it's time for you to put all that money in a Black bank somewhere." When you consider that in the course of a year, in my own Harlem community again, \$1.1 million will be spent by churches and social organizations on banquet facilities downtown, you may say to them, "Let us build our facility uptown." Let us spend our money among ourselves and think of this simple little thing here. There is one firm in New York that does the printing for the churches on Sunday at the cost of \$250,000 a year. One white firm servicing all the Black churches, \$250,000 leaving the community, never to come back. I think our 13 Congressmen might have some solution as to what we should do about things like that. I, for instance, personally need help on a problem that I have. I directed a motion picture called "Cotton Comes to Harlem" which has grossed up to date \$6.5 million. I appreciate your applause, but wait until you hear what the problem is. Now, 60 to 70 percent of the money that went across the box office came from Black people. Money that came from the Harlems of all our cities, the Harlems of all our country. Money that goes to Hollywood and it's one way; ain't coming back. I have been instrumental in helping rob, well, not rob exactly, helping borrow from my people money that we need in our own community. I need your help in structuring a way so that when the money goes to Hollywood it only stays for a little while, it doubles and comes back to the Black community.

Ladies and gentlemen, brothers and sisters, I think I've said enough. There's much that could be talked about tonight. But we are here and the fact that we are here is itself eloquent. This is a dinner that could have served without a single word. Because we know the historical significance of just sitting, looking, talking to each other of what this moment means. And if you think there are others who don't know what this moment means, you should be somewhere where the listening devices are tuned up very high.

But all I'm saying to the world, all I'm saying to that cadre of Black leadership that we have, that we want a plan. We want a plan so simple, so easy to remember that we carry it in our heads. So that if the storm of oppression should wipe us out, all out but one family, and that family was crouching somewhere in the dark, one brother would reach out to another and say, "Hey, hey man, what's the plan?"

Let us stop making history by ad hoc methods and by impromptu improvisations. Let us plan the whole thing out and give everybody his assignment and hold him strictly responsible if he doesn't carry it out. That's what it calls for. We are capable of doing it and now is the time to do just that.

Ladies and gentlemen, I can't imagine a better way to end my talk session than by calling for, and presenting to you now, a young man who has made not only a name for himself but for those of us who care about things of the spirit, those of us who care that our genius for insight, wit, love and laughter has caught fire in the person of this one young man. You know him, you love him as I do too, and it's a great honor for all of us and a pleasure for me personally to introduce to you or to present to you rather, Mr. Bill Cosby.

THE SHELTERED WORKSHOPS IN SOUTHWEST MISSOURI REPORT PROGRESS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, sheltered workshops came into existence in the State of Missouri in 1965, and since that time, the sheltered workshop program has provided productive employment opportunities to lower-range educable and upper-range trainable mentally retarded people and other handicapped individuals over the age of 16.

Recently, the Missouri Association of Sheltered Workshops notified me of the tremendous progress they have made in regard to the workshops in a number of communities of the Seventh Congressional District in Missouri.

The bulk of the money received from contracted work by these workshops must be paid to the handicapped employees. Many of the additional costs of operation, such as workman's compensation, rent, utilities, and overhead, are placing a tremendous burden on the majority of the shops. Thus, there is a continuing need by this fine industry for additional funds.

The employee of a sheltered workshop reports for work just as he would for any other employment. However, because many of the employees are from extremely low-income families, transportation can not often be provided for these workers to get to and from their work. Therefore, the staff at the workshops have been trained to fluctuate with these problems.

The managers of all of the workshops in the communities in the Seventh District of Missouri have provided me with some pertinent information concerning their progress and development.

The Carthage Area Sheltered Workshop, Inc., under the direction of Mrs. Donna Evans, employs 32 handicapped employees and serves Jasper, Vernon, and Barton Counties. Their work consists of reclaiming cheese, assembly bending wire, and packaging kits.

In Joplin, according to manager Elsy Abernathy, the Sheltered Workshop is now serving 72 handicapped people who have a high productive rate in quality

workmanship. The shop does benchwork, subassembly, collating, labeling, sorting, gluing, stapling, food salvage, inspecting, and packaging. Although the workers are not in a United Fund Agency, they participate by giving a great amount of time and work to the United Fund Drive.

The Extended Employment Workshop in Monett, under Charles Meadows, manager, employs 25 handicapped. The employees in Monett have constructed a 24 by 48-foot sheet iron building in which they make pallets, shipping boxes, and other carpentry materials. Custom weaving is also done in the workshop by means of a loom.

Near Neosho, the Crowder Area Sheltered Workshop, under manager Vernon Stonecipher, currently has 56 handicapped employees working on various types of contracts including packaging, light assembly, inspection, assembly line work, sorting and salvage, and simplified machine work. Work is also done for several industries in the Neosho area. I have visited this fine group on two occasions.

The Springfield Workshops, Inc., under manager James House, is employing 95 handicapped workers. The work done by the employees varies as their work consists of making pallets, repairing ladders and furniture, cutting and punching rubber, assembling total-tots, and inspecting cups. More than 50 local industries were used by this shop to provide them with necessary materials needed to operate.

Mr. Speaker, the sheltered workshop program in the State of Missouri has definitely had great success and made remarkable progress toward giving the mentally retarded and physically handicapped new opportunities for accomplishments that were once thought not to be possible. Many other States are now looking to the Missouri Association of Sheltered Workshops for needed guidance in this program. It is with great pride that I commend the managers of these workshops for their dedicated and continued service toward this worthwhile cause.

INDIANA HIGHWAY OFFICIALS OPPOSE DIVERSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statements by Mr. Ruel W. Steele, chairman of the Indiana State Highway Commission, and Mr. R. H. Harrell, executive director of the Indiana State Highway Commission, which were made to the Indiana congressional delegation here in Washington recently:

INDIANA HIGHWAY OFFICIALS OPPOSE DIVERSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(By Mr. Ruel W. Steele)

I would like to start by thanking our Indiana Congressional Delegation for giving of

their time to meet with us here today and giving us an opportunity to share with you our mutual highway funding problems in Indiana.

You extended us this same courtesy a year ago and each of you expressed a real interest in these mutual problems. Your continued support of our highway building program in Indiana is most appreciated. You in Congress are where the action is. It is the result of action both Congressional and Administrative at the Federal level that determines, to a large extent, how well we do back in Indiana.

We of the Indiana State Highway Commission are in a continual fight for badly needed funds, both at the State and Federal level, in order to continue our badly needed road building and maintenance programs.

If you could be with us and know that we are continuously attending meetings and listening to the repeated demands of the Mayors, County and Town Officials, Chambers of Commerce and other civic groups throughout the State pleading for the construction of highways which they badly need, you would understand the scope of these demands. The truth is that most of these demands from out in each of your districts are not only justified on a need basis but are long overdue.

It is in this atmosphere that I feel we must oppose the proposed Transportation Revenue Sharing Act of 1971, just as we have opposed all other invasions and diversions of the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

Under this proposed plan approximately 3/4 of the projected Revenue would come from the Highway Trust Fund. During the second half of fiscal year 1972, \$855 million of the proposed \$1,285 billion would come from highway user taxes.

It is interesting to note that the 6 largest States in the United States would receive 34.4 percent of this total fund.

The Federal Highway Trust Fund was created for one purpose only—to construct roads and streets. The use of this money already collected and being collected, for any other purpose, in my opinion, clearly would be breaking faith with the motorists who are taxed for the purpose of providing funds for building and maintaining roads and streets.

In my opinion upwards of \$5 billion surplus now in this Federal Highway Trust Fund absolutely should not be diverted for other purposes. From the newspaper articles, editorials and correspondence which crosses my desk daily I can assure you, in all good faith, that I feel without question this is the overwhelming sentiment of the people in Indiana.

Congress can, of course, change the purpose for which the money is used, if it chooses. But even though you should do so, in all fairness it would seem diversion should not be made from funds already collected from the motorists for the stated purpose of building highways.

With accountability for expenditures of Revenue Sharing Funds very loosely defined, the proposed Act would appear to have the reverse effect of discouraging these agencies from committing the sizeable long-term investments required to plan and complete comprehensive transportation projects.

It would further appear that the effect of Transportation Revenue Sharing on the State Highway operations could be most severe and could terminate the Federal-State partnership for all road programs except the interstate system which is nearing completion.

It further appears that the Revenue Sharing Act would, if only during fiscal year 1972, allow Highway and Airport and Airway Trust Fund Money to be diverted without limitation of use, which without question is a direct violation of the intent of the Federal statutes under which the tax was collected and the fund created.

We are trying to give the people of Indiana the very best highway program that can be provided with the dollars available. We are practicing economy to the point that we are perhaps too thin in many areas. We are doing this to try to conserve as much money as possible to let badly needed highway construction projects. We have had two banner years under this Administration but our prospects for the remaining two years are not that good.

Again I want to thank you for your presence and attention and for the many letters I have received from most of you expressing your cooperation with us and your stated opposition to the administrative cutbacks and diversion in any form of the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

I know there is now, and will likely always be, tremendous pressures exerted to divert these funds and use them for purposes other than those for which they were collected. This is true at all levels of Government.

We know that all cities and metropolitan areas need more funds, just as every State Highway Commission needs more funds. The demands for increased government services at all levels, along with the inflationary pressures, undoubtedly augment these diversion tendencies.

In closing let me reaffirm that in no area of government are these pressures greater than on the State Highway Commissions of this Country.

Again, you are our representatives here where the action is and what we are saying is HELP!

(By Mr. R. H. Harrell)

On September 17 of last year, we appeared before this distinguished group to report on our highway needs in Indiana. At that time hearings were being held on what is now known as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970.

We are happy to say that you and Congress voted to continue the Federal-State method of financing road and street construction from the Federal Trust Fund on the Interstate and the ABC System, plus the addition of the "D" System, which provides funds for the construction of needed modern highways in urban areas. The Indiana press, the majority of our citizens and correspondence received in the Highway Department, have supported the position you took on this important Legislation.

We are back here today to again point out to you the need to continue to construct Indiana Highways, on all Federal-Aid Systems (Interstate, ABC, D Systems) with Federal excise taxes collected from Indiana tax payers on motor fuels, new automobiles, motor vehicle accessories etc.

As all of you know, Indiana's constitution does not permit bonding the State to build highways on the State System. Our State has built many modern highways using the 6¢ Motor Fuel Tax, the recently added 2¢ tax passed by the 1969 General Assembly, and with the funds from the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

But, because of the ever increasing vehicle registration and the annual increase in miles traveled by each vehicle, we cannot keep up with our highway needs even under the present method of financing.

To give you an idea of these needs:

The Indiana State Highway Department has 4,367 miles of Primary and Urban highways, and 5,986 miles of Secondary roads that have not had, in the last 25 years, or since the end of World War II, the many critical improvements needed to make these highways safe for the traffic load they are forced to carry today.

Traffic fatalities alone, on all of Indiana's roads and streets, are over 1,600 persons per year, and a major portion of these are occurring on the Primary, Urban and Secondary Systems of Highways.

Over 1,500 miles of our total Primary and Urban System is in immediate need of major new construction and reconstruction. Also, an equal or larger mileage of the Secondary System needs similar type construction. Many of these roads and streets are feeder roads to the Interstate System.

Studies show that over 500 major bridges need replacement either because of their age, condition or inability to safely serve today's traffic volumes.

Railroad grade separations have been another of the forgotten programs which have not moved because of the lack of sufficient funds. The Department has 988 grade crossings on the State System, many without automobile protection.

87 miles of the Interstate System remain to be placed under construction at a cost of about 250 million dollars.

I have estimated that these needs are immediate and by immediate an arbitrary time span is set at 10 years or one decade, since in today's society a six year or more time span is required from the time a project is first set in motion until the project is open to traffic.

The today's total price tag estimated for these seriously needed construction programs is three (3) billion dollars, or about 300 million dollars annually for the next ten years.

Putting it another way, these needs are estimated to cost twice the final cost of completing Indiana's 977 miles of Interstate.

Now to give you an idea of the apparent sources of available funds to finance these needs, should the present methods of financing continue at about the present level, and without diversion of the Federal Highway Trust Fund Vehicle Taxes to other modes of transportation and without reduction for non-compliance with the Federal Billboard Law, now in contention, and periodic cutbacks, either by Executive Order or by reducing obligation authority below apportionment amounts.

After financing operational costs for maintaining our present State Highway System, plus funding all other expenses of operating the Department, at the reduced level we are operating on at the present time; about 40 million dollars remains available annually from the State's 53% share of the 6¢ Motor Fuel Tax, 32 to 35 million dollars from the State Highway's 55% share of the 2¢ Motor Fuel Tax, and 24 million dollars from the Federal Trust Fund, which requires State matching funds and is used for construction on various road and street programs on the Federal Primary, Urban and Secondary Systems.

In addition, the State Highway Department may continue to have about 50 million dollars per year available from the Federal Trust Fund for the next six years to complete the Interstate System.

To summarize apparent funds available for construction projects:

- \$40 million from the State 6¢ tax.
- \$33 million from the State 2¢ tax.
- \$24 million from the present Federal Highway Trust Fund for matching on the ABC System.
- \$50 million next six years to complete the Interstate System.
- \$147 million total for each of the next six (6) years, or until the completion of the Interstate.

After the completion of the Interstate a total of less than 100 million dollars per year would be available for the construction of new roads and streets on the State Highway System.

With our needs in the next 10 years set at 3 billion dollars, and our apparent revenue during the same period at less than 1.5 billion dollars, it is easy to see that unless Indiana is able to come up with some additional ways of financing new highway construction, the State will be left with obsolete

roads and inadequate funds to make the many necessary improvements.

Indiana has managed to keep an acceptable road building program in effect even though we, and other States, for a number of years, have had cutbacks, frozen obligations, national moratoriums, voluntary restrictions and arbitrary reduction of apportionments to a much lower obligation authority on the Federal Trust Fund money.

In addition, the States have been under constant pressure with possible penalty deductions for non-compliance with various regulations, as well as a reduction in Federal participation on some right-of-way purchases through the years.

With all of these operational restrictions, our State is, and can continue, operating successfully with this Federal-State method of financing road and street construction.

Our State is sharing road and street revenue with Indiana cities and counties from the present two sources of revenue; the 8¢ State Motor Vehicle Tax and the Federal Trust Fund money. From the Federal apportionments to the State Highway Department, all of the TOPICS money and the recently enacted "D" program funds go to the cities. Counties receive about 1/2 of all Secondary money or about 25% of the 1972 Federal apportionment for the ABCD Systems is now allocated to the cities and counties. In addition the Indiana State Highway Department maintains all State highways in cities and towns. A procedure not followed by many States in the Nation. We are not saying that the cities, counties and towns do not need additional road and street funds, but we are saying that the Indiana State Highway Department is taking a very active part in meeting urban street needs. For example, about 40% of our active construction project monies are being spent in metropolitan areas.

I personally want to thank each of you for the support you are giving our Highway program and for giving me this opportunity to review our road and street needs with you.

EULOGY ON VINCENT MONZEL

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday afternoon the family and friends of Vincent Monzel gathered in a chapel here in this city of Washington to attend a religious service in his memory. They heard not only the beautiful and consoling passages from the Scriptures delivered by the Reverend Edward Gardiner Latch, our own chaplain here in the House of Representatives, but they heard an eulogy spoken by the man Vince had served so well, our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Mr. JAMES BROYHILL.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the eulogy spoken by our distinguished colleague as a fitting memorial to his friend.

The eulogy follows:

EULOGY ON VINCENT MONZEL

We are gathered here as family and friends of Vince Monzel. As individuals, we are not all acquainted with each other. We're from different parts of the United States and some have even come from halfway around the world.

CVXVII—1417—Part 17

As friends of Vince, it is sad to think that so many of us will never be together again as a group. We're from differing backgrounds, professions, and have different interests. But one common theme runs through our minds at this time—and that is our admiration, respect, and love for our departed friend.

I won't go into the details of his life. Its many parts and facets are known to each one of us. Add together these many parts and they make the man we knew.

All of us knew of his intense interest and devotion to government. During his career on Capitol Hill, he earned the respect and admiration of Congressmen and staff members on both sides of the aisle. His willingness to be of help to new Members and their staffs was well known, his opinions were highly valued, and his advice often sought. But that is only one side of Vince as we knew him.

There were other sides which, viewed together, formed his towering personality. You know, when a diamond is taken from the earth, it has little value and it is dull in appearance.

The skill of the cutter and polisher in placing 58 sides or facets on the stone bring out the true color and brilliance of the gem . . . and as we look at the diamond in the light, we can see different appearances and hues as we view it from all sides . . . so each of us had a different view of Vince. If we were to get together to share these views, no two would be exactly the same because he was a man of many talents and interests . . . a person of tremendous capacity.

There are those here today who know of his love of people and his willingness to work overtime to help any individual no matter what his problem. And because of this interest in people, there are countless numbers who can say that, because of his help and devotion, their lives were given direction and purpose.

He was a devoted husband and father, constantly thinking of his family.

There are those here who know of Vince, the literary man . . . one who could sit and talk for hours quoting passages from the great books and debating the ideas contained therein.

The fact that Vince was a real expert in the field of music, especially opera, is not known to everyone. But the depth of his knowledge of many musical scores was well known to many including my staff, who listened to the opera along with him on Saturday mornings.

And another side of Vince was that he was a man of humor . . . one who enjoyed a good story and loved to describe in graphic detail humorous experiences from his life. I can recall as well as yesterday Vince recounting the story of his visit to the opera in Munich in the summer of 1969. When the curtain fell, the European opera star was seen to bow in Vince's direction, near the stage where he was seated. As the story goes, there was an American opera star appearing in the same performance and those in the audience saw her questioning her European colleague. It was later discovered that the conversation went something like this: "To whom are you bowing?" "I'm bowing to the Senator," said the European star. "And who is that?" "The Senator from the United States, Senator Monzel," replied the European performer. The American star then bowed, as well, and whispered to those on stage, "Why, he's a good friend of mine."

I know that we can all see the twinkle in his eye and the humor on his lips as he recalled these anecdotes from his vast experience.

Vince had a great philosophy of life. Often have I heard him say, "We are such stuff as dreams are made of." In this quote from William Shakespeare's "The Tempest," Vince

was expressing his belief that we have to do our very best, and that life is more than just eating, drinking and sleeping. Life can be as different and as varied in color as our dreams, and man should live life to the fullest, using the talents that his maker has given him.

Yes, he was a many-sided man. Someone has said that his light has gone out. But I do not believe that. Just as the light reflects from the many sides of the diamond showing the brilliance of the stones, so the recollection of the many sides of Vince adds to the brilliance of his memory.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the National Conference on Public Transportation, involving over 70 national civic organizations, was held in Washington on June 1 and 2.

Moderating this conference was Assemblyman Willie L. Brown, Jr., a member of the California State Assembly representing the 18th Assembly District in San Francisco. Assemblyman Brown also serves as chairman of the assembly ways and means committee.

Of special interest, was an address by Hazel Henderson of the Council on National Priorities entitled, "Making Democracy Work in Public Transportation."

I am placing this address in the RECORD at this time and I am sure that my colleagues will find it most interesting:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

During this conference we have explored most of the reasons why democracy has failed to work in allocating a proper share of our nation's resources to public transportation. They add up to an object lesson concerning the snowballing effect that a group of powerful special interests can have in influencing governmental decisions, economic conditions, the shape and size of our communities, the quality of our environment and our entire culture. We have also come to see how all institutions have an inbuilt predisposition to grow and empire-build until they overstep or lose sight of their original goals, and begin operating as autonomous fiefdoms. We see this here in Washington with some of our government agencies, but we also see it in every other large organization, whether religious, military or economic. As J. Kenneth Galbraith points out in his book "The New Industrial State" this phenomenon can now be observed in our large corporations. He believes that their power is now so great that the consumer, whom they originally set out to serve, is no longer king, but these great producing companies which can now manipulate government decisions as well as the consumer through massive advertising.

Nowhere is this state of affairs more clear than in the field of transportation, where the combined corporate power of the auto manufacturers, oil, construction and rubber companies have so dominated the market that they have almost driven out all other competing modes of transportation; and in many cases, making it all but impossible to get around without being forced to buy a car. Henry Ford's proverbial statement that the

American consumer could have any color car he wanted as long as it was black, has become more prophetic than he dreamed! This predisposition of big powerful companies to dictate what kind of products they will produce, and then use hard-sell, saturation advertising to market them is in large part responsible for the backlash of "consumerism" and rising demands for more participation in decisions that shape our lives. We have found that our dollar is no longer enough to signal to companies what we would like to buy, because the choices have become narrower. We cannot choose to buy a pollution-free car and Henry Ford II has just pronounced our Federal clean air goals for 1975 "impossible." We cannot even choose to walk or cycle in safety in many areas!

Economists would call such a state of affairs a "market failure" and it is just this kind of market failure that has occurred over the years in transportation. If the transportation market were operating freely according to the economic textbooks, and the consumer alone were dictating the production decisions (rather than a very few huge corporations, combined will all manner of subsidies favoring automobiles) we might have a very different, pluralistic system, offering a wide range of options to the consumer. They might include safe and adequate provisions for walkers and cyclists for the short trips; quiet, non-polluting individual vehicles, more and better urban subways, buses and jitneys of various sizes for in-city transit; fast suburban-urban trains and express buses on open highway lanes for commuters; intermediate and long-range inter-city trains, as well as the conventional highway and airlines.

So we have gathered here and explored this particular "market failure" and seen how other forms of transportation gradually declined as the power of the auto and highway related industries grew. Gradually they were able to wring favorable subsidies, bond issues and taxes to support their further growth, while "externalizing" from their own balance sheets the increasing, but hidden, environment and social costs, which have only recently become evident in pollution, suburban sprawl and the slow destruction of our cities. To paraphrase the elder Ford, we now find that we can have almost any kind of transportation we want, as long as it is a car!

We have all come together because in one way or another, these social and environmental costs have begun to affect the groups of citizens we represent. We know just how this automobile-dominated transportation system affects or disenfranchises the young, the old, the handicapped, the residents of inner cities, suburbs and rural areas, as well as all of the groups we represent. Other people have not found institutional voices to articulate their problems, perhaps because they merely share my fear of driving in heavy traffic, or on our super highways in between menacingly large trailers and trucks at terrifying speeds.

So how do we go about re-asserting consumer sovereignty in designing a new multi-option transportation system? Many efforts have already been mounted. Some hardy souls take the individual approach by defying city traffic and attempting to bicycle, in spite of the physical danger and overwhelming exhaust fumes. Or according to a recent *Wall Street Journal* article, many business executives have just given up on the commuting snarl and run their affairs by telephone and mail from their homes or country clubs. I'm sure many of us have wondered how many human transactions really need a face-to-face meeting, and whether we could manage as well by using the telephone and other forms of communication which might substitute on occasions for all this frenzied

rushing back and forth. Unfortunately, most of us are not as lucky as those corporate executives; we have to show up on the job in spite of the travelling problems! Some communities and cities like New York have taken the approach of trying to win back territory from the automobile by closing streets and creating pedestrian malls with varying success. Many groups have skirmished with highway engineers and insensitive city planners, and managed to block construction of ill-designed freeways in such cities such as San Francisco and New Orleans, and many others. Conservationists have waged a long standing war against badly-planned highways and anti-pollution groups have taken on the noise and exhaust fumes of the internal combustion engine. I think most of us feel a debt of gratitude to Ralph Nader for his tireless, intelligent efforts to improve so many aspects of the consumer's lot, particularly in auto safety. Others have joined the fight for no-fault insurance to lower rates and relieve our congested courts of millions of time-wasting, traffic-related cases, which prevent others from receiving speedy trials. Consumer groups have also worked hard for better-built, longer lasting cars, without meaningless style changes and other frills. A recent study by Bradford Snell in *Yale Law Review* shows that the big 3 auto makers spent \$1.5 billion to restyle 1969 models, and yet the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that the 1969's had a net reduction of \$3 each in performance improvements. Still other groups have pressed for special consideration of the needs of the old and young, the poor and the handicapped, in both public and private transportation. Planners have produced blueprints for dream transit systems, and whole new towns, such as Reston, Virginia and Columbia, Maryland have tried through total design to tame the automobile. Aerospace companies such as LTV, Grumman, Rohr Aircraft and North American Rockwell are announcing in new advertising campaigns that they are eager to serve the market for public transportation, and many of them have won contracts for demonstration projects. Other companies such as General Electric have already helped build new systems, like the Lindenwold line which links Philadelphia with its New Jersey suburbs, and the Turbotrain and Metroliner systems between Boston, New York and Washington.

So, with all this activity, why has there been so little progress? Could it be that up until very recently none of us was sufficiently aware of each others efforts, because we were all working in such very different ways to bring some improvement to the overall transportation system? Could it be that we never realized how many of us there were: enough of us in fact, so that if we got ourselves together we could forge a coalition with enough steam and political muscle to get public transportation up and running? Certainly the multiplicity of concerns that produced our many-faceted activities made it very difficult for us to see them as parts of a larger effort to solve one big problem: the overall, national transportation mess. For example, conservationists opposing a freeway which would divide a park area in Minnesota might not instantly recognize their kinship with inner-city organizations in a city like Washington, who were opposing a freeway which would divide their community just as disastrously. Or public health groups in respiratory or heart disease prevention, who were busy fighting automobile pollution, may not have appreciated their commonality of interest with similar organizations representing the interests of victims of handicapping diseases, or blind-

ness in their efforts for better-designed transportation. And meanwhile, the planners dreamed of funds to implement their blueprints, and companies waited on the sidelines to see if anyone really meant business. I believe that it is largely due to this fragmentation of efforts and lack of communication between groups, that we have never fully come together and explored the commonality of our transportation needs and defined precisely that area where all of our constituencies' vital interests overlap. In fact, we have often been somewhat suspicious of each other's interests and motives, fearing that they were irreconcilable with our own. Sometimes we have almost come to blows. A hearing in Milwaukee last year on whether to complete construction of a freeway was a perfect example. The highway construction companies and the unions demanded that the highway be completed, while the homeowners in its path and the conservation groups bitterly opposed the project. Such situations are indeed complicated by the fact that vital interests of the parties are too immediate to permit assessment of the project by larger, more objective standards. If there were time to develop feasible alternatives, perhaps another more pressing public construction project, or a commuter rail line down the center of an existing highway, such as the one in Chicago; there might have been a way to avoid the clash without human disruption or unemployment. But unfortunately, there is rarely time to work out equitable solutions and often the artificial carrot of Federal funds, pre-programmed for highway spending makes reallocation of priorities all but impossible.

Certainly many group's current interests tend to be vested in an existing system as pervasive as our highway-automobile complex. They include jobs, investments, academic or professional careers, such as highway engineering, as well as all the economic dependents of this vast industrial system; dealers, spare parts and repair shops, gas station franchises and dozens of other small businesses. But in spite of this, many of us are beginning to realize that all technologies have their own peculiar life-cycles progressing through growth to saturation and obsolescence, and that the auto is no exception. It too is reaching the limits of its growth potential. This can be seen clearly not only in proliferating highways, traffic jams and rising pollution, but documented in respected business publications, such as the *Wall Street Journal* of April 23rd, 1971 and *Fortune* in several articles over the past year, the latest in April 1971, as well as in *Business Week*, March 14, 1970.

So we should now stop focusing on what past conditions prevented us from working out ancient, deeply mired conflicts and instead, begin to concentrate on watching the shape of future national priorities and how we can help shape them. If we do this we can begin sharing in the development of new projects in which we can cooperate out of new mutual self-interests. We are now beginning to watch where the new transportation growth will occur as the exponential curve of automobile growth shows the first signs of collapsing. The new growth must surely come in filling the need for fast, clean, efficient public transit systems, and in re-making our cities for more human forms of travel, including walking and cycling. Here is where the new capital must surely flow and where the new jobs will eventually be created. But if this is to happen, we and many others like us, representing the interests of consumers, must come together and define what kind of systems we want and are willing to pay for. But the economics of

this new market we are trying to create will have to be a little different from a normal market, which has failed in this area. It will be a special kind of market which economists sometimes call a "public-sector market", which occurs when normal market mechanisms have been thwarted, as they have in transportation. So we create a public-sector market when we group together in sufficient numbers, decide what we want and then buy it as a collective, or "cooperative buying group". We have hundreds of such "cooperative buying groups" today of all sizes, and their numbers are growing because most of our unmet needs are now group needs, rather than individual needs, such as clean air and water or airports and parks. In many cases we use our municipal and state governments as our purchasing agents. They act for us in buying sewage treatment plants, schools or airports. If the item we want to buy is very large, such as a national system for old-age or disability insurance, we empower the Federal Government to act as our purchasing agent, or even set up the system itself, as in the case of Social Security or the new Environmental Protection Administration which is charged with protecting our communal drinking water and air. It's interesting to note that in the case of water, some of us are beginning to exercise our individual consumer demand too, by buying bottled water, and the ordinary market mechanism is now responding by producing an ever larger selection of bottled water from which to choose.

So our challenge now is to begin drawing together a new "consumer cooperative" to service our group consumer demand for a more varied choice of transportation, including the expensive new public systems that only our group, buying power can bring into being. Now we know that our group buying power at the Federal level of taxation is enormous: big enough to have permitted our Federal purchasing agents to spend some \$70 billion a year of it on military programs and further billions on space and building more highways. But we should not be surprised at this because we know how large institutions, such as government bureaucracies, tend to forget that they are supposed to be our purchasing agents, and in fact, under pressure from powerful lobbies, they have begun spending our money in ways we didn't intend, anticipate or consent to! So if we want to regain control over the spending of some of our money, we are going to have to form a coalition strong enough to convince our elected and appointed officials that they must forget some of their own pet projects, and start voting the funds necessary to start public transportation rolling. We can also make sure that they realize that as the Indo-China War is being wound down by the Administration, they must resist budget-padding by the Department of Defense, and divert some funds into public transit and other badly needed domestic programs. Furthermore, unemployment rates are high enough now, but we must impress on these officials that they should also imagine the situation when thousands of G.I.'s join the unemployment lines in the months ahead. We need to create new programs to provide jobs for all our workers, but not based on the saturated needs of the past, but the real unmet needs in our public-sector markets of the future; not only public transportation, but health care, housing, new towns and pollution control, grass-roots cable television system to help recreate electronically, the "town-meeting" style of local government, and of course, education and self-enrichment for adults as well as children. These areas of real consumer demand will provide opportunities for the growth industries of the next decade;

but only we consumers, out of our own self-interest, will have the incentive needed to organize that demand into a coherent and powerful force that can create these public-sector markets. We know we can do it, because we see that it has already happened in the pollution control and recycling field, where ordinary citizens and consumers created such a demand for environmental cleanups that an industry emerged to serve it, which is one of the fastest-growing areas of our economy and is already providing thousands of new jobs. In fact, the U.S. Dept. of Labor Statistics estimates that as of 1970, there were 655,900 new jobs created in environmental control, and that this figure would increase to 1,181,800 jobs by 1980! We cannot expect most of our older, bigger companies to play much of a role in developing these new industries, because they have too much invested in the current and past technologies. But some of our more innovative companies as well as a host of smaller, newer firms are eagerly waiting to serve our transportation needs.

But there is also another important reason why we must take the leadership role in pressing for these new transportation systems, and that is because we represent its future consumers, and if these consumers are to remain sovereign in this new marketplace, we must help them participate in the designs, in setting standards, and only then empower our government purchasing agents to award the contracts. If we do not move soon to define these consumer needs and push for their incorporation into the designs, demonstration projects, appropriations and the contracts; then we will have ceded yet another area to the company lobbyists who are already busy trying to sell their own idea of public transit projects to government agencies at all levels. A perfect example of a project designed by producer in this topsyturvy way is the SST. There was no great outcry from ordinary citizens demanding an SST, most people can't afford to fly very much in a regular plane. But the aerospace industry and a small handful of aviation enthusiasts wanted it and almost managed to impose it on us after spending millions of our taxes to pump up the aircraft industry. But the very citizens who joined together to fight the SST proved their concern for the unfortunate workers caught in the middle, by also pushing for new public works and transportation projects to cushion the blow in Seattle and other hard-hit areas.

We can avoid repetitions of such human dislocation by getting together on projects we will all benefit from, and mass transportation is a good area in which to begin. We can start small, hammering away at the simplest projects, such as reserving open lanes on our freeways for express buses, so that they will be able to compete with the automobile in faster commuting time, if nothing else. We can see that environmental pollution standards recently set by the Environmental Protection Administration are enforced, which will finally force municipalities to reduce automobile access to central cities, simply to meet maximum permissible carbon monoxide standards. In the transportation vacuum this move may create, we can push for refurbishing subway and bus services to attract the new riders. During the recent taxi strike in New York, the City's bus and subways added millions in fares. If the strike had gone on for long enough, the City Transit Authority might have actually started making profits! Or consider the possibilities for minority group entrepreneurship in setting up, perhaps with Small Business Administration or MESBIC-type loans, small locally-owned and operated bus and jitney companies to take the often trapped or carless inner-city workers to the sub-

urban industrial parks, where so many of the jobs are moving. In New York City alone, 72,000 jobs evaporated in the past year, and such bus lines could help alleviate the inner-city unemployment problems that the corporate moveouts to the suburbs are creating.

Some communities are discovering that their school bus fleets are under-utilized. They are putting them to work during school hours for shopping runs and after school for trips to theaters, movies and evening sporting events. The revenues help fatten up the school's coffers, or help with maintenance and repairs. All the while we are testing these modest programs, we must form local coalitions to push for funding for the more ambitious projects.

If we can go forward from here, forgetting some of our past or current differences, and concentrate on working towards the positive and exciting goals put forward at this conference, we will not only help create a more human transportation system and more livable surroundings, but also a whole new industry and thousands of new jobs at all levels. We will also help prove that America can re-order her priorities with a minimum of disruption and hardship, away from the military-industrial-complex toward a more humanly-oriented "life-industrial-complex".

NATIONAL CITIZENS' COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

American Association of Retired Persons.
 American Association of University Women.
 American Public Health Association.
 Americans for Indian Opportunity.
 Boy Scouts of America.
 Campfire Girls.
 Center for Science in the Public Interest.
 Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs.
 Central Atlantic Environment Service.
 Citizens for a Quieter City.
 Committee for Community Affairs.
 Concern, Inc.
 Conservation Foundation.
 Consumer Federation of America.
 Council on Economic Priorities.
 Environmental Action.
 Environmental Defense Fund.
 Epilepsy Foundation of America.
 Friends of the Earth.
 Goodwill Industries of America, Inc.
 Highway Action Coalition.
 Interstate Research Associates.
 Izaak Walton League of America.
 League of Conservation Voters.
 League of Women Voters of the U.S.
 Metropolitan Washington Coalition for Clean Air.
 Metropolitan Washington Housing & Planning Association.
 Mexican-American Youth Organization.
 Minority Contractors' Assistance Project.
 National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
 National Association of Conservation Districts.
 National Association of Hearing & Speech Agencies.
 National Association of Minority Contractors.
 National Association of Railroad Passengers.
 National Audubon Society.
 National Coalition on the Transportation Crisis.
 National Committee on Household Employment.
 National Consumers League.
 National Council of Negro Women.
 National Council of Senior Citizens.
 National Council on Aging.
 National Farmers Union.
 National Institutes on Rehabilitation & Health Services.
 National Organization of Women.
 National Paraplegia Foundation.

National Parks & Recreation Association.
 National Recreation & Park Association.
 National Rehabilitation Association.
 National Retired Teachers Association.
 National Tenants Organization.
 National Trust for Historic Preservation.
 National Tuberculosis & Respiratory Disease Association.
 National Urban Coalition.
 National Urban League.
 National Welfare Rights Organization.
 National Wildlife Federation.
 Natural Resources Defense Council.
 Nature Conservancy.
 Opportunities Industrialization Centers.
 Paralyzed Veterans of America.
 Polls '76, Inc.
 Rocky Mountain Center on Environment.
 Scientists' Institute for Public Information.
 Sierra Club.
 Southwest Council of La Raza.
 Student Committee on Pollution & the Environment.
 The Wilderness Society.
 Travelers Aid Association of America.
 Young Men's Christian Association.
 Youth Organizations United.
 Zero Population Growth.

WHO SAYS RADIO EXPIRED WITH TV? NOT FOLKS AT WCCO, MINNEAPOLIS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in the 1930's airmail pilots noted that the Twin Cities darkened shortly after WCCO radio's 10 o'clock evening news reported by the late Cedric Adams ended. A June 21, 1971, story in the National Observer indicates that WCCO radio still plays a very large role in the life of the upper Midwest. And anyone who has lived in the area served by WCCO knows that it is no exaggeration to describe it as "one of the most listened-to radio stations in the Nation."

Michael Putney's feature accurately portrays one of the dominating features of my home area. WCCO is truly a giant of the Midwest.

The article follows:

WHO SAYS RADIO EXPIRED WITH TV? NOT FOLKS AT WCCO, MINNEAPOLIS

(By Michael Putney)

It's 6:30 a.m. on a typical Tuesday morning and those two zany cut-ups on WCCO Radio, Rog Erickson and Maynard Speece, are up to their usual tricks.

"Hey, Rog," Maynard asks innocently between a hymn by Burl Ives and the July wheat futures, "Didja hear the one about the doctor who told his patient, 'Between your big, happy family at home and your big, happy family at the office you've got a big, happy ulcer?'"

Corny? Admittedly, and no one, certainly not the Messrs. Erickson and Speece, would pretend otherwise.

Popular? You might as well ask if it gets cold here in winter. From the tables down at Murray's on Sixth Street to the most remote northwoods hamlet, people are listening to WCCO and loving it. In fact, upwards of 1,300,000 listeners in five states tune in WCCO every week, making it one of the most

listened-to radio stations in the nation—and unquestionably the most dominant in any major metropolitan area.

"More people watch WCCO Radio than TV!" trumpets advertising for the station in broadcasting trade journals. If that doesn't quite parse, station promotion manager Chuck Hartley sorts it out: "It means that even when *The Today Show* is on here, we're delivering about 10 times more listeners than they've got viewers."

For the sake of comparison, there are more than 4,300 commercial AM radio stations licensed to broadcast in the U.S., only 23 of them 50,000-watt clear-channel stations like WCCO, whose signal blankets Minnesota, Wisconsin, the Dakotas, and Iowa. Most of the others, judging from what they send out over their airwaves, are animated by H. L. Mencken's aphorism on the intelligence of the American public.

WCCO, however, has grown rich and famous (but not fat) by not underestimating the intelligence of its public for the past 46 years. In recent years, specifically, that means programing rooted in the belief that the listener who enjoys waking up to the July wheat futures and corny jokes from the Reader's Digest is the same one who's eager to hear measured, intelligent news reporting and analysis over breakfast.

Too, he's the same one who's interested enough in what his neighbors think to listen to a telephone call-in show, appreciates a fishing report and more news en route home from the office, will tolerate a little polka music by Frankie Yankovic to hear a James Taylor ballad before the Minnesota Twins baseball game begins, and goes to sleep lulled by the slightly dated sophistication of Franklin Hobbs' "Hobbs House."

Nothing startling or unusual in the fare; nearly every radio station has some of it, but almost none does it all or as well as WCCO.

"We're not top-20 or top-40 or top-100 radio," explains Gordon Mikkelsen, WCCO special-events director. "It may sound corny, but I guess you could say we're top-10,000 radio—we've got something for everyone."

"We're great believers in building audiences by ones," says Mr. Mikkelsen. "If there is any key to our success it's that we serve our listeners very, very well. Call our approach warm or folksy or schmaltzy or whatever, but essentially it means treating our listeners with consideration and respect."

Indeed, first, there are no "ladies and gentleman" in WCCO's 110-county, five-state coverage area, just individuals. Nor are you likely to ever hear a WCCO announcer (a term, incidentally, that is eschewed along with disc jockey in favor of the more grandiose "communicator") refer to a listener "out there in radioland" or even "up" in Brainerd, "out" in Pierre, or "over" in St. Paul. Conversations on WCCO are personal, one-to-one, and intimate even when they're as agonizingly banal as any you can hear on the raunchiest top-40 rocker.

"The men I work with are really masters of communication," says 26-year-old Steve Edstrom, the junior member of the station's announcing staff by at least a decade. "Sure, a lot of what they say may be cornball, but I can't condemn someone for understanding his audience."

That understanding has been fostered by long-standing corporate and individual involvement by WCCO personnel in a gamut of community activities here and by an intensive effort by Director of Community Affairs Jim Bormann to determine and report on the needs, interests, and problems of communities in WCCO's sprawling nonmetropolitan area.

For 20 years the station's news director, Mr. Bormann now spends every other week

visiting with community leaders, public officials, and local news paper editors in rural Minnesota, the Dakotas, Iowa, and Wisconsin. "These people are really pleased that an institution in the Twin Cities is interested in them," says Mr. Bormann. "They're in competition with the Twin Cities in many ways, but they're also drawn to them like a magnet. For these people WCCO is a link to the big city." And conversely, WCCO is a link for many first-generation city dwellers to their rural roots.

Like the old dope peddler whom Tom Lehrer immortalized, WCCO has also done well by doing good. Owned by Midwest Radio-Television, Inc., which also owns WCCO-TV here, WCCO Radio reportedly grossed in the neighborhood of \$5,000,000 last year, of which \$3,000,000 was said to be profit. For the record, management spokesman simply smile and call the station "profitable." With prime time costing \$165 per minute, it should be.

Not everyone, of course, finds something to suit his tastes on WCCO, especially young people who refuse to stomach even a little Frankie Yankovic to get to Elton John when competitors WDGX or KDWB will give them little else but Elton John. Even more dissatisfied recently was Minneapolis Star columnist Jim Klobuchar, who took the station to task for its tornado-warning service, consisting of an "electronic arsenal of blood-freezing klaxons, beepers, high-pitched whistles, and psyched-up announcers."

That testy criticism bothers WCCO management a lot less than the prospect of complacency. "We're where we are because we have a staff of very professional people," comments WCCO General Manager Phil Lewis. "And we're trying constantly to keep from collecting dust, from getting fat."

A RESOLUTION OF THE STUDENT SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO, IN SUPPORT OF ENDING THE DRAFT

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the explicit request of the vice-president of the student association of the University of Texas at El Paso, Mr. Porfirio Montes, I should like to request that the resolution of the Student Senate of the University of Texas at El Paso regarding the ending of the draft be entered in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ENDING THE DRAFT

Whereas, The U.S. Constitution expressly prohibits any form of involuntary servitude and

Whereas, The Selective Service Act is in violation of that prohibition, and

Whereas, The draft has by its nature discriminated against impoverished, ethnic and racial minorities,

Be It Hereby Resolved; That the Student Association expresses its opposition to the extension of the Selective Service Act.

Be It Enacted; That copies of this bill be sent to all members of congress, the President and the Director of the Draft.

PAT MOSHER,

President-Student Association.

PORFIRIO MONTES,

President-Student Senate.

TODAY'S BUILDING INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise my colleagues of important new developments in the building industry that have a direct bearing on an area of great concern—runaway construction costs.

Despite the current inflationary spiral, a new building concept has been successfully implemented to help hold the line on construction costs for government as well as private sector building projects.

A leading owner-builder Tishman Realty & Construction Co., Inc., has perfected this approach, known as the construction manager technique.

And very importantly, the Tishman organization has demonstrated how Government agencies can utilize this approach to save tax dollars by exercising more prudent construction practices.

The construction manager is not a general contractor. He is not merely a builder who methodically follows a prescribed building plan. The construction manager is a professional, who takes charge of a building project from its earliest design stage to completion.

This consultant/contractor, working with the architect and engineer from the outset, reacts to the project plans with practical, money-saving, alternate suggestions; manages the bidding procedure; and awards the contracts in behalf of the owners.

The construction manager is retained for a fee, directly negotiated with the project sponsor. As a result, the construction management team reviews and evaluates design changes in light of clear-cut cost advantages for the project sponsor. There is little such incentive for austerity in the traditional general contractor approach because design variations can add handsomely to the contractor's price.

In addition to negotiating the bids and passing on savings, formerly absorbed by the general contractor, to the project sponsor, the Tishman construction manager technique stimulates the subcontractors to use their special expertise to provide better, more efficient approaches to their respective phases of a project.

For example, bids on one major project came in significantly over budget because of labor costs in a particular trade. At Tishman's urging, a subcontractor circumvented the problem by using larger units of material to complete the work. The savings in labor costs by far offset the increased material costs.

The management expertise and construction know-how of the construction management staff have a sophisticated computer back-up, namely cost information and scheduling programs.

With detailed cost information, assembled from Tishman field reports, the construction manager can project a realistic budget. He can track costs product

by product and trade by trade, anywhere in the Nation.

Cost trends are noted while the project is in progress so that the sponsor knows the exact financial condition of a job at all times. In some cases, awareness of these cost trends can even result in the use of an alternate system or product at considerable savings.

The scheduling program flags timetable variances that may jeopardize the successful fulfillment of the project schedule. Warned of such variances, the construction manager can make necessary adjustments to get the project back on schedule.

This sophisticated system also provides subcontractors with monthly reports indicating what each is to accomplish during a given period to maintain schedule.

Tishman's present-day computer technology is directly related to the fact that the company was able to anticipate the computer's value to the building industry. The available cost data makes the job of projecting a budget a realistic undertaking. This is vital to a developer, who otherwise might underestimate his financial requirements and later have to renegotiate his financing from a disadvantageous position and at an inopportune time. On the other hand, a budget mistakenly calculated as excessive might also persuade a sponsor to abandon his plan to build.

The Tishman organization has compiled its expertise by building commercial and residential facilities for more than 75 years. The company is an owner as well as builder. By 1972, there will be some 12.2 million square feet of commercial space—prime space in key cities across the Nation—in its own portfolio.

Tishman's current construction involvement now exceeds \$1.5 billion. Construction is underway on five new Tishman-owned properties, while the company is also active as construction manager on 10 other projects for individual sponsors and quasi-government agencies.

Tishman-owned properties are located in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Cleveland, San Francisco, Rochester, among others.

The company applies the same craftsmanship and disciplines used on projects for its own account to the work it does for others as construction manager.

Among the complexes where Tishman has successfully employed the construction manager approach, are the World Trade Center, the Hancock Building in Chicago, Centre Square to be Philadelphia's largest twin office towers and the Theme Complex, the mammoth commercial and entertainment center in Los Angeles.

Tishman also has become involved in airport redevelopment and is even recognized internationally as consultant for Europe's tallest office building-to-be, the Tour Apogee in Paris.

Tishman's role in the redevelopment of Newark airport is a good example of how the construction manager can coordinate a project involving both public and private sectors. Tishman was assigned by the Port of New York Author-

ity to build the shell structures for two terminals, and will also carry out the interior space improvements and operations facilities in one terminal that will house three airlines, Trans World, United, and Piedmont.

Furthermore, the Tishman Organization through its subsidiary Tishman Research Corp., has most commendably devoted its energies to a wide spectrum and public-interest problems such as low-cost housing a fire safety.

Established some 12 years ago, Tishman Research has successfully blended brain with construction brawn in a far-reaching consulting operation that serves clients ranging from industrial accounts to the Government agencies.

SAVINGS TAX DOLLARS THROUGH PRUDENT CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

When the Federal Government discovered unhappily that its building programs took too long and cost too much to complete, Tishman Research was hired to study the problem.

Tishman, under contract to the National Bureau of Standards, funded by the General Services Administration, found that the Federal office building projects took twice as long and cost one and one-half times more to build than similar projects handled by the private sector.

An overhaul of Federal construction practices was recommended, patterned after the construction manager approach as developed and implemented by the parent Tishman Co.

The study showed how the Government could reap substantial savings by updating its methodology. The advice: Instead of the antiquated classical general contractor approach, use a professional construction manager working in tandem with the architect to anticipate construction problems and take advantage of opportunities in design; and to bring the competitive bidding process into the open at the level of all the specialty trades. This would allow the Federal Government to keep savings which traditionally belonged to the general contractor.

This was linked to examples of how the parent organization used this approach in the construction of public and private major buildings.

The Public Building Service responded promptly and has announced that it will adopt the new management approach.

Tishman Research Corp. is helping others develop many new and major advances in the building sciences through its technology program which is the only one of its kind in the Nation.

Among those who have been Tishman Research clients are: Alcoa, Dow Chemical, U.S. Gypsum, Owens-Corning, and the Urban Development Corporation of New York, Johns-Manville, American Gas Association, York Division of Borg Warner, U.S. Department of Commerce, IBM, U.S. Steel & Corning Glass. Also, Tishman Research has advised on projects funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development—HUD.

Able to identify practical innovation, and then test new products/systems and methods in day-to-day Tishman build-

ing projects, the Tishman Research arm, is concerned primarily with applied technology for multistory commercial and residential buildings.

HOUSING

Much of the present-day thinking on technology for housing rehabilitation has sprung from Tishman's early work in the field. As a consultant on projects funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development—HUD, Tishman pioneered a number of new rehabilitation concepts. Tishman also helped HUD's predecessor, HHFA, in the developments of cost-reduction techniques for low-income, multifamily housing.

Today many HUD-financed rehabilitations and new construction projects are using systems and types of construction springing from Tishman Research recommendations and findings on interior partitions, flooring, ceilings, windows, exterior walls, mechanical systems, and many others.

The Tishman organization also introduced split-level apartments on a major project to the United States, and developed a low-cost dry-floor construction for apartment buildings, and led in practical solutions to achieve acoustical privacy between apartments.

As a consultant to New York State's Urban Development Corporation—UDC—Tishman Research outlined 10 innovations with potential savings of 11 percent in construction cost and 36 percent in construction time.

These included prefabricated brick panels, improved time temperature rated interior wall systems, factory-produced plumbing walls, alternative structural systems, and an "instant painting" technique by which a two-bedroom apartment could be painted in 40 minutes.

Tishman also developed a cost assessment analytical tool, called the Analog, to help UDC evaluate new construction concepts in relation to actual context of a building.

The Analog is a series of standard costs taken from standard buildings which may be stored in a computer's memory and periodically updated.

The Analog enables UDC to make a bona fide comparison between the innovation and the components or function it would replace. In short, the tool helps translate benefits in terms of time and money. UDC is using the Analog beneficially.

Fire safety—Tishman Research is constantly on the lookout for new ways to fireproof steel without polluting the air—to make safe buildings safer—and expects much progress in this and the entire fire safety area soon.

NEW BUILDING PRODUCTS

"Dry" building—Tishman anticipated the construction cost spiral that was about to start in the early 1960's. The problem: a way had to be found to somehow condense the construction cycle and minimize costs.

The solution: Tishman assisted its client U.S. Gypsum in the development of a fire rated dry shaft wall, which now

replaces conventional masonry and plaster walls and results in astounding savings in both time and labor.

Predecessors to such wall systems could not be used—economically or from a performance standpoint—for elevator enclosures or stairwalls. But the new product changed all that. The parent Tishman company introduced it to several of its buildings with "grade A" results, "debugging" the new system right on the jobs. Once proven, the product was used in the World Trade Center and saved more than \$1 million by eliminating the need for temporary 24-hour heat and masonry cleanup chores. A second generation version of the shaft wall has been introduced with additional performance and economic benefits.

The Tishman organization has been the pacesetter for building technology for decades, benefiting the average citizen as well as the business community through achievements in housing and office construction.

In the 1940's and 1950's Tishman led the development of the factory fabricated metal curtain wall, a revolutionary departure from the expensive painstaking use of stone and granite exterior facades. We take this development of only a generation ago for granted now. In the 1960's Tishman led the way of "dry" interior construction. And its spirit for the seventies' is to pioneer in the area of structural and mechanical systems, while continuing to improve upon the exterior and interior wall developments of the previous decades. However, above all and at all times Tishman strives to put together all the parts of a building more efficiently, effectively, and economically—in the interests of public and private sectors.

I suggest that the expertise evidenced by efforts of the Tishman organization, an outstanding example of a good corporate citizen in the private sector, could well be used in helping to solve some of the problems related to housing and the building industry that we deal with. And, accordingly, I recommend that Messrs. Robert V. Tishman, Alan V. Tishman, and John L. Tishman, the principal executive officers who have directed the company's unparalleled successes, be invited to participate at appropriate conferences called to discuss such matters. In addition, we should also draw on the professional talents of appropriate senior officers and department heads of the company, in particular Joseph H. Newman, vice president of Tishman Research, who was recently named chairman of the building advisory board of the prestigious National Academy of Science.

ARTICLE BY GLENN MARTZ

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the following article

by Mr. Glenn Martz, director of information, seafoods division, of the Alabama Department of Conservation, with my colleagues. The article recently appeared in the Foley Onlooker, an Alabama newspaper, as follows:

PUBLIC RELATIONS, SEAFOODS DIVISION OF ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

(By Glenn Martz)

Alabama has been aptly described as a gallant Southern lady—head pillowed in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains—feet dangling in the Gulf of Mexico.

She is all this charming metaphor implies. And much more.

A geographical and climatic contradiction she is a bouquet of camellias and snow-covered hills in the dead of winter—a tarpon leaping high in gulf waters trying to shake a fisherman's hook, a bevy of cardinals flashing through green thickets.

Alabama is a field of white cotton under a canopy of blue sky.

She is a mountain of precious iron ore—a million pines gently swaying in the wind.

She is Mobile Bay and a necklace of lagoons stretching all the way from Perdido Bay through Gulf Shores to Mississippi Sound—a land of ancient oaks, mistletoe, and Spanish moss.

She is the southern loop of the Tennessee River—a strip of sugarwhite beach sand lapped by waters and tides for untold centuries.

Alabama is a fishing trawler bobbing on wind-tossed waves, a school of porpoises playing follow-the-leader, an ocean freighter, a banana boat silhouetted on a distant horizon.

She is a sorghum mill, a turpentine still, a cotton gin, and a space center turning out moonships.

She is a land of neat farmsteads sprinkled with ante-bellum homes, magnolia blossoms, and flaming azaleas—a delta vegetable garden as big as all outdoors, laced with buttercup meadows.

Alabama is Hernando de Soto in search of gold—the playground of legendary pirate Jean Lafitte—the Ave Maria Grotto, an Indian mound dating back to antiquity.

She is Admiral Farragut shouting "Damn the torpedoes! Full speed ahead!"—a Confederate flag flying over fortresses of a lost, but sincere, cause—historic Fort Morgan—the world's largest iron statue—Vulcan—overlooking the "Little Pittsburgh of the South", busy Birmingham.

A scenic wonderland, she is an enchantress without peer.

A lodestar of unspoiled natural beauty and abundance, she was coveted and courted by three major European powers.

More battles have been fought for her possession than any other single area on the continent.

Seven flags have alternately flown over her ramparts signifying successful conquests.

She has enough iron in her hills to build a million battleships—enough timber to bridge the Atlantic.

She has enough fish in her coastal waters to feed her people for all time to come, enough freshwater streams and underground reservoirs to quench man's thirst for untold centuries.

She is the Heart of Dixie beating with unhurried rhythm, a healing sanctuary for those with jaded nerves, a bonanza of unlimited possibilities for men dreaming of industrial empires or quiet retreat.

This is Alabama—charming, unique, friendly, intriguing—Nature's last outpost of natural beauty.

To each and all she beckons with an inviting finger.

Which, in quaint language of the South, signifies "ya'all come! Hear?"

PROPOSED INTERNMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR IN NEUTRAL COUNTRIES

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, 7 years and 94 days have elapsed since Capt. Floyd Thompson was captured in South Vietnam and became the first prisoner of war in Southeast Asia. Since that time numerous American military personnel have suffered a similar fate.

The agony endured by those who are being held prisoner, as well as their families who are awaiting their safe return, must not be forgotten as we go about our daily business. These brave men are constantly being subjected to physical and psychological stresses that the average American cannot even imagine, much less survive. We owe them nothing less than our constant efforts to secure their humane treatment and early release.

One such effort is represented by the letter which I, along with 143 of my colleagues, addressed to the Honorable David Bruce, our chief negotiator in Paris, suggesting that we seek the internment of prisoners of war in neutral countries. A copy of this letter follows, together with the reply received from Ambassador Bruce:

APRIL 26, 1971.

Hon. DAVID K. E. BRUCE,
Head, U.S. Delegation to Paris Meeting on Vietnam, American Embassy, Paris, France.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned Members of the United States House of Representatives, are deeply concerned over the failure of North Vietnam to abide by the terms of the Geneva Convention pertaining to prisoners of war.

We recognize that the United States has repeatedly urged adherence to the terms of the Convention through diplomatic channels and that those efforts have been unsuccessful. We now suggest that it is time other nations joined in an effort to secure adherence by North Vietnam to the terms of the Convention.

Article I of the Convention states: "The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect and to ensure respect for the present Convention in all circumstances."

"The Commentary" on the Geneva Convention by Jean S. Pictet, Swiss jurist, reads:

"In the event of a Power failing to fulfill its obligations, each of the other Contracting Parties (neutral, allied or enemy) should endeavor to bring it back to an attitude of respect for the Convention. . . ."

"The application of the Convention does not depend on whether the conflict is just or unjust. Whether or not it is a war of aggression, prisoners of war belonging to either party are entitled to the protection afforded by the Convention."

Since our efforts to promote inspection of prisoner-of-war facilities in North Vietnam have failed and it is not possible to determine if North Vietnam is fulfilling its obligations under the Convention, it is respectfully suggested that a proposal be made through your good offices calling for delivery of prisoners of war to willing neutral countries, where they would be interned in accordance with the Geneva Convention. We suggest that arrangements be made with such neutral countries and that the United States commit

itself to delivering a specific quota of North Vietnamese prisoners held in South Vietnam to such neutral countries. Hopefully, North Vietnam would reciprocate, but, if she refused, it would constitute one more clear example of her unwillingness to abide by the terms of the Geneva Convention.

We earnestly request your consideration of this suggestion.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES S. GUBSER.
W. C. DANIEL.

The following Members of Congress also wish to be listed as cosigners of this letter: W. M. Abbott, Joseph Addabbo, Bill Archer, Leslie C. Arends, Les Aspin, Nick Begich, Page Belcher, Alphonzo Bell.

Charles E. Bennett, Mario Biaggi, Edward G. Biester, Jr., Richard Bolling, Frank T. Bow, Frank J. Brasco, Jack Brinkley, Clarence J. Brown.

John H. Buchanan, Jr., James A. Byrne, Tim Lee Carter, E. A. Cederberg, Bill Chapel, Donald D. Clancy, Frank M. Clark.

Don H. Clausen, Del Clawson, James C. Cleveland, Harold R. Collier, Silvio O. Conte, James Corman, Dominick V. Daniels, Lawrence Coughlin.

Edward J. Derwinski, Samuel L. Devine, William L. Dickinson, Harold D. Donohue, Thomas N. Downing, T. J. Dulski, John J. Duncan, Ed Edmondson.

Edwin Edwards, Joshua Ellberg, Walter Flowers, Gerald R. Ford, Edwin B. Forsythe, Bill Frenzel, James G. Fulton.

Don Fuqua, Cornelius E. Gallagher, Edward A. Garmatz, Ella T. Grasso, Charles H. Griffin, Seymour Halpern, John Paul Hammer-schmidt, James M. Hanley.

Julia Butler Hansen, Orval Hansen, James Harvey, James F. Hastings, Ken Hechler, Henry Helstoski, Floyd V. Hicks, Louise Day Hicks.

Lawrence J. Hogan, Craig Hosmer, William L. Hungate, John E. Hunt, Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Charles R. Jonas, Walter B. Jones, William J. Keating.

Hastings Keith, Carleton J. King, Dan Kuykendall, Peter N. Kyros, Manuel Lujan, Jr., George H. Mahon, William S. Malliard, James R. Mann.

Dave Martin, Robert B. Mathias, Dawson Mathis, Spark M. Matsunaga, Wiley Mayne, Romano L. Mazzoli, John Y. McCollister, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr.

James A. McClure, John Melcher, Clarence E. Miller, George P. Miller, G. V. Montgomery, F. Bradford Morse, Charles A. Mosher, John T. Myers.

Bill Nichols, Thomas M. Pelly, Peter A. Peyser, J. J. Pickle, Alexander Pirnie, W. R. Poage, Walter E. Powell, Graham Purcell.

John R. Rarick, Donald W. Riegle, Ray Roberts, J. K. Robinson, Howard W. Robinson, Robert Roe, Harold Runnels, Earl B. Ruth.

Paul S. Sarbanes, Herman T. Schneebeli, William L. Scott, Richard G. Shoup, Garner E. Shriver, Bob Sikes, John Slack, Henry P. Smith III.

M. G. Snyder, Floyd D. Spence, J. William Stanton, Sam Steiger, Samuel Stratton, Burt L. Talcott, Charles M. Teague, Olin E. Teague.

Fletcher Thompson, Charles Thone, Lionel Van Deerlin, Guy Vander Jagt, Victor V. Veysey, G. William Whitehurst, Jamie L. Whitten, William B. Widnall.

Charles E. Wiggins, Bob Wilson, Larry Winn, Jr., Wendell Wyatt, John W. Wylder, Gus Yatron, Roger H. Zion, Frank Horton.

U.S. DELEGATION,
PARIS MEETINGS ON VIETNAM,
May 6, 1971.

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER, and HON. W. C. DANIEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER AND CONGRESSMAN DANIEL: Thank you very much for your

letter of April 26 regarding prisoners of war. I thoroughly share your concern over North Viet-Nam's continued failure, to abide by the Geneva Convention and by accepted international standards in its treatment of our men.

Your suggestion that we seek the internment of prisoners of war in neutral countries is quite similar to what has recently been proposed here by our side at these talks. The representative of the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam stated at the 108th Plenary Session on April 8:

"Specifically, the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam is proposing, in conformity with Article 109 of the Geneva Conventions on Prisoners of War, that the other side agree to conclude an agreement with a view to the direct repatriation or internment in a neutral country of able-bodied prisoners of war who have undergone a long period of captivity."

Later, at the 111th session on April 29, the same representative repeated this proposal and added that his government was prepared to facilitate the transfer of 1200 able-bodied Vietnamese prisoners of war who have been detained over a period of four years to a neutral country for temporary internment. He asked the Hanoi authorities for suggestions on the choice of a neutral government for that purpose.

We have strongly endorsed this proposal and have called upon the other side to accept it and to designate a third country on which we could agree for neutral internment of these men. We have made clear that our side is prepared immediately to conclude arrangements for such internment. At the same time, we have also called upon the other side to agree to similar arrangements for our men held by their forces.

As you know, the President has noted with great satisfaction reports that the Government of Sweden has offered the use of its vessels and its territory to provide internment of prisoners of war from the conflict in Viet-Nam. We have expressed to the other side here his hope that Hanoi would move promptly to negotiate an agreement on this issue to take advantage of this humanitarian offer on the part of the Swedish government.

Unfortunately, we have had no positive response so far from those on the other side. The decision is clearly up to them, and we intend to continue pressing hard for their acceptance of these proposals.

I can assure you and your colleagues that this delegation will persist in its efforts to obtain a full accounting for our missing men and the proper treatment and earliest possible release of those held prisoner. I very much appreciate the support we have always received from the Congress for these efforts. I find your letter a most timely and encouraging example of this.

Sincerely,

DAVID BRUCE.

FORCED UNIONISM

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey has confirmed beyond any doubt that a vast majority of the American people are opposed to legislation which would force farmworkers to pay dues to a union or lose their jobs.

The June 9 issue of the Odessa, Tex., American contains an excellent editorial concerning this recently completed survey. A copy of this editorial follows:

FORCED UNIONISM

Cesar Chavez is not going to like this: The American people, by a lopsided majority of 5 to 1, oppose legislation, which would legalize compulsory union membership for farm workers.

Sorry, Cesar, but that's the way it is.

A nationwide study of the public's attitude on forced unionism was made by the respected Opinion Research Corp. for the National Right to Work Committee (NRWC). In making known the results, Reed Larson, executive vice president of the NRWC, had this to say:

"The prevailing attitude is quite important at this time in view of the intense interest of many members of Congress in farm labor legislation." Somehow "quite important" doesn't seem adequate in this case. But on second thought it probably is. So—

The question posed by the research people was simple and to the point. The researchers asked: Would you want your congressman to vote for compulsory union membership for farm workers?

The results showed 68 percent of the respondents said no; 14 percent said yes; and 18 percent had no opinion.

It was an impressive victory for Larson and the Right to Work Committee. Larson said Sen. Carl Curtis, R-Neb., and Rep. Watkins Abbitt, D-Va., personally sent copies of the survey to their colleagues, and that Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., made the following statement on the senate floor:

"What the American people are saying, loud and clear, is that there should be no farm labor legislation unless the right to work of all farm workers is protected. It is true that there are some who hold the view that Congress would refuse to pass needed farm legislation unless it includes an authorization for compulsory unionism as a 'sweetener' for union bosses. This, of course, is precisely the same position in connection with the proposal for postal reform legislation introduced in 1969.

"As we know, Congress passed a postal reform reorganization bill in 1970 that included Right to Work for all postal workers. I am hopeful that this Congress will pass meaningful farm labor legislation—but to be meaningful it must include Right to Work protection for the worker against compulsory unionism. The American people believe this, too."

The survey results would seem to indicate that Americans have a decided distaste for forced union membership. The research people say the findings represent the thinking of 2,061 men and women 18 years of age, and over living in private homes in continental U.S.

The findings also serve to negate propaganda put out by supporters of Chavez and his United Farm Workers Organizers Committee that farm workers are falling over each other in a scramble to join the UFWOC. That kind of talk doesn't square with the facts.

STATEMENT REGARDING H.R. 1

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I would like to insert in the RECORD a statement of the House Republican Policy Committee regarding H.R. 1, the Social Security Amendments of 1971:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON H.R. 1, THE SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1971

"We will strengthen the Social Security system and provide automatic cost-of-living adjustments. . . .

"Welfare and poverty programs will be drastically revised to liberate the poor from the debilitating dependence which erodes self-respect and discourages family unity and responsibility." (Republican Platform, 1968.)

The House Republican Policy Committee supports the passage of H.R. 1, the Social Security Amendments of 1971.

President Nixon has described H.R. 1 as "an important landmark in the history of both social security and public welfare reform", and "the single most significant piece of social legislation to be considered by the Congress in decades."

H.R. 1 contains significant improvements in the Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Programs and in the Medicare, Medicaid, and Maternal and Child Health Programs. Major provisions include: 1) automatic increases of future Social Security benefits commensurate with increases in the cost-of-living, 2) a liberalized retirement work-income standard, 3) greatly improved benefits for widows and widowers, 4) increased benefits for those working after age 65, and 5) extended Medicare, Medicaid and Maternal and Child Health programs, more efficient, more effective and more equitable.

The "core" of the bill, however, is fundamental reform of our present public welfare system, and provides requirements and incentives to individuals to work and earn.

The present welfare system has failed tragically; it does not provide adequately for those truly in need; it encourages family disintegration; it discourages self-sufficiency, capturing the poor in an unbreakable cycle of dependency—and all at a skyrocketing cost to the taxpayer.

The principal goal of H.R. 1 is to provide the vehicle by which every family in which there is an employable adult may become economically self-sufficient. The Opportunities for Families Program would, 1) require every employable adult to accept employment or training leading thereto, 2) expand federal support for training, placement, public service employment, child day care and other supportive programs, 3) encourage family unity by removing the incentives for parental desertion, and 4) provide financial incentives for recipients enrolled in work training. H.R. 1 will further provide basic assistance to families headed by unemployable or incapacitated adults under a Family Assistance Program, and a new and improved assistance program for needy, aged, blind and disabled persons.

Passage of H.R. 1 has been given the highest of priorities by the Republican Administration. The House Republican Policy Committee urges support of this "momentous step" in social security improvement and welfare reform.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF RETRAINING FAILURES

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up to my June 16 speech on the lack of job opportunities for retrained aerospace workers, I am submitting a letter from Mr. George Wandrocke of the Pacific Southwest Universities Air Pollution As-

sociation. The letter is another illustration of the magnitude of the problem confronted by the people who want to devote their skills to the improvement of the environment and have found that opportunities to do so are in short supply.

The letter tells of 40 retraining graduates, none of whom were able to find work. I indicated on June 16 that only 28 of 300 retrained people had found jobs. No we must add zero out of 40 to the figures I presented earlier.

The letter also helps to highlight the importance of the hearings held by the Science and Research and Development Subcommittee on H.R. 34. The letter provides another bit of evidence to the case for passage of the bill:

PACIFIC SOUTHWEST UNIVERSITIES
AIR POLLUTION ASSOCIATION,

June 23, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HANNA: I thought I might be able to provide you with some data in regards to placement of "retrained" aerospace engineers for your current hearings. Out of 20 students in our institute and after two months of effort none have been placed as a result of my efforts nor have any of the last 40 graduates. I was able to expose them to 50 jobs in various locations of the country at salaries from \$8,000-12,000/year but was unable to stimulate any great interest. It is apparent that the alternatives in opportunities are not attractive enough to hire them.

The institutes providing the training are often not in tune with the day to day problems of the trainees nor are they aware of the additional information or effort needed to make the trainees more "sellable." That information should include guidance in receiving federal civil service ratings where many of the opportunities are in federal government, professional registration where local civil service agencies require it, interview, travel and relocation benefits available through Displaced Persons Project (or similar) or any other information relating to placement improvement. In many cases the problem lies not with the individuals abilities but with his inability . . . to write a resume, to perform in an interview and to sell himself.

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE WANDROCKE.

FESTIVAL PLAYERS OF CALIFORNIA

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the Festival Players of California, Inc., has recently completed their 12th concert season, and I would like to take this opportunity to commend their worthwhile activities. The festival was conceived to give children, especially those who are culturally deprived, the opportunity to hear and appreciate some of the world's finest classical music. At a time when modern society tends to constrain a sense of community, the Festival Players have performed an outstanding service in combating this erosion of personal involvement and personal sacrifice for the benefit of others.

Under the dedicated direction of Dorye Roettger, the Festival Players of California have won enthusiastic acclaim

throughout California. In thousands of performances in public and private schools, in extensive concert tours of California and neighboring States, through the production of educational recordings and films, and in the Players' original artistic apprenticeship project, where young people participate in actual concert performances, the players are realizing their ultimate goal of offering not only wholesome entertainment for young people, but an educational stimulus for their continued interest and personal involvement in the great cultural achievements of mankind. In bringing fine music and fine arts experience to thousands of young people, this nonprofit organization deserves the highest praise. Their work is a source of inspiration to the Nation.

PERSIAN GULF DISCUSSED IN
MONITOR SERIES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, John Cooley of the Christian Science Monitor has just completed a series of articles on the Persian Gulf, an area that should be of increasing interest to Americans as the British withdrawal from the region is completed.

I commend the series to my colleagues.

The articles follow:

PERSIAN GULF IS YAWNING AWAKE

(By John K. Cooley)

AL MANAMAH, BAHRAIN.—From the new oil ports of Iran, Iraq, and Kuwait southward to the ancient sultanate of Oman, the Persian Gulf is on the move.

After centuries of slumber in the backwaters of Portuguese colonialism, Arab piracy and slave trading, and Britain's Indian Ocean trading empire, the gulf's people have awakened with a start.

Suddenly they see around them swift change and modernization in education, manners, and technology. Stirring among them is a sudden sense of their own importance at the center of the main oil supplies of the Western and Eastern worlds and as a hub of world communications in the age of satellites.

This breakneck change and above all the sense of change are converting the Persian Gulf—as its Arab citizens prefer, the Arabian Gulf—into one of the world's most exciting and economically adventurous frontier regions.

Every ideology, from raw, 19th-century capitalism to the Chinese-style Maoist socialism of the guerrillas on Oman's southern coast, is found here, sometimes in rough conflict and sometimes in easy coexistence.

The official commitment of Britain and the British to direct the gulf's affairs ends, except in Oman, Dec. 31.

INDEPENDENCE EXPECTED

Bahrain, a cluster of agreeable, subtropical islands where good British education and wise use of natural resources have brought prosperous maturity, and Bahrain's wealthy but politically less mature neighbor, Qatar, both expect to be fully independent.

The equally wealthy Trucial States of Abu Dhabi and Dubai, and their five smaller

and much poorer cousins, Sharjah, Ras al Khaymah, Umm al Qaywayn Ajman, and Al Fujayrah, are hoping and groping for some kind of economic if not political togetherness with their rich neighbors.

The Sultanate of Oman, emerging from total isolation and backwardness imposed by the 38-year rule of a tyrant, Sultan Said bin Taymur, whom his son Qabus and the British finally deposed last July, needs the neighborly help of all the world, but finds itself unable to join in any gulf experiments in political federation. As evidence of its "coming out," Oman has applied for membership in the United Nations.

The 1 million or so inhabitants of the Arab side of the gulf are a bewildering mix of Arab, Iranian, Bauuchi, Indian, Pakistani, and European technicians, traders, fishermen, shepherds, and soldiers of all descriptions.

A PAPER FEDERATION

The federation that Britain and the gulf rulers hoped would emerge has remained so far on paper only. "The destinies of the gulf people," says a very senior British official now busy trying to make Britain's exit as graceful as possible, "will be decided not in London, Bahrain, Kuwait, or Abu Dhabi. It will be decided in Riyadh and Tehran," the Saudi Arabian and Iranian capitals, respectively.

Saudi Arabian King Faisal and the Shah of Iran are both anxious that Britain should not be replaced by another big power. Each would like this role for itself. Most of the gulf's leaders conceive their own politics in terms of their ties with either Saudi Arabia or Iran, and many believe an early collision between growing Iranian power and burgeoning Arab aspirations to be inevitable.

Yet politics and defense are the concern of only a tiny minority in the gulf. Most of its residents are absorbed in making money fast; in trying to predict and shape the patterns of jet-age change and in importing and learning to use the tools of the 20th-century education and technology.

TECHNOCRATS TORN

New-style men are shaping the new gulf with the help of some old-style ones. They include gold traders, arid-zone scientists, petroleum and industrial engineers, former colonial administrators, and others who find themselves suddenly confronted with the responsibilities of power.

Today's typical gulf technocrat, like Dubai's Mehdi al Tajjer, the Dubai ruler's multimillionaire adviser on "rulers and petroleum affairs," is often a man torn between two goals; building the prosperity of his own state and hence competing with neighbors who are doing precisely the same things, but realizing that this prosperity must somehow be made to fit into the larger mosaic of the region.

Mr. Tajjer began his career as a British-trained civil servant in Bahrain before making a fortune in Dubai's thriving transit trade. He sees it this way:

"Duabi's future lies in trade. There is no point in creating industries in places where there is no demand and no aptitude, just for prestige."

"NOT BY OIL ALONE"

"Trade has brought us prosperity," he said. "Oil income is welcome as a supplement, but economies based on oil alone"—the case in Dubai's next-door neighbor and rival, Abu Dhabi—"are not healthy or growing economies."

In Bahrain, however, the dynamic head of the development board, engineer Youssef al-Sharawi, has a different view:

"Industry is the answer for an island like Bahrain. We have enough natural gas to power the whole gulf for the next 70 years."

POLITICAL FUTURE ROILED: PERSIAN GULF HARBORS RICHES—AND EDDIES OVER OWNERSHIP

(By John K. Cooley)

ABOARD A PERSIAN GULF OIL PLATFORM

"Who," asks Alvin Toffler in his bestselling book *Future Shock*, "owns the bottom of the ocean and the marine life that covers it?"

The question has total relevance to the vast reserves of oil, natural gas, and minerals under the Persian Gulf.

"Ocean mining," as already carried out for coal by Japan, is the new giant step in the race to unlock the huge power resources buried here.

On both Arab and Iranian sides of the gulf the tangled questions of what company, sheikh, or consortium owns which offshore oil and gas concession increase the complexity of the gulf's political future, as Britain relinquishes its defense and political commitments here this year.

A bewildering network of agreed and disputed demarcation lines crisscrosses the gulf's maps. Some neighbor states, such as Dubai and Abu Dhabi, and Bahrain and Saudi Arabia, have agreed on joint exploitation of fields in "gray" zones touching concession areas in both.

GUNBOATS NOW AND AGAIN

In others, near the outer limits of concessions in midgulf, companies and rulers have preferred to leave the lines undrawn. Here the rich offshore fields approach what Iran, determined to be the gulf's major power, considers its own territorial waters.

On rare occasions Saudi Arabian, Iranian, or British gunboats show their countries' flags in "no trespassing" warnings.

Intercountry relations, however, are generally good. On June 21, 17 Western oil firms operating in the gulf are to meet in Bahrain to take joint action to halt growing oil pollution of the gulf, where more than half the entire world's oil supplies pass through the Strait of Hormuz—one potentially polluting tanker every 20 minutes.

From this vantage point 60 miles out in the gulf, where about 40 oilmen of half as many nationalities live and work together on an artificial island standing on stilts in the tepid sea, the shape of a new kind of industrial life on the high seas is clearly emerging.

HUGE STORAGE VESSEL

In turquoise water patched with the darting whites and yellows of great schools of fish, the Dubai Petroleum Company (DPC) operates the world's first underwater storage tank.

Chicago Bridge & Iron Corporation built the tank, called Khazzan 1 and shaped like an inverted steel champagne glass. Despite its concrete lining it was floated and towed into position out here in August, 1969. Of its 205-foot height and 270-foot diameter, only this 40-foot tower protrudes from the gulf's surface.

The tank system and extensive automation make this immense sea-bottom oil field, called Fateh (Arabic for "the unfortunate," bearing no relationship to the Palestinian guerrilla group of the same name), both cheap to operate and self-contained.

Supertankers load directly here at sea. Boats and helicopters move personnel and supplies back and forth.

NO ONE HAZARDS ESTIMATE

No one, least of all Sheikh Rashid or DPC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Continental Oil Corporation of the United States, or DPC's French, German, and Spanish partners, were willing to estimate the reserves of the Dubai offshore field. It adjoins Abu Dhabi's offshore marine area fields operated by British Petroleum, Compagnie Francaise des Petroles, and three Japanese companies.

Both Abu Dhabi and Dubai are already well in the 20 million to 30 million-tons-a-year production bracket, though Dubai has been a commercial producer only since 1969. Each state has a population of less than 100,000, whose per capita income is already soaring close to the world high levels of Kuwait and the United States.

WELFARE STATEHOOD PUSHED

Each, after late starts, is spending its money to convert to total welfare statehood where most everything in life is free.

In Oman at the gulf's southern end, oil money has to provide schools, housing, hospitals, roads, and all the other bare essentials which were almost totally denied the sultanate under its former despotic ruler, Sultan Said bin Taymur.

Despite an almost total stoppage of work in the kingdom amid the explosion of popular joy following Sultan Said's dethronement by his son Qabus last July, Petroleum Development (Oman) managed to export more than 17 million tons in 1970.

In its total isolation Oman had no labor laws. But exiled Omanis now returning from abroad, many from lucrative oil jobs up the gulf, are bringing with them demands for social services, fringe benefits, and wages of the more sophisticated gulf states.

Working on this is Nasser Abu Ali, Omani social-affairs director who lived in exile in Britain for years. He is one of a handful of overworked Omani civil servants who, he says cheerfully, "are responsible for just about everything."

AMERICAN GAINS CONCESSION

Off Oman's south coast, east of the province of Dhufar, where a tough, Chinese-backed guerrilla rebellion rages against the British-officered army of Sultan Qabus, American millionaire Wendell Phillips has acquired a personal oil concession for offshore exploration about 400 miles long and 40 miles wide.

In Qatar, north of Abu Dhabi, with about 100,000 people, the oil has been flowing for more than a decade.

It is produced by subsidiaries of the Western-owned Iraq Petroleum Company, Japanese firms, and Shell. A new American independent, Southeast Asia Oil & Gas Company, moved into Doha, Qatar's capital, with an offshore concession granted in March, 1970.

BAHRAIN'S INTEGRATED SETUP

Bahrain is the only gulf state benefiting from a 34-year-old integrated oil and natural-gas industry. Bahrain Petroleum Company, a Caltex subsidiary, produces relatively small but steady amounts of crude and refines much of it into gasoline and other products on the spot.

Bahrain's natural-gas fields, so huge in reserves that they are still only partially charted, pump power to the refinery and generate electricity for Bahrain's more than 200,000 people, as well as for the big new aluminum smelter which has just begun operating outside Al Manamah, the capital.

REDS RESISTED: OMAN TUGS ECONOMIC BOOTSTRAPS

(By John K. Cooley)

MUSCAT, SULTANATE OF OMAN.—Guerrillas fighting the Omani Government in Dhufar, Oman's southwestern province, say they want to establish Chinese-style communal government and economies throughout the Persian Gulf.

The gulf's rulers and diplomats are scurrying between one another's capitals, seeking to form some kind of larger political federation or other grouping of the gulf's 10 states that could prevent such an outcome.

Though the political efforts seem to have bogged down, the gulf's native and Western planners are testing two basically different

types of economic answers to the guerrillas' Marxist theories of revolutionary terror—decentralization and self-help.

Each type requires application of Western technology. One method imports this and imposes development, in a sense, from the top down. Such an experiment is going on in the scientific use of seawater to farm desert land in the sheikhdom of Abu Dhabi.

OTHER METHOD HARDER

The other method consists of building simple basic development units from the bottom up for a population now lacking even basic essentials. This is about to get under way here in Oman, an ancient and once rich country depopulated by despotic rule and resulting ignorance, disease, and malnutrition.

Former Sultan Said bin Taymur, who ruled a diminishing population of around 1 million in a country the size of Minnesota, allowed his people no roads, schools, nor hospitals.

For 18 years an American church mission here provided schooling and health, almost the only facilities in the entire sultanate. Now Prime Minister Tariq bin Taymur's government is preparing to award a contract to a European firm to build six "basic living" compounds near main Omani towns.

POWER, WATER, AND POLICE

"The idea is simple," says Salloum al-Shakli, one of the many former Omani emigrants who grew up in East Africa and who returned to develop their country after Sultan Said's son, Qabus, overthrew his father last July and opened the country to the world outside.

"Besides a school and public-health center each unit will include its own electric power station, driven by diesel generators, water supplies provided by artesian wells and springs, and a police station."

Each package unit will serve towns of around 15,000 or more. Each will serve about another 25,000 persons in the surrounding deserts or mountains.

The cost for all six units is estimated at a modest \$9 million.

SCHOOLS SPROUT

A year ago all Oman had scarcely two elementary schools worthy of the name. Now, 12 modern primary and elementary schools are already open, including a new girls' school in Muscat, where 1,200 girls attend in two shifts. Twenty more elementary schools, including the six in the compounds, are planned.

"At the start we want quality, not quantity," says scholarship director Ali al-Quadi, a Palestinian to whom the old sultan granted citizenship. "We have about 220 teachers in the country now, mostly former Omani émigrés except for 15 Palestinian men and women."

Oman's concept of growth upward from nothing contrasts with an advanced water power-agriculture project on Sadiyat, a desert island that is part of the sheikhdom of Abu Dhabi. Abu Dhabi's ruler, Sheikh Zayed, agreed in 1969 to finance its start for the arid-lands research center of the University of Arizona, which provides the know-how.

The center distills seawater, generates electricity, and grows vegetables and fruit in desert sand through chemical nutrients sprayed in pressurized plastic greenhouses where the high temperature and humidity are controlled.

TECHNIQUES FROM TUCSON

According to the Sadiyat program's directors, Drs. James Riley and Miguel Fuentes, the center has imported techniques already studied in Tucson and at the center's experimental station at Puerto Penasco, Mexico.

Lettuce that would take three months to grow in the Temperate Zone greens in giant

heads here in three weeks. New heat-resistant tomato strains are being developed. Some 100 Abu Dhabi employees, four of whom have been to the United States and Mexico, are getting basic schooling, then on-the-job training in various farming and engineering techniques.

"We'll go commercial this year," says Dr. Riley. "The center will produce food for Abu Dhabi at a time of year when normally everything has to be imported."

The center also lends its know-how to Abu Dhabi government land projects in the Al Ain oasis inland. Dr. Hamdy Qafisheh, a Jordanian scientist who has written a textbook of modern gulf Arabic, says, "By showing people new ways of using seawater and sand to grow food we are breaking down the traditional Arab disdain for creative manual work—the reluctance to get one's hands dirty, which has been a bane of all development in the Arab world."

BRITISH WITHDRAWAL NEARS: PERSIAN GULF LOOKS FOR FRIENDS

(By John K. Cooley)

BAHRAIN, PERSIAN GULF.—The United States seems bound to play a large part in answering the question of what happens here after British military and political power are phased out at the end of this year.

The biggest part of this question is the projected union or federation of Arab emirates. It has remained on paper since first proposed after the British withdrawal announcement in 1968.

Each gulf state has differing notions about the would-be federation's powers, the site of its permanent capital, the makeup of its legislature and its financial and defense arrangements.

POSSIBLE DEFENSE BASE

Britain hopes the latter may be based on the British-officered Trucial Oman Scouts force now based in the emirate of Sharjah and on the Trucial States' development council, which has promoted the financing of useful development projects from oil revenues. And oil lies at the heart of the gulf dilemma—with the steep world-oil price hikes decided at Tripoli and Tehran conferences earlier this year underlining the situation.

"The U.S. will be forced to keep an eye on the gulf whether it wants to or not," warns one American high up in the oil industry in the gulf.

OUTSIDE SUPPORT SOUGHT

Although Western Europe and Japan are the main customers for the gulf's prodigious reserves of oil, the speculation here is that it is the United States which is going to have to shoulder most of the burden of ensuring their security.

Now that British withdrawal is drawing closer, the gulf's rulers are fishing for outside political and moral support, as Saudi Arabia and Iran, the gulf's big rivals, carefully watch.

Kuwait's Foreign Minister and the deputy ruler of the state of Qatar recently were in Cairo, seeking advice from Egyptian President Sadat who earlier dispensed it to Sir William Luce, Britain's roving gulf envoy, who has been trying to patch the federation together.

Another bid for outside support is the membership applications of the Sultanate of Oman to the United Nations and the Arab League. Sultan Qabus, Oman's reform-minded ruler who managed with British help to oust his despotic father last July, is trying to end his country's 40 years of isolation.

ARAB CAPITALS TOURED

Qabu's uncle sent diplomatic missions to Arab capitals and one June 2 formally applied for admission to the United Nations.

In a kind of "straw vote," the UN in which it was admitted to the World Health Organi-

zation, Oman was opposed only by Albania and South Yemen.

Another foreign power in the area is Peking which backs a guerrilla movement in Dhufar, Oman's southwestern province, which has pretensions in the entire gulf.

Yet another and older current of opposition to the Omani regime in Muscat is still generated by the Imam Ghaleb, an Omani religious leader now exiled in Saudi Arabia who led an unsuccessful war against Qabu's father in the 1950's.

Some Arab governments are highly suspicious of Sultan Qabu's British-officered Army and because of past British political influence in the country and control of Oman's few past relations with the outside world.

Last March 2 the U.S. State Department spokesman said the U.S. would not replace Britain as "protecting power" in the gulf. He praised the interest of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Iran in assuring gulf stability and said the "fundamental interests of Britain and the United States" were not endangered by the British pullout.

This statement came several weeks after three Soviet warships cruised through the gulf. This was a rare event since closing of the Suez Canal has forced Soviet warships in the gulf and Indian Ocean to take the long sea routes around Europe and Africa.

Bahrain, the only visible symbol of U.S. power in the gulf now, is the site of the Middle East force of the U.S. Navy. This consists of two destroyers (sometimes only one) and an auxiliary ship based in Bahrain. They have no connection with the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean and their commander, Rear Adm. Marmeduke G. Bayne, takes orders only from Washington.

SURROUNDINGS NOTED

Admiral Bayne's headquarters here is within easy hailing distance of the office of Britain's senior gulf administrator, Sir Geoffrey Arthur, the British Resident, and of the main British military headquarters which is phasing down.

Bahrain's Crown Prince and Defense Minister, the son of Sheikh Issab Ibn Sulam al-Khalifa, the ruler, recently flew to the United States for a year's work at the U.S. Army's general staff school at Ft. Leavenworth, Kans. Both Bahrain and Abu Dhabi have made training arrangements with the U.S.-supplied armed forces of Jordan.

Bahrain's busy port may take on new significance if, as expected, the Organization of Arab Oil Exporting Countries (O.A.P.E.C.), which met in Kuwait in early June, finally approves construction here of a fleet of Arab tankers and of a \$300 million drydock, the only one between Singapore and Amsterdam capable of handling supertankers.

SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONCERNED ABOUT TRADE WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the South Carolina General Assembly has unanimously adopted a resolution memorializing the President and the Congress to exercise extreme caution in opening trade relations with Communist China and to immediately make provisions for establishing potent safeguards to prevent further erosion of domestic textile markets by still another low-wage nation. This resolution was authored by State Senators Lake, Bonner, and Long, all

outstanding members of the South Carolina General Assembly Textile Committee. I commend this important resolution to the attention of my distinguished colleagues:

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS TO EXERCISE EXTREME CAUTION IN OPENING TRADE RELATIONS WITH COMMUNIST CHINA AND TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE PROVISIONS FOR ESTABLISHING POTENT SAFEGUARDS TO PREVENT FURTHER EROSION OF DOMESTIC TEXTILE MARKETS BY STILL ANOTHER LOW-WAGE NATION

Whereas, the President of the United States has lifted restrictions on trade with Communist China in forty seven categories, including textile products and machinery; and

Whereas, it is believed that Communist China has a large textile industry, and the President's action simply opens another source of low-wage textile imports that further imperil the wages and jobs of thousands of Americans; and

Whereas, there seem to be no reliable indications at this time that substantial exports can be sent to Red China so far as textiles are concerned; and

Whereas, the importation of textiles and apparel from foreign nations has seriously undermined the entire economic structure of the State of South Carolina; and

Whereas, the revenues of the State Government, county governments and municipal governments of South Carolina are down by millions of dollars causing mandatory cutbacks in all agencies of State Government thereby affecting every citizen of this State; and

Whereas, thousands of South Carolinians have lost their jobs or are on short time that causes them to earn below average wages; and

Whereas, the foreign competitors who flood our market and force thousands of our citizens completely out of work or onto short-time, manufacture and market their textiles and apparel under conditions that are illegal in the State of South Carolina and in the United States; and

Whereas, the textile markets of the United States are virtually wide open to foreign imports while many of the major exporters to this country tightly protect their own markets against our textile exports; and

Whereas, our government has imposed upon the American industry numerous regulations and cost factors that are not required of our foreign competitors; and

Whereas, the textile industry of South Carolina and the entire nation has invested billions of dollars in recent years in new plants and equipment, making it the most efficient in the world; and

Whereas, the American textile industry pays its employees approximately two dollars an hour more than the industry of Japan, with the gap being even wider between this country and some other Asian Nations; and

Whereas, the Legislature and the people of South Carolina are not willing to see these terribly unfair conditions continue to weaken their most important industry which together with its supply and related industries over the years have been good, responsible corporate citizens; and

Whereas, the opening of trade with Red China adds still another competitive burden on the American textile industry and its employees. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the General Assembly of South Carolina respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to immediately take steps necessary to safeguard the American textile industry against further serious inroads into its markets by placing appropriate restrictions on all such items that might be imported into this country.

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator and each member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina, the Clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State of the United States

THE AMERICAN CONSUMER AND PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important aspects of consumer protection concerns itself with the pricing of prescription drugs. The late Senator Estes Kefauver brought this question to public attention as early as 1959. Almost 8 years later, Senator GAYLORD NELSON began probing this problem with his Senate Monopoly Subcommittee. Now, 4 years after the Nelson hearings, the uncertainties and problems of drug pricing are as great as ever for the American consumer.

We have long been aware of tremendous price differences for the same prescription drug from pharmacy to pharmacy within a single neighborhood throughout this country.

Now, we have evidence that even the lowest U.S. prices are frequently higher than those charged for the identical drug sold in Europe and South America, even when these drugs are produced and exported by American manufacturers.

These higher prices at home are made possible by U.S. patent standards which are, in effect, anticompetitive. It gives the drug manufacturer a great amount of leeway in which to price their drugs. This creates an exclusive vacuum for the sole distributors of certain drugs. These practices are revealed by an article in today's Washington Post by Morton Mintz.

All of this information points up the need for penetrating public scrutiny to find out how this happens and what must be done to protect the American consumer from arbitrary high-pricing practices.

To meet the problem of prescription drug pricing in the United States, I have introduced legislation—H.R. 4432—that would allow retailers to advertise prescription drug prices. This would give the consumer more freedom in choosing where he will get his prescriptions filled at the lowest prices possible. The consumer has an undeniable right to know the price of the products he needs and wants; this includes the right to compare prices for like items. Too often, merchants hide behind the cloak of so-called professionalism in refusal to permit price advertising. This protects high prices and inefficient operations, and unfairly harms the consumer. Drug price advertising is all the more important in these times of rapid increase in cost of living.

I am inserting into the RECORD an article by Morton Mintz of the Washington

Post. This article, which clearly delineates the tremendous drug price differences between the United States and other countries, follows:

TWENTY U.S. DRUGS COST LESS IN EIGHT OTHER NATIONS

(By Morton Mintz)

A new government study shows that manufacturers of 20 popular prescription drugs charge druggists in the United States much higher prices, generally, than they charge pharmacists in eight other countries.

In the case of Darvon, a painkiller that American doctors prescribe more often than any other drug in the years 1967 through 1969, the price was more than four times higher here than it was in Ireland.

Similarly, American druggists pay more than three times as much as their Irish counterparts for: Elavil, a Merck antidepressant; tolbutamide, an oral antidiabetes pill Upjohn sells as Orinase; Librium, a Hoffman-LaRoche tranquilizer sedative; chlorpromazine and trifluoperazine, antidepressants that Smith Kline & French sells as Thorazine and Stelazine, respectively; meprobamate, a sedative/tranquilizer Wyeth Laboratories tradenames Equanil; Doriden, a CIBA sedative and a penicillin that Lilly sells here as V Cillin K.

In other cases, the lowest prices among the eight countries were found in Brazil, Sweden and the United Kingdom, but never in the United States. The highest prices for 12 of the 20 drugs were those charged in this country; three each were higher priced in Canada and Italy, and one each in Brazil and Sweden. Other countries in the survey were Australia and New Zealand.

Edmond M. Jacoby and Dennis L. Hefner, who did the study for the Division of Health Insurance Studies of the Social Security Administration, point out that Ireland, along with New Zealand and the United Kingdom negotiate with pharmaceutical firms for lower drug prices.

Italy and Brazil actually set drug prices, and Sweden regulates them. Australia considers the price of a medicine in deciding whether to include it on the list of drugs for which the government provides reimbursement.

The authors, whose report was published in the May Social Security Bulletin, also note that the United States grants drug manufacturers 17-year patent monopolies, not only on production processes, but on products, as well.

Brazil and Italy grant no patents at all on pharmaceuticals, Jacoby and Hefner say. Sweden grants them on processes alone. The other countries in the study issue patents on processes and products, as does the United States.

Jacoby and Hefner say their data does not reveal the extent to which price variations are caused by "real economic factors," such as differences in labor costs and sizes of markets.

But, they say, "General knowledge of the problem suggests that it would be unwise to assume that price discrimination exercised by drug producers is a minor factor." They go on to say:

"The study shows that prices in the United States for these (the 20) drugs are generally higher than in any other country studied. The lowest price for any drug was usually about one-fourth the highest price...."

"Although certain countries exhibited tendencies toward a high or low level of prices, these levels were not consistent for all products.... For one category of drugs—tranquilizers—U.S. prices were highest in every case.

Yet for * * * antibiotic, the U.S. price was among the lowest observed."

The authors did not note that this product, which is tetracycline, is highly competi-

tive in price because a patent monopoly was broken in court.

The authors continued:
"The price for Polycillin (an antibiotic) was much higher in Brazil than in any other country, yet for five drugs Brazil had the lowest price...."

"Australia, Ireland and Sweden pay part of the retail price of prescription medicines. In Sweden, payment is for one-half of that portion of the price between \$1 and \$3 and for everything over \$3.

"In Ireland, payment depends on the patient's income; in Australia, payment is for everything except a nominal co-payment fee.

"For medicines to treat certain chronic diseases all three countries pay the total price.

"The United Kingdom and Italy pay the full retail price for medicines. New Zealand pays for the least expensive brand of a drug.

"These six governments therefore have a direct interest in the prices at which pharmaceutical items are sold."

The study grew out of an earlier investigation by the Task Force on Prescription Drugs, which the Department of Health, Education and Welfare created in the Johnson Administration.

In the fiscal year now ending, "pharmaceutical services" in HEW-sponsored health care programs will amount to about \$1.4 billion, out of a national total of more than \$7 billion, the study says.

About a decade ago, the late Sen. Estes Kefauver (D-Tenn.), as chairman of the Senate antitrust subcommittee, established that pharmaceutical houses frequently were charging American druggists more than druggists in countries as distant as New Zealand, even for medicines manufactured in the United States and shipped abroad.

In 1967 Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), chairman of the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee, established that such pricing disparities were persisting.

He brought out, for example, that CIBA's price to druggists for 100 0.25-mg. tablets of Cerpasil, its brand of reserpine, which often is used to lower blood pressure, was \$4.50 in the United States—but \$1.05 in Bonn, \$1.19 in London, \$1.24 in Bern, \$1.56 in Vienna, \$1.52 in Rome, and in Mexico City, \$3.00.

Pressed to explain, Charles T. Silloway, then president of the Swiss firm's United States subsidiary, testified about such things as "differing economics" in various countries and "local circumstances."

Nelson said, however, "In every single instance where competition occurs the price is far lower." He also emphasized that the United States grants patent monopolies on both processes and products, while many other nations do not.

THE PLIGHT OF THE BALTIC NATIONS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this month marks a tragic anniversary, the 31st year that the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have been denied their freedom and have been under the subjugation of a foreign power.

On June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union, then working in cooperation with Nazi Germany, invaded the three Baltic republics and imposed their rule on these formerly free nations. A brutal occupa-

tion followed with massive deportations of the resident populations. To date, nearly a quarter of the population of these three republics has been removed from their native homelands. This attack on the liberty of these peoples was met with resistance. It is estimated that during the period between 1940 and 1952, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters alone have lost their lives in a magnificent resistance movement. Although armed resistance has ceased, the spirit of liberty continues in the hearts of these brave people. They live in the hope and belief that some day independence will once again be theirs.

It is our duty to hold, always, the torch of liberty, the example of freedom up high, so that the captive and enslaved peoples of the world may continue to hope and aspire for the return of freedom. By our every example, by our every action, we must stand forth as the champions of independence for all people, everywhere.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the rich heritage of cultural diversity and the contributions to liberty which immigrants to America from the Baltic nations have given to this country.

This summer's Smithsonian Folk Art Festival on the Mall in the Nation's Capital is giving special recognition to the crafts and cultural background of the people of Ohio. Among the groups which will be represented are Americans of East European descent. These people, whose homelands are, for the most part, now denied the liberty which is the recognized right of mankind, will demonstrate the crafts and skills which their fathers brought to this Nation—and which helped make this Nation great.

As we participate in this festival on the Mall, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom which has been denied their homelands.

HEROIN ADDICTION IN INDOCHINA

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the real tragedy of our involvement in Southeast Asia is reflected in some recent correspondence I had regarding the son of one of my constituents who returned from serving in Vietnam with an undesirable discharge because of drug addiction.

There is a great deal of discussion and planning now for rehabilitation and treatment centers to care for men in this same situation. While I support these plans I do feel that they are missing the main thrust of this tragedy. We must direct our efforts toward withdrawal so that no longer will our young, healthy men be thrust into the horrors of that war and seek drugs as their only escape. I include these letters in the RECORD in the hope that they will bring the full impact of the war to those who would delay that withdrawal:

APRIL 24, 1971.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: I have received the reply from the Army relative to my brother, (—). However, the Army has failed to supply the most important information concerning my brother's situation. We, his family, have painfully received this information firsthand and all its heartbreaking ramifications. As far as I'm concerned the Army has shipped home one of the 30,000 walking dead.

While Colonel Proudfoot's letter lists the charges brought against my brother—and I have no argument against these charges—he forgets to state that at the time this incident occurred (—), a heroin addict, was trying to "kick the habit" and was "coming down" on his own. His addiction was known in Chu Lai, for he had, prior to this incident, applied for the Amnesty Program but had dropped out. Since he was only allowed to go to Amnesty once, he was trying to break his habit on his own. It is interesting to note the way in which the Army treated his sickness—in my brother's case. An addict is locked up, not treated for his sickness, and then discharged undesirably with this grave war wound.

Yesterday, in the Capitol, veterans flung their medals back. How does my brother fling his war medal back—his tortured mind—his punctured arm—his shattered life? My brother needed psychiatric help long before he went to Vietnam, but he was not a heroin addict. That wasn't the answer to the horrors of life in the field, but as you know, that is the unfortunate escape route so many soldiers take.

Now my brother is fighting for his life. He is struggling to stay off the needle. But he has been stripped of all his veteran benefits and his own self esteem is so low that I really doubt he will make it. Unfortunately, my parents are not able to accept addiction as a sickness, but look on it as criminal activity and my father, who served 22 years in the "old" Navy, cannot comprehend, let alone accept, the heartbreak of heroin. And my brother is presently living in this tense situation—trying to piece his shattered life together. Of course my father is also heartbroken about his discharge too. My brother says that after it was known that you helped get him out of the field, undue pressure was exerted on him and that this incident in Chu Lai was a result of that pressure.

I want you to know that my family is very grateful for your help and efforts on behalf of (—). My brother was a weak and disturbed person when he went to that insane, immoral war. Now he is a weak, disturbed heroin addict. Also, I am not trying to excuse my brother or his weaknesses. I desperately want him to receive psychiatric help—but I am bitter about his treatment in Vietnam. He was not treated as a war casualty, as a sick person. He was treated as a criminal and discharged as undesirable. This is punishment, not rehabilitation.

While (—) remains alive there is hope. But his self-esteem is so very low that I do not know how long he will be alive. I have tried to help him—have tried to get him to go to one of the drug rehabilitation programs, but he is so confused and trying to "please" my parents that he won't admit to them or himself that he needs to go. He's getting very shaky lately. I have seen the look of desperation in his eyes. Being off the needle is not enough to keep him off. He must have something to live for. School is out because his G.I. benefits are gone. Jobs are scarce and with an undesirable discharge the outlook is rather grim.

I really don't know if there's anything else you can do for my brother. But I hope that you can do something to stop this immoral,

inhumane, criminal treatment of boys who turn to heroin in the service. The Army does very little to stop the flow of these killer drugs, but then punishes those afflicted with the sickness. Insanity reigns these days.

Again, Mr. Waldie, thanks for your efforts on (—) behalf. He would like to write you, but is really unable. He told me to thank you very much for your help.

Peace,

(Name withheld.)

P.S.—Sorry this is so long. I know you're a busy man, but it isn't something you can say in a paragraph or two.

JUNE 5, 1971.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: I am very glad that upon our meeting last evening I could personally thank you and your staff for all their efforts on behalf of my brother (—). As I said last night, you have my family's permission to put my letter of April 24th into the Congressional Record. We would be very grateful if your office could send us several copies of the record when the letter is entered.

I have been unable to answer your letter because the situation with my brother had worsened. He had moved out of my parent's home and was living with a pusher. He was once again on heroin and my husband and I physically removed him from his depressing and self-destructing environment. We brought him here to live with us and my husband, who is a community organizer, was able to get (—) into Opportunities Industrialization Center where he is now enrolled in a welding class.

But (—) is by no means in the clear. Most recently he has started to talk about the horrors of the war, the atrocities he committed. He has trouble concentrating at OIC because the war and his guilt is always on his mind. He has nightmares and cannot get a good night's sleep. As he says, "I can't seem to get my head straight". When I returned home from the cocktail party last evening I told my brother of my conversation with you. He was drunk or stoned out of his mind—but not on heroin. He sat there, the tears rolling down his face, and told me how hurt he was when he'd killed a little puppy. And then there was the family he almost blew up just for the hell of it. And the rice paddies his truck ran over as the "pappason" pleaded with him not to. And there was the woman he killed and other accompanying atrocities that the heroin had blocked out. He is still in that insane war. He relives it every day and every night. He is "rotten", "evil", etc. He was very drunk and angry at himself for what he'd done.

I'm trying to get him involved in the Veterans Against the War. Then he can turn his anger and guilt into constructive action to try to abolish "the green machine"—to end the draft and to bring the boys home. Right now all his anger and "evil" feelings are directed against himself, not those who made him kill and then sent him home with an undesirable discharge and a heroin addiction.

I have read what the President proposes to do to stop the heroin addiction in Indo-China. I think his approach is inadequate and I know that the only answer is to bring the boys home and to end this insane war. At least the problem is being recognized. But so far no one has said anything about getting help for those addicts who have been returned home—with their shattered lives, their undesirable discharges and their heroin habit.

I am sure that my brother is only one of hundreds or even thousands who has been discharged undesirably and stripped of his benefits. The government is leaving him with a bleak future and is not bearing the respon-

sibility for his sickness. I would like to see some sort of legislation proposed to deal with this aspect of the Vietnam war, for my brother is a war casualty just as much as the guy who lost his legs. He is losing his sanity, I feel that pressure must be put on the Army to rescind these undesirable and dishonorable discharges and to reinstate rightful benefits to these veterans. He has been unable to even obtain a part-time job and one of the main reasons is that undesirable discharge.

Please let me know what else I can do to put pressure on the government to try to get help for boys like my brother. Who else should I write letters to in the Army and other departments in the government? My brother now resides in Don Edward's district, as do I, and I shall be writing him, but I feel I must do more.

Another tragic result of our personal family situation is that my father had a heart attack about a month ago and my mother may have to have heart surgery. Their conditions may not be completely attributable to my brother's situation—but our family has been living in a pressure cooker ever since we first got letters home from (—) when he was in the field. We are all a nervous wreck. I live with hope in my heart for my brother, but my mother has already buried him several times. I am realistic and am prepared for the worst. However, he is alive—but he is not living.

Peace,

(Name withheld.)

P.S.—You have our permission to use any of our correspondence to help remedy this insanity.

NUCLEAR POWER IN MAINE— FOURTH INSTALLMENT

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, last week I caused to be inserted in the RECORD of this body's proceedings the first five of seven chapters of a pamphlet entitled "Nuclear Power—The Greatest Threat To Maine," which is the product of the work of a Maine citizens' group called Citizens for Safe Power. These chapters were devoted to the environmental, safety, and other problem which construction and operation of a proposed atomic power plant in Maine could cause, as well as the likelihood that no agency will effectively be able to monitor or regulate these problems. The insertions appear on pages 21717, 21781, and 22109 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Today, I include the sixth chapter of the pamphlet in the RECORD, together with appropriate footnotes. The chapter is entitled "What are the Alternatives?" The article follows:

WHAT ARE THE ALTERNATIVES?

First consider whether nuclear fission plants, regardless of hazards, will assure sufficient supplies in the future! At present nuclear reactors provide the steam to generate less than one percent of electricity consumed. Of the 17 nuclear plants now "on the line" approximately half of them are now shut down permanently, or semi-permanently for repairs. Assuming they can be made reliable, is fission nuclear generation the most economical way to produce electricity? Dr. E. P. Radford points out that "... there has never been a detailed breakdown of all costs of nu-

clear power generation to determine just what the total cost to the consumer actually is . . ." (55)

Listed are some costs to the public:

1. Development in reactor engineering.
 2. Administration and promotion costs of the AEC.
 3. Mining, processing and transporting fuel.
 4. Insurance.
 5. Waste disposal.
 6. Plutonium re-purchase.
 7. Costs of shut downs of nuclear power plants when accidents or radioactivity make them inoperable.
 8. Environmental monitoring.
 9. Damage to the environment, losses in fish, game and contaminated foodstuffs.
 10. Disease and deaths of miners and members of public due to allied radioactivity.
- Joshua Lederberg estimates the health cost of mutations due to AEC's permissible exposure limits will be about \$10 billion a year, (56)

Utilities already know that nuclear plants are not as economical as conventional means of generation. That is why utilities demand that public taxes pay 500 million dollars annually of the 560 million dollar insurance bill (Curtis and Hogan, 1969), up to 70% of reactor research and development costs (Karp, 1970) (2 billion dollars for 1970, less than 2% for research of safe waste disposal [Committee on Resources and Man, 1969]), initial fuel costs, essential government monitoring of each plant, AEC administration and promotion costs, etc. The tax subsidy will soon be higher. The AEC states:

"With reactors of current technology, the known and estimated domestic resources of uranium at prices less than \$10 per pound of uranium oxide (U₃O₈) are adequate to meet the requirements of the projected growth of nuclear electric plant capacity in the U.S. for about the next 25 years." (57)

Since that estimate "nuclear power-plant capacity for 1980 has been increased from 95,000 to 145,000 electrical megawatts without a corresponding increase in the estimates of uranium reserve", and only about two-thirds of the reasonably assured reserves can be produced by 1980. The AEC claims it is developing a breeder reactor that would produce up to two-thirds the amount of fissionable material it burns, thus greatly extending the use of the limited supplies of uranium on earth.

However, Dr. Radford reports:

"Presently in the U.S. only one small experimental breeder reactor is operating in Idaho. A larger one built in Nebraska never operated adequately and has been shut down permanently.

The large Enrico Fermi breeder reactor constructed near Detroit had a loss of cooling capacity in a portion of the fuel elements, a melt down of some of the elements, with the result that it has not been operating since 1966." (58)

If competitively priced uranium runs out before the breeder is developed the AEC and the utilities are not worried. By then present nuclear plant construction will have the U.S. dependent enough on nuclear generation to force tax subsidy of non-competitively priced uranium reserves found in low-grade uranium deposits, granite, and certain soils. Such dependence will also conveniently preempt present safety considerations, and the public will have to accept nuclear generation at any cost.

Theoretically, nuclear fission could be an enormous source of electrical power in the future and scientists agree that if all radioactivity could be contained, if uses could be developed for the deadly radioactive waste, and thermal effluents adequately controlled, nuclear power generation would be acceptable, and we should be strictly researching to achieve these goals and not be accelerating power demands to justify more construction of present wasteful and hazardous nu-

clear plants. Canada has perfected, through a purely research approach toward nuclear power generation, a nuclear plant cleaner and more efficient than U.S. plants and is buying the necessary heavy water from Russia.

Aside from the AEC-utility rush to commit the U.S. to nuclear power generation, what is the "power crisis?" The most conservative estimates of readily available conventional sources of electricity gives us well over 600 years to perfect safe nuclear power generation. The National Academy of Science estimates at projected consumption rates, we have about 100 years minimum before the peak 80% of known reserves of petroleum (crude oil, natural gas, etc.) are exhausted; about 300 to 400 years to exhaust the peak 80% of coal reserves.

There is no question that solar energy can generate vast amounts of electricity.

The U.S. has installed less than one-third of its river power generating capacity, and we have an annual 255,020,000,000 kilowatt potential in North America alone for generating electricity by tidal power. (Committee on Resources and Man, 1969).

Are there new means of generating electricity? Unfortunately the AEC has kept this Country behind in developing other means by cornering 84% of the electricity generating research dollar for the past 20 years, (Shepard, 1970) for the singular development of nuclear power plants. The Federal Power Commission states that a radically new means of generating electricity called magneto-hydrodynamics (MDH):

"could become an established form of electric energy supply much before the turn of the century" . . . "the requirements for water for cooling MDH generation would be only a fraction of the requirement for fossil-fueled or nuclear-powered generation, and MDH generators would contribute little to air pollution . . . MDH, a high voltage potential can be obtained by placing electrodes in a very hot, ionized and highly conductive gas stream as it moves through a magnetic field." (59)

Privately in the U.S., the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. of California now generates 82 megawatts geothermally using natural volcanic steam beds that cover almost the entire Western half of the U.S. and will generate 220 megawatts by 1972. Eleven northern California towns have contracted for their own geothermal generating facilities. Russia is developing a geothermal potential that "is greater than all other Soviet energy sources together." Mexico recently "awed" University of California scientists with their development of geothermal energy. Presently she has a 75 megawatt plant under construction and 300 megawatt plant under design. Ireland, New Zealand, Japan, Hungary, Indonesia, and the Philippines use substantial geothermal energy. Italy has 389 megawatts, and Russia 828.25 megawatts with total capacity in the early 1970's of 1,124.75 megawatts. (Committee on Resources and Man, 1969) Worldwide the steam beds are proving inexhaustible as surface rains are found to seep down and more than compensate for any possible steam release.

Russia now leads the world in development of electricity generation by nuclear fusion (version fission). The National Academy of Sciences cites Bethe in Resources and Man:

" . . . the enormous amounts of energy radiated from the sun and the stars are produced by the fusion of hydrogen of atomic-mass 1 into helium of atomic-mass 4."

"The Academy goes on to say:

"The fusion of deuterium and tritium (each a form of hydrogen) into helium in an uncontrolled explosive manner has already been achieved as is the basis for the so-called hydrogen, or thermonuclear bomb.

" . . . The relative abundance of deuterium in water (including sea water) is 1 deuterium atom for each 6,500 hydrogen atoms . . .

" . . . the fuel equivalents of 1 cubic kilo-

meter of sea water are 269 billion tons of coal, or 1,360 billion barrels of crude oil. . . . The total volume of the oceans is about 1.5X10⁹ cubic kilometers. Should enough deuterium be withdrawn to reduce the initial concentration by 1 percent, the energy released by fusion would amount to about 500,000 times that of the world's initial supply of fossil fuels." (60)

On October 31, 1969 the New York Times reported:

"British scientists, using 5 tons of equipment flown to Moscow to test a Soviet plane widely viewed with skepticism in the West, have found that the Russians underestimated their success in trying to tame the power of the hydrogen bomb.

"The development has injected new life into the effort to develop the reactor power by fusion—that is, by the energy released when two very light atoms merge to form a heavier one. In reactors now in use, the energy is produced by fission—the splitting of giant atoms such as those of uranium.

"Oak Ridge has begun work on a counterpart of the Tokamak series, known as Ormak, which will cost about \$1 million. Dr. Postma plans to incorporate some design features that he hopes will make it superior to the Soviet machine. However, he reported recently that the Russians had a long head start." (61)

On February 5, 1971 the New York Times reported:

"Princeton University physicists reported Wednesday that recent experiments deem it may be possible to demonstrate before 1975 that it is scientifically feasible to harness the awesome energy of the hydrogen bomb.

"If so, they said, in another 15 years the nation may see an electric power generating plant operating on thermonuclear fusion . . .

"Grove (Dr. Don Grove, Physicist in charge of fusion experiments at Princeton) told a news conference that recent experiments on the Princeton Tokamak have verified the work done in the Soviet Union and have begun to find out what features of the Tokamak make it work better than any previous device . . .

"Because the research is advancing rapidly, Grove said, electric power utilities are becoming interested. Public Service Gas and Electric Company of New Jersey has made a 50,000 dollar grant and utilities in New York, Philadelphia and other places have expressed interest . . .

"As for safety, Grove commented: 'It is absolutely impossible to have a nuclear explosion in a fusion power plant. There are absolutely no radioactive by-products, no hot fission ashes to be carted away.'

"As a result, he added, 'A thermonuclear plant could be located right in the center of the city.'" (62)

Fossil fuel plants operate at 39% efficiency as compared to 32% for nuclear reactors [such as Maine Yankee], which means 32% of a nuclear plants' heat is converted to electricity and the rest goes into the environment (Seaborg, 1970). Richard F. Post, (Gaugh, Eastlund, 1971) of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory has proposed a direct energy conversion fusion process which could operate at as much as 90% efficiency. Present fission reactors can only use 1% of the uranium fuel installed before the fuel assembly must be replaced. (Radford, 1969)

According to All Bulent Cambel, Wayne State University's Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Director of a sweeping White House inquiry into energy problems:

"There is no doubt whatsoever that the production of power is the main source of environmental blight that engulfs us everywhere. The limitations of energy consumption lies not in any shortage of resources but in environmental limitations." (emphasis added) . . .

"When fossil fuel reserves, uranium and

thorium reserves, the nuclear fusion potential of deuterium in sea water, and non-depletable energy sources (hydro, aero, geothermal, tidal and solar) are all considered together, man need not fear an energy shortage for billions of years. Because some fuels are more abundant than others, however, careful decisions must be made concerning when to switch from one fuel to another but these are easy in comparison to the effectuations of controls over environmental pollution." (63)

We could easily install stack precipitators for an estimated three hundred million dollars on present and additional fossil fuel generating plants and meet all power needs in the foreseeable future, plus assure a huge reduction in polluting emissions (The Advocates, 1971) Dana A. Eldridge, Engineer for Maine's Public Utility Commission writes to point out the practicality of this more conventional and safer approach.

"Originally the cheaper cost of fuel was the prime consideration of nuclear generation with its effect on the general level of rates, however, the long lead time for construction, continually escalating cost of construction, cost of money, and the many safeguards required for operational safety and protection of the environment has offset to a considerable degree the advantage of cheaper fuel and recent planning has indicated a preference for fossil fuel plants with their relatively short construction time and capital cost per kilowatt."

However, in the same letter he recognizes the political reality that the AEC will still push nuclear plants over fossil fuel plants on an uninformed public.

"There will, however, be additional nuclear generation in the late 70's and early 80's for the New England Region, and no doubt States will be selected several years in advance of construction . . . inasmuch as power generation sites are becoming scarce in the more heavily populated sections of New England no doubt more and more attention will be given to Maine's open spaces for future locations of generating plants, both fossil fuel and nuclear." ("One or two more nuclear plants are now proposed for southern Maine by 1980, in the 1,000 megawatt range, and possibly of the more dangerous breeder type.")

LaMont C. Cole, Professor of Ecology, Cornell University, states:

"I am convinced that this rush to blanket the Northeast with nuclear power plants is one of the most dangerous and misguided steps ever taken by man." (64)

Resources for the Future, February 1968, reports:

"The Soviet nuclear fission-based power program may come to a complete halt . . . if one takes at face value a reported statement by Kirillin, Chairman of the State Committee on Science and Technology. According to this, no more nuclear power stations are to be built in the Soviet Union because they are not economically competitive with conventional fuel power stations." (65)

However President Nixon's science advisor, Dr. Edward E. David Jr., recently announced that development of the most hazardous, liquid sodium, fast breeder reactor for the production of additional fuel for fission nuclear plants had become one of the country's chief technological goals. Accordingly, the AEC has received 103 million dollars for fiscal 1971 for such breeder development, with a concurrent reduction reduction of funds for fusion research (Sullivan, 1971).

REFERENCES

55. Radford, Edward P., M.D., Statement to be Read for the Senate Appropriations Committee, October 15, 1969, p. 7.
56. Statement by Dr. Joshua Lederberg reprinted in Nuclear Power and Public Concern, revised edition, 1971, p. 21.
57. Committee on Resources and Man, p. 224.

58. Radford, October 15, 1969, p. 6.
59. Environmental Effects of Producing Electric Power. An analysis by the Staff of the Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission, p. 56.
60. Committee of Resources and Man, pp. 228, 230.
61. Statement by Walter Sullivan reprinted in Nuclear Power and Public Concern, 1970, p. 50.
62. Sullivan, Brian, "Thermonuclear Power Envisioned By 1975," New York Times (February 5, 1971).
63. Lear, John, "Clean Power from Inside the Earth," Saturday Review (December 5, 1970), p. 61.
64. Statement by LaMont C. Cole reprinted in Nuclear Power and Public Concern, 1970, p. 3.
65. Statement from "Resources for the Future" reprinted in Nuclear Power and Public Concern, 1970, p. 47.

RARICK'S TESTIMONY ON RHODESIAN SANCTIONS AND STATE DEPARTMENT POSITION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 I testified before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs relative to legislation to limit the economic sanctions employed by our Nation against the Government of Rhodesia.

Subsequently, I received a copy of correspondence from the State Department opposing any end to economic sanctions or resumption of normal trading with Rhodesia and full recognition of the Rhodesian Government.

The letter from the State Department representative clearly shows that that body dwells in the unrealistic world of fantasy, myth, and superstition. For a nation which is usually dedicated to fair play and open trade, even to Communist countries and to Red China, it seems juvenile to maintain that the United Kingdom is the sovereign power in Rhodesia 5 years after the Rhodesians declared their own independence. Had our present State Department been in existence in 1776, one would wonder how many years they would have vacillated before trading with the new American colonies, or if they ever would have.

Nor does it make sense for the State Department of the United States to dodge their constitutional responsibilities to the American people and hide behind the U.N. Charter. Especially is this so when our national policy is subservient to the United Nations in some instances, yet we ignore our so-called U.N. responsibility in other instances and do what our leaders tell us they feel is right.

For example, Red China was condemned as an aggressor nation in 1951. The condemnation has never been lifted or removed. Yet our State Department approved of trade with Red China.

Israel has been condemned 12 times since 1966; yet not only does our State Department continue diplomatic relations and open trade with Israel but also

U.S. taxpayers have time and time again subsidized Israel and by so doing condone the actions which have been condemned by the U.N.

Our State Department's foreign policy is certainly an Alice in Wonderland enigma.

I insert a copy of my testimony to the committee and a copy of the letter to the State Department in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. RARICK BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I am thankful for the opportunity offered by this committee to examine our country's policy relating to sanctions against Rhodesia. In my thinking, the entire theory of retributive punishment against a sovereign nation in the hopes of intermeddling in the internal affairs of that nation is wanton folly—sought as a dignified effort to commit piracy.

We are given three basic reasons for refusing to grant diplomatic recognition to Rhodesia, all of them false, as I will demonstrate.

First, we are told that we must honor the sanctions on that country which were imposed by the United Nations Organization. Let us look honestly at these sanctions, from either the point of view of objective evaluation of their validity or from the point of view of the interest of the United States.

Objectively the sanctions were either the conniving of the Soviets, manipulating the black puppets of the 42 so-called emerging nations which make up a significant and controllable bloc in the General Assembly or they were the petulant pouting of spiteful children who are going to spit on the pie if they cannot have it to eat.

The idea that peaceful Rhodesia—nonaggressive, and with no announced threat to its neighbors—is a threat to world peace—because some other nation may make an aggressive attack on Rhodesia—is the kind of poppycock that thinking Americans are sick of hearing. Besides, too many Americans have been to Rhodesia to continue swallowing this fabrication which has been invented for political expediency.

Rhodesia has a population of 4,670,000, while Washington, D.C. has a population of 756,510. Yet the District of Columbia police force has 5,100 men while the Rhodesian army totals under 4,000, with less than 1,000 being European or white. Although the Rhodesian army is smaller than the police force of Washington, D.C., no one has yet suggested an embargo against our nation's capital as constituting a threat to international peace.

Even though our treaty obligations are the law of the land under our Constitution, the actions of the United Nations Organization or any of its organs, no matter how prestigious, are binding on us only if we choose to be bound.

Noteworthy, the only conceivable justification for such an act of warfare—and a declared blockade under articles 39, 41, and 42 of the United Nations Charter is an act of warfare—is the determination by the Security Council that a target nation constitutes "any threat to world peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression."

This is like saying that a solvent bank is a dangerous threat to law and order in the community because some criminal may rob or burglarize it; therefore, to preserve public peace it must be boycotted and destroyed.

In the debate relating to the imposition of trade sanctions against Rhodesia, it was not shown—nor could it be that Rhodesia was a threat to world peace.

The Security Council procedure during the debate deviated from the U.N. Charter provisions since Rhodesia was not permitted to be

present and was even denied the opportunity to be heard or participate in its own trial pursuant to article 32.

Furthermore, under the U.N. Participation Act, the U.N. representatives are authorized to perform in connection with the U.S. in the U.N.O. as the President may from time to time direct.

In some instances it suits our domestic political purposes or our international relations to be bound, and we ratify the U.N.O. decree by our acceptance. In other cases, where it does not fit the policy of the United States, we have many convenient ways of avoiding the impact of U.N.O. mandates.

For example, Israel is in violation of repeated mandates by the Security Council to withdraw within its own borders and cease its aggressive military operations against its neighbors. As a member of the Security Council as well as of the United Nations Organization, it might be urged that we should apply the same standards to the violation of these mandates as to any other, but instead, we are aiding and abetting their repeated daily violation. Not only do we give financial support to Israel, through tax-free bonds enjoyed by no other nation, we actually manufacture and sell to the Israelis the weapons with which to continue their alleged transgressions against U.N.O. authority.

It has been suggested by some critics of our very elastic interpretation of our obligations to the United Nations Organization that the Rhodesians would fare better if there were more Rhodesians voting in New York. I offer no opinion on this idea.

Nor is Israel the only such example of our highly variable standard.

Red China is actually at war with the United Nations Organization—or with the United States, if you desire to pierce the thin veil of illusion. Remember Korea—the U.N. condemnation of Red China as an aggressor nation in 1951. Yet recently the Nixon Administration announced relaxation of trade and travel restrictions and reportedly will back a two-China U.N. seat to the prejudice of our U.S. ally of long standing—Nationalist China. The President also indicated he would like to visit Red China. Perhaps he intends to use his visit to negotiate ending the war in Korea—a war which is interrupted by a shaky cease-fire with U.S. casualties continuing whenever it suits propaganda purposes for the Reds.

The President can take comfort in hiding behind the sanctions imposed on Rhodesia by claiming U.N. cooperation. Red China and Israel have both been condemned as aggressors but without U.N. imposition of economic boycott. So Rhodesia, it can be said, remains saddled with sanctions differing from other U.N. action.

The obviously intended thrust of the U.N. sanctions, participated in by the foreign policy experts of both national parties, was to replace the British government in their hunch that the new revolutionary government of Prime Minister Smith could be toppled in a short period of time. The sanctions must then have been intended as a temporary political expediency to internationally embarrass the Rhodesian politicians and to encourage a "created poverty" in the hopes of stirring dissension and dissatisfaction among the Rhodesian citizens.

That U.N. sanctions have failed is self-evident. Rhodesia continues as a free Republic. U.N. members, including the Soviet Union, trade with Rhodesia whenever trade in strategic materials such as chrome and petalite is deemed necessary to their nations' interest.

As a second reason suggested for continuing sanctions, we are told that we must not offend the United Kingdom by granting recognition to a former colony whose independence does not meet with approval of the British Government—neither with the dictates of the Labor Party formerly in

power—nor with the Conservative Party presently in power.

There may or may not be a good reason for being the rubber-stamp endorser of British colonial policy. If there is, it has never been even suggested to the American people nor to their representatives in the Congress, much less explained to any of us. I, for one, have had enough of the British willingness to fight to the last American, whether in Rhodesia or elsewhere. I believe the majority of the American people share this view.

We do not find our British brethren anywhere near as solicitous of our feelings as they desire us to be of theirs. While Americans die in combat in Vietnam, ships flying many of the flags of the British Commonwealth sail in and out of the port of Halphong, trading with the enemy and supplying him with the necessary materiel for his slaughter of Americans. And this, even though Britain is also a signatory to SEATO. Despite the threat to the United States from the presence of Soviet missiles and missile bases in Castro's Cuba, our Canadian friends, a nation of the British Commonwealth, carry on a sustaining trade with Havana.

For five years the government of Rhodesia has demonstrated that it is here to stay as a stable and responsible government. Nor do even the British suggest a desire to violently overthrow the existing government to restore colonial rule over Rhodesia. Both British parties when in power have always announced that they intend the Rhodesians to have home rule and self-government—the opposition by the British royalty and political leaders is simply that they would prefer a political group of their choosing to be in power in Rhodesia in order to help the political future of Great Britain.

For the U.S. to continue sanctions behind the smokescreen that Rhodesia is but a token rebel government which ought to remain subject to the sovereignty of Britain is to perpetuate the myths and superstitions of unreality.

Our British friends plead for our cooperation in recognizing their plight because they are helplessly out-voted in the U.N. by the Black Racist regimes in Africa, many being their freed former colonies.

Britain and the U.S. have a combined population of over 250 million, while the population of all of Africa is just over 335 million. Yet, while the U.S. and England have two votes in the U.N. General Assembly, the Africans have 41 votes. In fact, under present composition, two-thirds of the U.N. could represent 10 percent of the world population.

Should the U.S. side with Britain in any issue contrary to the best interest of the U.S.? Britain certainly knew in sponsoring her former colonies for U.N. membership that her 55 million people would be out-democratized by any "one-tribe, one-vote" theory where there was no equal representation based on the usual requisites to civilization.

A third reason advanced for continuing sanctions against Rhodesia is the concept which has been drummed into American ears for years that there is something bad about the Government of Rhodesia and about the Government of South Africa, because these nations are ruled by civilized white men rather than black masses, be they civilized or savage. A false corollary to this propaganda line is that something must be wrong with the "democracy" in these lands, since where savages manifestly outnumber civilized men, a one-man, one-vote situation would obviously result in a savage and not a civilized government.

A recent report from UNESCO announced that 97 countries of the world have illiteracy rates of 50 percent—and in 20 countries 95 to 99 percent of the inhabitants are illiterate. And, according to UNESCO, the situation contrary to public opinion has grown worse in some countries.

In short, we are urged not to recognize a

government using the criterion of whether or not its internal political processes are in accord with some intellectual's theories of "democracy."

Let us examine our foreign policy from this angle, and demolish once and for all this totally inane and dishonest argument.

If we were to honestly accept this as a standard for recognizing a foreign government, we should at once withdraw our ambassadors from half the nations of the earth. Diplomatic relations should be broken at once with the Soviet Union, as well as its satellites Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and even Yugoslavia and Albania. If we listen to the complaints of certain dissidents in Northern Ireland, we might even have to withdraw our recognition of the United Kingdom because of the suppression claimed by the Irish.

Any government which resulted from a coup—or for that matter, from an election not to our liking—would be beyond the pale and diplomatically ostracized. Remember, even the caste discrimination in India can be repulsive and shocking to some.

Foreign policy pronouncements by President Nixon have indicated a relaxing if not an abolition of all trade barriers. Lately the announcement was made that trade by our country with any nation was not to be considered as approval by our nation of that country's leaders or its domestic policies.

President Nixon defined his Nixon Doctrine as:

"In effect we are encouraging countries to participate fully in the creation of plans and the designing of programs. They must define the nature of their own progress. For only in this manner will they think of their fate as truly their own."

Following the election of Allende, the Marxist-Communist in Chile, President Nixon stated:

"The new Government in Chile is a clear case in point. The 1970 election of a Socialist President may have profound implications not only for its people but for the inter-American system as well. The government's legitimacy is not in question, but its ideology is likely to influence its actions. Chile's decision to establish ties with Communist Cuba, contrary to the collective policy of the OAS, was a challenge to the inter-American system. We and our partners in the OAS will therefore observe closely the evolution of Chilean foreign policy.

"Our bilateral policy is to keep open lines of communication. We will not be the ones to upset traditional relations. We assume that international rights and obligations will be observed. We also recognize that the Chilean Government's actions will be determined primarily by its own purposes and that these will not be deflected simply by the tone of our policy. In short, we are prepared to have the kind of relationship with the Chilean government that it is prepared to have with us."

On Romania, President Nixon said:

"In 1969 I visited Romania—a Warsaw Pact country—the first visit by an American President to a Communist country in 42 years. President Ceausescu visited Washington in 1970.

"Romania takes positions on many major issues quite different from our own, but we both recognize the right of every nation to develop its own policies in light of its own interests. Therefore our differences do not preclude consultation or practical cooperation."

On Yugoslavia, President Nixon said:

"In 1970, on President Tito's invitation, I paid the first visit by an American President to nonaligned Yugoslavia. We exchanged ideas on major international issues, especially on the Middle East. We broadened our ties of cooperation on the basis of mutual interest and a mature respect for our acknowledged differences. President Tito has

now accepted my invitation to pay a return visit to the United States."

On Red China, President Nixon said: "We are prepared to establish a dialogue with Peking. We cannot accept its ideological precepts, or the notion that Communist China must exercise hegemony over Asia. But neither do we wish to impose on China an international position that denies its legitimate national interests."

Why persist therefore in a double standard on trade with Rhodesia?

If the United Nations Charter is to be given any significance, article 1, section 7 must be considered.

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII."

The previous Washington administration implemented the United Nations call for sanctions and issued regulations on both March 2, 1967, and August 13, 1968, that included automatic penalties against any American business or industry trading with Rhodesia.

American investment in Rhodesian chromite mines has been sizable, and American-owned firms were producing most of the chromite ore imported into the United States. Union Carbide Corporation and Foote Minerals Company owned these mines. The Treasury Department was made responsible for enforcing the executive orders that spelled out sanctions against trade with Rhodesia.

The two companies have petitioned the Treasury Department to at least permit them to bring into the United States that chromite ore already mined, paid for, and stockpiled in Rhodesia. Union Carbide has over 150,000 tons paid for and Foote Mineral has 57,000 tons. Both companies are investing sizable amounts of money to keep the mines operating in order to avoid possible flooding.

The second major element, petalite, is even more critical. Rhodesia is the only commercial source of this ore which is used in civilian glass and ceramic manufacture.

What is even worse, we are now buying 60 percent of our total chromite imports from the U.S.S.R., which has steadily increased prices to us since we stopped importing Rhodesian ores. Moscow has raised the cost of chromite 50 percent and has no petalite for us to buy. At least we can be grateful for that.

The official double talk that keeps on trying to make Rhodesia a threat to peace and an enemy of this country is totally unworthy even of people who guessed wrong and don't want to admit it. We should release Rhodesia from the restrictions on trade between our two countries. It is something of a minor miracle that Prime Minister Ian Smith has led the Rhodesians to continue a high regard for American principles, the American people, and our symbol as the world's leader for liberty. The least we can do is to repay that loyalty by recognizing Rhodesia as our friend and an ally of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, I have several bills before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that could remove any obstacle or cloud of excuse preventing the Executive Department from lifting the sanctions, or at least modifying the sanctions where it is known to be in the best interest of the American people and specifically our national defense.

H.R. 8967 contains the phraseology of the Collins Bill and would amend the United Nations Participation Act to remove prohibition or regulation of imports of strategic and critical materials, the produce of any foreign country or area not listed as Communist-dominated.

H. Con. Res. 60, calling for a sense of Congress that the President through the United States delegation to the United Nations take steps to revoke the U.N. economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

H.R. 360, that the U.N. Participation Act of 1945 be repealed in toto. H.R. 360 was introduced with the express intent that two wars and continued adherence to U.N. political rulings have proven that the Participation Act is too broad and has in far too many instances superseded and usurped the Constitution of the United States to the detriment of U.S. citizens.

While I feel H.R. 360 offers the soundest solution; i.e., by repealing and completely re-legislating, I also recognize the opposition at hand. Therefore, I feel the provisions of H.R. 8967, or legislation of similar provision offers the American people the fastest relief from the sanctions against strategic and critical materials and would encounter the least resistance or controversy.

The Rhodesians throughout history have been our ally and friend. They fought beside our men in World Wars I and II and offered troops to aid us in Vietnam. The Rhodesians have indicated time and time again they want to be our friends but not at the price of letting us dictate how they should run their country.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1971.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your request of April 29 for the Department of State's comments on House Joint Resolution 172, House Concurrent Resolutions 5, 6, and 12, and House Resolution 45, all submitted on January 22, 1971.

H. Res. 45 supports U.S. participation in the United Nations mandatory sanctions program on Rhodesia. As this resolution thus affirms present policy as most recently stated by the President and Secretary of State in their respective foreign policy reports to the Congress this year, the Department of State is in favor of it.

The Department opposes H.J. Res. 172 and H. Con. Res. 6 and 12, which call for an end to economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and H. Con. Res. 5, which in addition proposes the resumption of normal trading relations with Rhodesia, and full recognition of the Rhodesian regime. The operative paragraphs of these resolutions conflict with U.S. policy, and we believe that their preambular paragraphs contain statements of fact and law which are inaccurate or misleading.

If the U.S. Government were to act as recommended by these resolutions, the U.S. would be in violation of international treaty obligations which it has freely undertaken. The U.S. has obligated itself in Article 25 of the UN Charter, "to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council." We voted for the resolutions in 1966 and 1968 by which the Security Council decided upon mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and for a Security Council resolution in 1970 which reaffirmed the earlier resolutions and called for more stringent enforcement of the program. In his Foreign Policy Report to the Congress on February 25, 1971, President Nixon stated that the U.S. supports the sanctions program as well as measures which could insure more universal compliance with that program.

H.J. Res. 172 states that "the Congress of the U.S. is vested with sole authority to regulate foreign commerce under Article I, section 8, paragraph 3 of the Constitution, while the only authority delegated by the Congress to the Executive Branch to restrict trade concerns the control of trading with the enemy . . ." This point is also made in

H. Con. Res. 5 and 12. In fact, however, Congress has, in the UN Participation Act of 1945, empowered the President to take actions such as that implementing Rhodesian sanctions. Section 5 (a) of the Act, as amended (59 Stat. 619), authorizes the President "to regulate or prohibit, economic relations" when the U.S. is called upon to apply mandatory sanctions under Article 41 of the UN Charter. This authority was cited in the Executive Orders which implemented Rhodesian sanctions.

If sanctions are imposed under Chapter VII of the Charter, all Members of the United Nations are obligated by Article 25 of the Charter to comply with the Security Council decision imposing the sanctions. In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Report on the United Nations Participation Act, the Committee said:

"The committee realizes that the powers proposed to be granted to the President namely, the prevention of armed conflict" under [section 5] . . . are very great. However, the basic decision in this regard was made when the Charter was ratified and this provision is simply a necessary corollary to our membership in this Organization. The committee also believes that the Security Council must be placed in the most effective position possible to act under Article 41 since the prompt and effective application of economic and diplomatic sanctions by all the United Nations (or even the threat or possibility thereof) may avoid the necessity for the use of the armed forces available to the Security Council.

"The better prepared this country is to participate promptly in action of this kind, the more effective will be the Security Council and the more hope there will be that the United Nations may serve its major purpose,

The Department of State is concerned that any limitation of the authority of the President to carry out mandatory sanctions decided by the Security Council would decrease the effectiveness of the United Nations and might at some point result in the United States being unable to satisfy its treaty obligations. In this connection, it should be noted that the President is also empowered by the Export Administration Act of 1969 (and was empowered formerly by the Export Control Act of 1949) to prohibit or curtail U.S. exports "to the extent necessary . . . to fulfill [the] international obligations" of the U.S.

H.J. Res. 172 states that the United Kingdom supplies our enemy in Vietnam and "has refused our request that it cease doing business with the enemy that is killing American boys every day . . ." In fact, virtually all external assistance to North Vietnam comes from the Soviet Union and Communist China. In the past four years only one British-owned vessel has visited North Vietnam and the British Government has acted to prevent any reoccurrences. The other British flag vessels that have called at North Vietnamese ports are controlled by Chinese Communist interests and registered in Hong Kong.

The British Government is seriously concerned about the use of its flag in this traffic and has succeeded in confining it, for all practical purposes, to vessels based in Hong Kong. The UK maintains that legal and political considerations involving its position in Hong Kong restrict its ability to deal with the matter there. Even so, the effectiveness of British efforts is evident in the decline in the number of vessels operating out of Hong Kong to North Vietnam under the British flag—114 in 1968, 74 in 1969, and 40 in 1970.

In several other respects, the preambular paragraphs of these resolutions state premises which are not consistent with the official attitude of the U.S. toward the white-ruled regimes of southern Africa and with U.S. policy in the area. First of all, as the Presi-

dent stated in his Report to the Congress in February: "Both our statements and actions have, or should have made it patently clear to all concerned that racism is abhorrent to the American people, to my Administration, and to me personally. We cannot be indifferent to apartheid. Nor can we ignore the tensions created in Africa by the denial of political self-determination. We shall do what we can to foster equal opportunity and free political expression instead. We shall do so on both moral and practical grounds, for in our view there is no other solution."

The U.S. voted as it did in the United Nations Security Council in 1966 and 1968 in part because the regime in Rhodesia was adopting measures designed to deny an effective voice to the African majority in the determination of Rhodesia's future. These measures were expanded in 1970 with the regime's unilateral introduction of a new constitution institutionalizing white minority control and racial discrimination. Contrary to the view expressed in H.J. Res. 172, the peaceful measures taken by the UN are designed to forestall bloody struggle in southern Africa, not promote it. We are concerned that the present tensions arising from the denial of majority rule in Rhodesia could lead to serious violence there, a situation which could be exploited by communist states seeking to increase their presence and influence in the area.

Preambular paragraphs of these resolutions which refer to Rhodesia as a "sovereign" nation are inconsistent with the view of the international community, which we share, that the UK is the sovereign power in Southern Rhodesia. Of the 21 countries which maintained some form of consular representation in Rhodesia at the time of the unilateral declaration of independence in November 1965, only South Africa and Portugal continue to do so. No country in the world—not even South Africa or Portugal—has formally recognized the Smith regime or Rhodesian independence.

Accordingly, the Security Council's actions with regard to Rhodesia were not an intervention in the internal affairs of a state, as stated in H. Con. Res. 12. They were rather a response to a request for assistance by a member nation, the United Kingdom, recognized by all as having sovereignty over, and responsibility for the territory, and to the threat to international peace and security which the Council concluded existed as the result of the situation in Rhodesia.

Finally, the statements in H. Con. Res. 5 about chromite and our national security must be judged against the following background:

The matter of chrome ore supply in this country is kept under constant review within the Executive Branch. Our studies indicate that adequate supplies of chrome ore are available to American industry at the present time. While the supply situation might be described as tight, it is premature to suggest that there is a shortage. In fact, inventories of American industry increased last year, while imports and domestic consumption were virtually in balance. Moreover, although some chrome ore is needed for national defense purposes, I should put this in perspective by noting that direct military consumption presently requires about 10% of our consumption.

With respect to U.S. imports of Soviet chrome ore, I would note that American purchases of chrome ore from the USSR did not result solely from the imposition of Rhodesian sanctions nor is the Soviet Union the sole supplier in this area. In the years immediately prior to sanctions, Rhodesia and the USSR each accounted for about one-third of U.S. imports of metallurgical grade chromite. In the period 1967-70 since sanctions, the U.S. has imported approximately 51% of its supplies from the USSR

while also increasing purchases from other producers such as Turkey and South Africa.

Some months prior to the adoption of Rhodesian sanctions, the U.S. Government commenced the disposal of chrome ore and its equivalents from the stockpiles which had been found in excess of U.S. needs. Disposals of 885,000 short dry tons were authorized by the Congress in Public Law 89-415 of May 11, 1966, and are continuing.

Soviet and Rhodesian chrome ore prices are not susceptible to comparison as suggested by H. Con. Res. 5. No current Rhodesian price is ascertainable, since Rhodesian chromite is not traded freely, and it would be misleading to compare 1971 Soviet ore prices with 1966 Rhodesian ore prices. Prices for Soviet chromite have doubled since 1966. Lower-quality chromite from other sources has increased in price more or less proportionately to that for Soviet ore. The overall rise in market prices does reflect the impact of sanctions, but it also reflects factors such as inflation and overall demand, which have caused significant price increases in many raw materials over the same period.

I hope that the foregoing is helpful in explaining the Department's position with respect to these resolutions. The Office of Management and Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

EMERGENCY STRIKE LEGISLATION

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD at this time a copy of a letter from Mr. Albert Lannon, ILWU Washington representative, expressing the opposition of the ILWU to the Emergency Strike Legislation.

In addition, I am also placing in the RECORD a copy of an article from the New York Times of June 16, 1971, entitled "Dock Union Head Assails Move for U.S. Action in Labor Dispute."

I am sure my colleagues will find these to be of great interest.

The articles follow:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S
AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,
Washington, D.C. June 23, 1971.

Re Emergency Strike Legislation
Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public
Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When the Administration first proposed its Emergency Public Interest Protection Act last year the International Executive Board of the ILWU branded it "a major attack on organized labor, free collective bargaining, and rank and file democracy." We maintain that position, and include in it the Javits bill and any other proposal aimed at harassing and crippling the bargaining strength of workers in the transportation or any other industry. Free collective bargaining—the bulwark of American labor-management relations—is not, as some would imply, somehow unAmerican; it has worked. Without governmental interference it will continue to work.

We are told that the nation cannot tolerate a railroad strike, so therefore we must have

controls and compulsion on longshore, trucking, maritime and airline workers also. We are told that railroad negotiations are at a constant impasse, conveniently forgetting the fact that it was legislative interference in that collective bargaining process which created the impasse. Employers, in our experience, will never bargain seriously when they can expect the government to bail them out. An example of this can be seen in the attached *New York Times* story exposing a confidential American Association of Port Authorities letter predicting a 90-day East Coast longshore strike and urging support for the Administration proposals—even before negotiations there have begun!

When the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act was first unwrapped in the last Congress, it came at a time when, in addition to railroad, negotiations were under way for a national trucking contract. We believe that was no accident, that the proposal was meant to interject government into those negotiations at the expense of the involved workers. Its re-introduction comes at a time when the ILWU is in coast-wide negotiations and the rest of the longshore industry is preparing for contract talks. That too is not an accident; it is a blatant attempt to interfere with a free collective bargaining process which has served both labor and management well for over 35 years.

The last Pacific coast-wide longshore strike occurred in 1948. Armed with the new Taft-Hartley Act, the employers were trying to accomplish nothing less than the destruction of the union and the democratically-run hiring halls won in the historic 1934 strike. The Act was being used also to harass democratic unions by requiring declarations of political conformity from leaders freely elected by their rank and file. An injunction was issued under a Taft-Hartley provision requiring a government-supervised vote on management's final offer. The rank and file showed what it thought of government interference; the certification of that vote by the National Labor Relations Board read:

Number of eligible employees.....	26,965
Ballots marked "Yes".....	0
Ballots marked "No".....	0
Ballots challenged.....	0
Total ballots cast.....	0

Since then free collective bargaining has maintained a profitable industry; pioneering collective bargaining agreements have been ratified by the membership without strikes. Now, once again, we see legislative efforts which can only benefit the employers introduced while negotiations are in progress. Should our employers again count on governmental intervention, the reaching of a contract agreement will surely be difficult.

As the ILWU membership rejected the "final offer" vote and the political saliva tests of Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin, so they will reject any further efforts to weaken or destroy their bargaining power. Workers, when push comes to shove, have but a single weapon to counter the finances, political pull and economic might of the corporations—workers have the basic right of free men and women to withhold their labor, to strike.

That right has been hard-won. It was opposed with court injunctions, with mass arrests, with vigilante murders and with legal lynchings, with the use of troops, with red scares, and with legislation. The right of working men and women to strike has been won with blood, sweat and tears, and it will not lightly be given up, in the longshore or any other industry.

The President, in resubmitting his proposal, called for action "before there is another crisis in the transportation industry." What crisis? What emergencies is he referring to? In January, 1970 the Department of Labor issued a lengthy study titled *Impact of Longshore Strikes on the National Economy*.

That study, presented by then-Secretary George Shultz, concluded:

"The economic impact of a prolonged strike appears to have been minimal" and "the economic impact of strikes on the economy are usually seriously exaggerated."

The study was of east coast longshore strikes where, in all except one negotiation over a twenty-one year period, Taft-Hartley provisions had been invoked; and in all but one of those situations a strike resulted anyway. There are two points to that: first, that governmental intervention does not assist collective bargaining, and second, that despite strikes in five out of seven negotiations, the industry and the nation managed to survive.

Indeed, Secretary Shultz indicated in releasing that study that Taft-Hartley ought not to be applied, that federal interference ought to be minimized. Clearly this Administration, little more than a month before it first introduced its proposals, was not raising the alarms about "crisis" in the transportation industry. In fact, Secretary Shultz commented then that a potential national trucking strike "was not likely" to become a national emergency.

We ask: why the turnabout? And in the face of other events, we ask if it might not be related to a growing repression in other areas, a repression which sees priests and nuns charged with an absurd "conspiracy;" which sees dissent over the war viciously attacked by high officials; which sees the bugging of Congressional offices; and which sees black and chicano militants shot down in the streets as union militants were a generation ago. We ask: do the employers and those who represent them feel that now is the time to strike also against the labor movement, to try and cripple those organizations which have won decent wages, conditions and human dignity for their members at the expense of super-profits?

We are told that these measures "would establish a framework for settling emergency transportation disputes in a reasonable and orderly fashion, fair to the parties."

What is fair about ordering people to work when they have decided to strike? What leverage does that put on an employer for settlement? By curtailing a strike, for 80 or 110 days, a rank and file impetus might be blunted and the union's bargaining strength thus deliberately weakened. That is not fair.

What is fair about ordering the partial operation of a struck industry? Besides the aspect of compulsion, such a move could only prolong a labor dispute if the employer can reap profits from one side while starving out workers on the other. That is not fair.

What is fair about a compulsory settlement, the empowering of a so-called neutral panel to select "the most reasonable" of one of the parties' final offers? The President tells us that this would "reward reasonableness." We tell you that it would destroy free collective bargaining, destroy the intrinsic pressures on the parties to reach a settlement, and in fact legitimizes a take-it-or-leave-it approach which is the antithesis of negotiating. And that also is not fair.

We find it curious that this measure is proposed at the same time that the President, in his State of the Union message, is calling for a "peaceful revolution in which power was turned back to the people." The Emergency Public Interest Protection Act and like proposals would place further power in the hands of government, in the hands of what the President termed "a bureaucratic elite." The right of the rank and file membership to vote to accept or reject a contract, to strike or settle—that power would be legislatively taken away. That rank and file right to determine its own course of action remains a basic tenet of democratic unionism. To limit that right any further is more than just strike-breaking: it is the denial of our democratic system itself.

We urge no amendments, no qualifying language, no improvements to these proposals. We urge only that the Congress reject them in toto, and thus reaffirm the right of American workers to seek—as the President declared—"a better life, a fuller life, in which by their own decisions they could shape their own destinies."

In conclusion, we felt obliged to make our feelings known at this time, and ask that this letter be included in the hearing record. We will appreciate an opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee at an appropriate time to amplify on our views.

Sincerely,

ALBERT LANNON,
ILWU Washington Representative.

[From the New York Times, June 16, 1971]
DOCK UNION HEAD ASSAILS MOVE FOR U.S.
ACTION IN LABOR DISPUTE

Thomas W. Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, said yesterday he was "very disturbed" by the stand taken by a major group of port authorities on the possibility of a strike when the I.L.A. contract expired Sept. 30.

The group is the American Association of Port Authorities. It has asked its members—which include most major port authorities—to join it in calling for Congressional hearings on a bill that, among other things, would empower an independent commission to settle maritime labor disputes by binding arbitration.

Mr. Gleason said in an interview that he was angry at the request because it went counter to what both he and industry negotiators maintained was a good thing—the Nixon Administration's promise that this time there would be no governmental intervention in longshore bargaining.

The association has also told its members that "if past experience and current assessments are any guide," Atlantic and Gulf ports "will be closed for at least 90 days" when the union contract runs out.

The Government has invoked the Taft-Hartley Act and its mandatory 80-day cooling-off period seven times in past I.L.A. contract renewals, and on six occasions the union walked out again—legally—at the end of the injunction period.

Mr. Gleason said yesterday that Government intervention "wasn't of any use" because it made industry unwilling "to put its best foot forward" early in the negotiations. "This time," the dock union's president added, "they're under the gun."

Administration officials say the probability of intervention has resulted in an unwillingness on the part of both sides to get down to hard bargaining without the prodding of an outside board or panel.

Mr. Gleason contended that the stand of the Association of Port Authorities would complicate the negotiations. Paul A. Amundsen, executive director of the trade group, denied this and argued that "on the basis of past experience everybody is expecting a strike."

The I.L.A.'s wage committee has recommended that the union seek an increase in straight-time pay from \$4.65 an hour to \$7.50. Asked if the figure was "for real" or just "for openers," Mr. Gleason replied: "Does Macy's tell Gimbels?"

LOCKHEED LOAN ISN'T SOCIALISM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by Holmes Alexander pre-

sents an excellent assessment of the Lockheed loan. I wish to present the column at this time:

LOAN TO LOCKHEED ISN'T SOCIALISM

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—It is shallow thinking to believe that the requests of Lockheed and the Boeing aircraft companies for Federal financing are any indication that this country is on the skid row into Socialism.

All aerospace manufacturers—indeed, the fabricators of all scientifically advanced equipment—are under compulsion of what we may call the Robert Browning Law: "Ah, but man's reach should exceed his grasp, Or what's a heaven for?"

We won't compete successfully with ourselves (which is what cleaning up the environment means) nor with other industrial nations (chiefly in the transportation of goods and persons) unless we keep trying to extend the state-of-the-art. We must press against the technological borders, as we once pressed against the geographical borders. This is what John Kennedy was talking about when he first mentioned the New Frontier.

Mr. Kennedy knew that popularly priced air movement, supersonic air speeds and space flights were, by his election year of 1960, within "man's reach." He knew that much else was just beyond man's grasp. He foresaw that if America set and maintained a hot technological pace, the social gains would naturally follow. There would be employment and enlightenment as the power plants and the newest products of industry became available to the people's use.

It is always predictable that partial failure and cost overruns will show up when an effort is made to crowd the state-of-the-art. Lockheed had to endure the inevitable in attempting the C-5A military transport which was designed for a huge payload, a long haul, but with short takeoff and landing distances. The financing of the Lockheed TriStar airbus, with imported engines, posed difficulties which were bound to bring setbacks. One of these was that the banks, already heavily invested in Lockheed's future, refused to lend more money without a government guarantee, something the President is now asking Congress to provide.

You hear it said, "But this is socialism!" No, it is not that, and the best word I've heard used to define it is "venture." The President and the Treasury Department are asking Congress and the people to do what American private enterprise has been doing for nearly 200 years, that is, to venture its capital in oncoming technology. George Washington, among others of his day, was an investor in a steamboat that suffered early failures. It would, of course, be better if individuals and private institutions put up all the venture capital, but that has now become impossible because of mounting prices. The question is whether or not the American people want to invest in progress, by entirely legal processes in Congress, or whether to let progress be carried on by Europeans and Communists.

If the Nixon administration were going into Socialism, it wouldn't be asking funds for the Lockheed TriStar or the Boeing Supersonic (SST) prototypes. A Socialistic administration would be financing a perpetual dole, limitless medical care, come and get-'em food stamps and the rest of the social or Socialistic programs. If the American people are venturesome enough, through their Congress, to invest in aviation vehicles for the world market, we won't need the Socialistic alms-basket. The making and selling of Lockheed and Boeing planes will bring payroll money and help block the need of welfare money.

The Boeing firm recently won the coveted Collier Trophy for the "greatest achievement in aeronautics" during 1970, the 747 passenger plane which is larger, quieter, cleaner

and, so far, safer than any previous air carrier. That is what progress is. Somebody at the presentation luncheon remarked that progress is also a contest between the Wright Brothers who started commercial aviation and Senator Bill Proxmire who is trying to stop it both for TriStar and SST.

Proxmire is bound to lose in the end, because progress never stops. Sometimes, however, it gets postponed or diverted. This is another way of saying that our generation and our country may be the loser, too.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the National Conference of Public Transportation involving 70 organizations ranging from the Sierra Club to the League of Women Voters recently held a conference moderated by a former colleague of mine, the most able California Assemblyman Willie Brown.

I include in the RECORD the address of Hazel Henderson of the Council on National Priorities which I believe contains a message worthy of the attention of this body:

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

(By Hazel Henderson)

During this conference we have explored most of the reasons why democracy has failed to work in allocating a proper share of our nation's resources to public transportation. They add up to an object lesson concerning the snowballing effect that a group of powerful special interests can have in influencing governmental decisions, economic conditions, the shape and size of our communities, the quality of our environment and our entire culture. We have also come to see how all institutions have an inbuilt predisposition to grow and empire-build until they overstep or lose sight of their original goals, and begin operating an autonomous fiefdom. We see this here in Washington with some of our government agencies, but we also see it in every other large organization, whether religious, military or economic. As J. Kenneth Galbraith points out in his book "The New Industrial State" this phenomenon can now be observed in our large corporations. He believes that their power is now so great that the consumer, whom they originally set out to serve, is no longer king, but these great producing companies which can now manipulate government decisions as well as the consumer through massive advertising.

Nowhere is this state of affairs more clear than in the field of transportation, where the combined corporate power of the auto manufacturers, oil, construction and rubber companies have so dominated the market that they have almost driven out all other competing modes of transportation, and in many cases, making it all but impossible to get around without being forced to buy a car. Henry Ford's proverbial statement that the American consumer could have any color car he wanted as long as it was black has become more prophetic than he dreamed! This predisposition of big powerful companies to dictate what kind of products they will produce, and then use hard-sell, saturation ad-

vertising to market them is in large part responsible for the backlash of "consumerism" and rising demands for more participation in decisions that shape our lives. We have found that our dollar is no longer enough to signal to companies what we would like to buy, because the choices have become narrower. We cannot choose to buy a pollution-free car and Henry Ford II has just pronounced our Federal clean air goals for 1975 "impossible." We cannot even choose to walk or cycle in safety in many areas!

Economists would call such a state of affairs a "market failure" and it is just this kind of market failure that has occurred over the years in transportation. If the transportation market were operating freely according to the economic textbooks, and the consumer alone were dictating the production decisions (rather than a very few huge corporations, combined with all manner of subsidies favoring automobiles) we might have a very different, pluralistic system, offering a wide range of options to the consumer. They might include safe and adequate provisions for walkers and cyclists for the short trips; quiet, non-polluting individual vehicles, more and better urban subways, buses and jitneys of various sizes for in-city transit; fast suburban-urban trains and express buses on open highway lanes for commuters; intermediate and long-range inter-city trains, as well as the conventional highway and airlines.

So we have gathered here and explored this particular "market failure" and seen how other forms of transportation gradually declined as the power of the auto and highway related industries grew. Gradually they were able to wring favorable subsidies, bond issues and taxes to support their further growth, while "externalizing" from their own balance sheets the increasing, but hidden, environmental and social costs, which have only recently become evident in pollution, suburban sprawl and the slow destruction of our cities. To paraphrase the elder Ford, we now find that we can have almost any kind of transportation we want, as long as it is a car!

We have all come together because in one way or another, these social and environmental costs have begun to affect the groups of citizens we represent. We know how just how this automobile-dominated transportation system affects or disenfranchises the young, the old, the handicapped, the residents of inner cities, suburbs and rural areas, as well as all of the groups we represent. Other people have not found institutional voices to articulate their problems, perhaps because they merely share my fear of driving in heavy traffic, or on our super highways in between menacingly large trailers and trucks at terrifying speeds.

So how do we go about re-asserting consumer sovereignty in designing a new multi-option transportation system? Many efforts have already been mounted. Some hardy souls take the individual approach by defying city traffic and attempting to bicycle, in spite of the physical danger and overwhelming exhaust fumes. Or according to a recent Wall Street Journal article, many business executives have just given up on the commuting snarl and run their affairs by telephone and mail from their homes or country clubs. I'm sure many of us have wondered how many human transactions really need a face-to-face meeting, and whether we could manage as well by using the telephone and other forms of communication which might substitute on occasions for all this frenzied rushing back and forth. Unfortunately, most of us are not as lucky as those corporate executives; we have to show up on the job in spite of the travelling problems! Some communities and cities like New York have taken the approach of trying to win

back territory from the automobile by closing streets and creating pedestrian malls, with varying success. Many groups have skirmished with highway engineers and insensitive city planners, and managed to block construction of ill-designed freeways in such cities such as San Francisco and New Orleans, and many others. Conservationists have waged a long standing war against badly-planned highways and anti-pollution groups have taken on the noise and exhaust fumes of the internal combustion engine. I think most of us feel a debt of gratitude to Ralph Nader for his tireless, intelligent efforts to improve so many aspects of the consumer's lot, particularly in auto safety. Others have joined the fight for no-fault insurance to lower rates and relieve our congested courts of millions of time-wasting, traffic-related cases, which prevent others from receiving speedy trials. Consumer groups have also worked hard for better-built, longer lasting cars, without meaningless style changes and other frills. A recent study by Bradford Snell in *Yale Law Review* shows that the big 3 auto makers spent \$1.5 billion to restyle models, and yet the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that the 1960s had a net reduction of \$3 in performance. Still other groups have pressed for special consideration of the needs of the old and young, the poor and the handicapped, in both public and private transportation.

Planners have produced blueprints for dream transit systems, and whole new towns, such as Reston, Virginia and Columbia, Maryland have tried through total design to tame the automobile. Aerospace companies such as LTV, Grumman, Rohr Aircraft and North American Rockwell are announcing in new advertising campaigns that they are eager to serve the market for public transportation, and many of them have won contracts for demonstration projects. Other companies, such as General Electric have already helped build new systems, like the Lindenwold line which links Philadelphia with its New Jersey suburbs, and the Turbotrain and Metroliner systems between Boston, New York and Washington.

So, with all this activity, why has there been so little progress? Could it be that up until very recently none of us was sufficiently aware of each others efforts, because we were all working in such very different ways to bring some improvement to the overall transportation system? Could it be that we never realized how many of us there were: enough of us in fact, so that if we got ourselves together we could forge a coalition with enough steam and political muscle to get public transportation up and running? Certainly the multiplicity of concerns that produced our many-faceted activities made it very difficult for us to see them as parts of a larger effort to solve one big problem: the overall, national transportation mess. For example, conservationists opposing a freeway which would divide a park area in Minnesota might not instantly recognize their kinship with inner-city organizations in a city like Washington, who were opposing a freeway which would divide their community just as disastrously. Or public health groups in respiratory or heart disease prevention, who were busy fighting automobile pollution, may not have appreciated their commonality of interest with similar organizations representing the interests of victims of handicapping diseases, or blindness, in their efforts for better-designed transportation. And meanwhile, the planners dreamed of funds to implement their blueprints, and companies waited on the sidelines to see if anyone really meant business. I believe that it is largely due to this fragmentation of efforts and lack of communication between groups,

that we have never fully come together and explored the commonality of our transportation needs and defined precisely that area where all of our constituencies' vital interests overlap. In fact, we have often been somewhat suspicious of each other's interests and motives, fearing that they were irreconcilable with our own. Sometimes we have almost come to blows.

A hearing in Milwaukee last year on whether to complete construction of a freeway was a perfect example. The highway construction companies and the unions demanded that the highway be completed while the homeowners in its path and the conservation groups bitterly opposed the project. Such situations are indeed complicated by the fact that vital interests of the parties are too immediate to permit assessment of the project by larger, more objective standards. If there were time to develop feasible alternatives, perhaps another more pressing public construction project or a commuter rail line down the center of an existing highway, such as the one in Chicago; there might have been a way to avoid the clash without human disruption or unemployment. But unfortunately, there is rarely time to work out equitable solutions and often the artificial carrot of Federal funds, pre-programmed for highway spending makes reallocation of priorities all but impossible.

Certainly many groups' current interests tend to be vested in an existing system as pervasive as our highway-automobile complex. They include jobs, investments, academic or professional careers, such as highway engineering, as well as all the economic dependents of this vast industrial system; dealers, spare parts and repair shops, gas stations franchisees and dozens of other small businesses. But in spite of this, many of us are beginning to realize that all technologies have their own peculiar life-cycles, progressing through growth to saturation and obsolescence and that the auto is no exception. It too is reaching the limits of its growth potential. This can be seen clearly not only in proliferating highways, traffic jams and rising pollution, but documented in respected business publications, such as the *Wall Street Journal* of April 23rd, 1971 and *Fortune* in several articles over the past year, the latest in April 1971, as well as in *Business Week*, March 14, 1970.

So we should now stop focusing on what past conditions prevented us from working out ancient, deeply mired conflicts and instead, begin to concentrate on watching the shape of future national priorities and how we can help shape them. If we do this we can begin sharing in the development of new projects in which we can cooperate out of new mutual self-interests. We are now beginning to watch where the new transportation growth will occur as the exponential curve of automobile growth shows the first signs of collapsing. The new growth must surely come in filling the need for fast, clean, efficient public transit systems, and in re-making our cities for more human forms of travel, including walking and cycling.

Here is where the new capital must surely flow and where the new jobs will eventually be created. But if this is to happen, we and many others like us, representing the interests of consumers, must come together and define what kind of systems we want and are willing to pay for. But the economics of this new market we are trying to create will have to be a little different from a normal market, which has failed in this area. It will be a special kind of market which economists sometimes call a "public-sector market," which occurs when normal market mechanisms have been thwarted, as they have in transportation. So we create a public-sector market when we group together in sufficient

numbers, decide what we want and then buy it as a collective, or "cooperative buying group." We have hundreds of such "cooperative buying groups" today of all sizes, and their numbers are growing because most of our unmet needs are now group needs, rather than individual needs, such as clean air and water or airports and parks. In many cases we use our municipal and state governments as our purchasing agents. They act for us in buying sewage treatment plants, schools or airports. If the item we want to buy is very large, such as a national system for old-age or disability insurance, we empower the Federal Government to act as our purchasing agent, or even set up the system itself, as in the case of Social Security or the new Environmental Protection Administration which is charged with protecting our communal drinking water and air. It's interesting to note that in the case of water, some of us are beginning to exercise our individual consumer demand too, by buying bottled water, and the ordinary market mechanism is now responding by producing an even larger selection of bottled water from which to choose.

So our challenge now is to begin drawing together a new "consumer cooperative" to service our group consumer demand for a more varied choice of transportation, including the expensive new public systems that only our group buying power can bring into being. Now we know that our group buying power at the Federal level of taxation is enormous: big enough to have permitted our Federal purchasing agents to spend some \$70 billion a year of it on military programs and further billions on space and building more highways.

But we should not be surprised at this because we know how large institutions, such as government bureaucracies, tend to forget that they are supposed to be our purchasing agents, and in fact, under pressure from powerful lobbies, they have begun spending our money in ways we didn't intend, anticipate or consent to! So if we want to regain control over the spending of some of our money, we are going to have to form a coalition strong enough to convince our elected and appointed officials that they must forget some of their own pet projects, and start voting the funds necessary to start public transportation rolling. We can also make sure that they realize that as the Indo-China War is being wound down by the Administration, they must resist budget-padding by the Department of Defense, and divert some funds into public transit and other badly needed domestic programs. Furthermore, unemployment rates are high enough now, but we must impress on these officials that they should also imagine the situation when thousands of G.I.'s join the unemployment lines in the months ahead. We need to create new programs to provide jobs for all our workers, but not based on the saturated needs of the past, but the real unmet needs in our public-sector markets of the future; not only public transportation, but health care, housing, new towns and pollution control, grass-roots cable television system to help recreate electronically, the "town-meeting" style of local government, and of course, education and self-enrichment for adults as well as children. These areas of real consumer demand will provide opportunities for the growth industries of the next decade; but only we consumers, out of our own self-interest, will have the incentive needed to organize that demand into a coherent and powerful force that can create these public-sector markets. We know we can do it, because we see that it has already happened in the pollution control and recycling field, where ordinary citizens and consumers created such a demand for environmental cleanups that an

industry emerged to serve it, which is one of the fastest-growing areas of our economy and is already providing thousands of new jobs. In fact, the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics estimates that as of 1970, there were 655,900 new jobs created in environmental control, and that this figure would increase to 1,181,800 jobs by 1980! We cannot expect most of our older, bigger companies to play much of a role in developing these new industries, because they have too much invested in the current and past technologies. But some of our more innovative companies as well as a host of smaller, newer firms are eagerly waiting to serve our transportation needs.

But there is also another important reason why we must take the leadership role in pressing for these new transportation systems, and that is because we represent its future consumers, and if these consumers are to remain sovereign in this new marketplace, we must help them participate in the designs, in setting standards and only then empower our government purchasing agents to award the contracts. If we do not move soon to define these consumer needs and push for their incorporation into the designs, demonstration projects, appropriations and the contracts; then we will have ceded yet another area to the company lobbyists who are already busy trying to sell their own idea of public transit projects to government agencies at all levels. A perfect example of a project designed by producing in this topsy-turvy way is the SST. There was no great outcry from ordinary citizens demanding a SST, most people can't afford to fly very much in a regular plane. But the aerospace industry and a small handful of aviation enthusiasts wanted it and almost managed to impose it on us after spending millions of our taxes to pump up the aircraft industry. But the very citizens who joined together to fight the SST proved their concern for the unfortunate workers caught in the middle, by also pushing for new public works and transportation projects to cushion the blow in Seattle and other hard-hit areas.

We can avoid repetitions of such human dislocation by getting together on projects we will all benefit from, and mass-transportation is a good area in which to begin. We can start small, hammering away at the simplest projects, such as reserving open lanes on our freeways for express buses, so that they will be able to compete with the automobile in faster commuting time, if nothing else. We can see that environmental pollution standards recently set by the Environmental Protection Administration are enforced, which will finally force municipalities to reduce automobile access to central cities, simply to meet maximum permissible carbon monoxide standards.

In the transportation vacuums this move may create, we can push for refurbishing subway and bus services to attract the new riders. During the recent taxi strike in New York, the City's bus and subways added millions in fares. If the strike had gone on for long enough, the City Transit Authority might have actually started making profits! Or consider the possibilities for minority group entrepreneurship in setting up, perhaps with Small Business Administration or MESBIC-type loans, small locally-owned and operated bus and jitney companies to take the often trapped or carless inner-city workers to the suburban industrial parks, where so many of the jobs are moving. In New York City alone, 72,000 jobs evaporated in the past year, and such bus lines could help alleviate the inner-city unemployment problems that the corporate movements to the suburbs are creating.

Some communities are discovering that

their school bus fleets are under-utilized. They are putting them to work during school hours for shopping runs and after school for trips to theaters, movies and evening sporting events. The revenues help fatten up the school's coffers, or help with maintenance and repairs. All the while we are testing these modest programs, we must form local coalitions to push for funding for the more ambitious projects.

If we can go forward from here, forgetting some of our past or current differences, and concentrate on working towards the positive and exciting goals put forward at this conference, we will not only help create a more human transportation system and more livable surroundings, but also a whole new industry and thousands of new jobs at all levels. We will also help prove that America can re-order her priorities with a minimum of disruption and hardship, away from the military-industrial-complex toward a more humanly-oriented "life-industrial-complex".

PUBLIC WORKS OF ART PROJECT MURALS TO BE RESTORED

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1971, I included in my remarks a statement on behalf of the restoration of the many murals painted during the 1930's under the public works of art project in several Federal office buildings.

My conviction that the restoration and preservation of this artwork would serve as an important step toward maintaining the city's appropriate role as the center of culture of the metropolitan area led me to write to the General Services Administration requesting that consideration be given to such a project and for a status report on these "forgotten" murals.

In response, I have received a most encouraging letter indicating that a program is underway to catalog all such pieces of art in governmental buildings, both in Washington and other cities, and that upon completion of this inventory, a coordinated program of restoration and labeling would begin. I am pleased that the GSA has taken note of these murals, and I am more pleased that efforts are being made to preserve them for the future edification of all who may visit those agencies possessing this art. These pieces of art give visual expression to the hopes and frustrations of the American people during the depression, and I am pleased that their eloquence is to be saved.

I would like to submit the response I received from the General Services Administration for the consideration of my colleagues:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

HON. GILBERT GUDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUDE: This is in response to your letter of April 22 concerning the restoration and preservation of works of art in various Federal Government buildings.

I concur wholeheartedly in your assessment of the value to our heritage of the works of art of the 1933-43 period. I also share your interest in their preservation be-

cause I believe they are important threads in the fabric of our culture.

To assure the preservation of all works of art commissioned by the Federal Government throughout its history and still in its possession, we are compiling a Fine Arts Inventory of the works which can be located. While the inventory will include works of all periods, emphasis will be placed on the years of 1933-43, the years of the greatest patronage—unmatched in the history of art. Its first purpose is to provide us with a record of all existing works and their condition which will permit us to conduct an organized program of restoration and continued maintenance. At that time a priority list will be established and every work will receive the necessary attention based on condition. In addition, fixed works of art, such as murals and large sculpture, will be identified on the site with an appropriate informative placard.

We have had an unpublicized on-going program of restoration and maintenance in effect for some time under which we have cleaned and restored several works in the Department of Interior and the Health, Education, and Welfare Building as well as the two large murals in the Rotunda of the National Archives. Our regional offices in Denver, Kansas City, and Atlanta have also been conducting a cleaning and restoration program in their areas.

Funding for this work is through our Repair and Improvement budget because the works of art are considered integral parts of the buildings under our responsibility. Costs for the professional restorers we employ are nominal in relationship to the cost of the art work. We have had, therefore, no funding problems.

In addition to restoration, we have been relocating art works, especially murals, from buildings declared excess or where remodeling work might cause damage to the painting. Where it is not feasible to install them in nearby Federal facilities, we have placed some works on the walls of universities or colleges on a loan basis. If this is not possible, the National Collection of Fine Arts serves as our repository. They are presently holding several large murals pending availability of appropriate wall spaces.

When our inventory is complete, we hope to issue a publication listing the works of art in it. Public interest in the art of the 1930's appears to be growing, and we believe such a pamphlet will fill an urgent need. Federal agencies and departments could use it effectively in conducting the employee tours you suggest. The sections relating to the works of art in Washington's Federal buildings would be excerpted and made available for tourists.

We appreciate your interest in preserving the Government's art collection and we are pleased that you share our enthusiasm.

Sincerely,

HAROLD S. TRIMMER, Jr.,
Assistant Administrator.

JOHN J. RHODES REPORTS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, following is the reprint of my June 28 newsletter which I am sending to my constituents in Arizona's First Congressional District.

JOHN J. RHODES REPORTS
VIETNAM

In the last 6 years, I have written at least 4 newsletters on the subject of Vietnam. I had hoped that I would not have to choose

that subject for any more newsletters. However, the upsurge of carping criticism in certain quarters directed at our rate of withdrawal, and the re-doubled efforts on the Congressional level to impose some sort of a timetable for withdrawal on the President, make it obvious that once again it is necessary to try to straighten the record.

Even before the New York Times and the Washington Post saw fit to publish parts of an illegally obtained Pentagon report on Vietnam, we were all aware of certain facts. They are: 1) when President Eisenhower left the White House, there were 684 Americans in Vietnam, acting as trainers and advisers to the Army of South Vietnam. These men were not engaged in combat. Actually, our training establishment in Vietnam was inferior to the military advisers stationed with forces of several other countries; 2) when President Kennedy was assassinated in November 1963, we had something over 16,000 Americans in South Vietnam. Many of these soldiers were with South Vietnamese units, and if their unit was in combat, they engaged in combat roles; 3) during the Johnson Administration, the American troops in Vietnam increased to 540,000. We adopted the role of a full belligerent, and were actually engaged in fighting the Vietcong and North Vietnamese in our own units, under our own flag; 4) shortly after President Nixon was inaugurated, he announced a twofold policy to get us out of Vietnam: a) he would continue to negotiate with the North Vietnamese and Vietcong in Paris, and press toward a negotiated settlement of the war; b) simultaneously, and as a hedge against failure at the conference table, our forces would undertake the task of "Vietnamization" which means retraining and re-equipping the South Vietnamese forces, systematically turning over the fighting to the Army of South Vietnam, and withdrawing American troops.

There has been no progress in negotiation. However, as a result of the Vietnamization program, the Army of South Vietnam has increased so dramatically in fighting ability and in power that the President was able to announce and carry out various troop withdrawals. For instance: 1) on June 8, 1969, President Nixon announced that 25,000 US troops would be redeployed from Vietnam by August 31, 1969; 2) on December 15, 1969, President Nixon announced that the US troop ceiling in Vietnam would be reduced an additional 50,000 to 434,000 men by April 15, 1970; 3) on April 20, 1970, President Nixon announced plans for the redeployment of an additional 150,000 US troops from Vietnam to be completed by the Spring of 1971; 4) on April 7, 1971, President Nixon announced plans for the redeployment of an additional 100,000 US troops from Vietnam to be completed by December 1, 1971.

All of these troop reductions were, or are being, accomplished on, or ahead of schedule! Thus, by December 1, 1971, the authorized US troop strength in Vietnam will be 184,000, a reduction of 365,000 from the 549,500 troop ceiling that was in existence prior to Vietnamization.

When the Nixon Administration came to power, Melvin Laird made the remark that there would be no "credibility gap" in the Pentagon as long as he was Secretary of Defense. Since that time, the Department of Defense has been very careful in its statements, and has scrupulously lived up to its promises. It can reasonably be expected that this policy will continue. It is also obvious that the policy of withdrawal from Vietnam will continue at the fastest pace possible commensurate with (1) the safety of our remaining forces, (2) the safety of our prisoners of war, (3) the continued ability of the South Vietnamese to choose for themselves the type of government they want.

Lest anyone think to the contrary, let it be understood that the policy of the Nixon

Administration is still to press for negotiations in Paris. A negotiated peace is by far the best way to end this war. However, the other side has remained as intractable as it was at the beginning of the negotiations, and not only demands our withdrawal, but in effect demands that as we leave we overthrow the algon Government and turn power over to them. Obviously, it would be physically impossible for us to do that, and morally reprehensible for us even to try.

The Thieu Government has its shortcomings, but it should be remembered that it has been elected once, and is standing for election again. There will be those who look askance at these elections on the grounds that they are rigged. Our people in Vietnam doubt that there is significant "rigging" in these elections. Certainly, the elections are more like the ones we have in this country than one will find in any Communist country, including North Vietnam, where there are no elections at all.

To sum up the picture at this point: (1) we have helped establish in South Vietnam a viable, if far from perfect, government; (2) Vietnamization has proceeded to the point that the forces of South Vietnam should be capable of defending their country; (3) we have proceeded with American withdrawals with the result that the number of Americans in Vietnam on December 31, 1971, will be only 35 percent of those who were in that country when President Nixon became our Chief Executive; (4) our casualties are down from an average of 281 men a week in 1968 to an average of 45 men a week in 1971; (5) the government is committed to continue withdrawals as rapidly as possible.

Then comes the \$64,000 question. This being the case, why do you find in the Congress and in the country this sudden passion to set the rate of troop withdrawal by legislative act? There are many people who honestly believe that Congressional action can and should take us out of the war at a fixed time. These are sincere people, and I respect their opinions. However, there are also those who feel that withdrawal from Vietnam is a prime political issue, and they are doing their very best to climb on this

horse and ride it as far as it will go. Also, I am satisfied that there are many people in the peace movement who would like to see this government overthrown completely. Most of them have no idea as to what kind of government that they would put in its place. They only know that they want a change.

This situation becomes completely ludicrous when it is recalled that very few, if any, of these same people raised their voices one decibel when President Johnson was escalating our participation in Vietnam from 16,000 men to 540,000 men. There were no cries of rage from these people when the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was twisted and distorted so as to be used as authority for fighting a ground war in Asia 8,000 miles from our shores. There was no protest by them when we took the war away from the outh Vietnamese and made it an American war. As a matter of fact, one of the loudest protesters, Mr. Clark Clifford, was Secretary of Defense at the time the last escalation of our troop strength in Vietnam occurred! His credentials appear to be rather weak in speaking out for faster troop withdrawal. The fact that he is also one of the chief advisers to the Democratic Party hardly improves his standing.

During the Johnson Administration, there was a feeling in Congress that, in the best American tradition, politics should stop at the water's edge. Although there was much dissatisfaction with the Vietnam war, and many of us spoke out, as I did in my newsletters, to warn American people that this was not an easy war and would last for years as it was being prosecuted, mainly politics did not enter into the Congressional pronouncements. What a contrast that is with the manner in which President Nixon's efforts to end the war are being treated by the opposition! I have heard members of Congress justify supporting various "end-the-war" amendments on the ground that they "really wouldn't hurt the President, because most of these amendments are ineffectual," and as one member put it "are largely symbolic." Nothing could be farther from the truth. Each such effort weakens our position in negotiating with the enemy. They give

the enemy the feeling that they can win if they just "sit tight." Therefore, they don't negotiate—there is no incentive for them to do so.

It is no wonder that Ambassador Bruce, our chief negotiator in Paris, purportedly told the President that if one of the amendments placing a time limit on our withdrawal from Vietnam were adopted, it would undermine his negotiating position so completely that he might as well come home.

Each of these "end-the-war" amendments really amounts to a vote of no confidence in President Nixon. Is this really good for the country—especially at this time? Does he really deserve this kind of treatment?

With the record which the Nixon Administration has compiled, I should think that every American would be thankful for the effectiveness of President Nixon's efforts. This is no time for division—it is a time to close ranks behind a President who has proved he knows what he wants to do, and that he is capable of doing it.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Recent data on social security benefits indicate that by the end of 1970, the social security program was paying monthly cash benefits to over 26 million persons. Of this total 17.5 million were 65 years of age or older, and another 2.3 million were between the ages of 62 and 64. Some 4.1 million beneficiaries were receiving "child" benefits, including over half a million students aged 18-21. More than a quarter of a million individuals aged 18 and over received payment because of childhood disabilities.

Total benefit payments in 1970 amounted to \$31.9 billion, roughly \$5 billion more than 1969. Nearly three-quarters of the increase is due to the increased benefit rates authorized by the 1969 Amendments to the Social Security Act which became effective in January 1970. The rest of the increase was due to the addition of over 900,000 beneficiaries. The 10 percent increase in benefit rates enacted by Congress in 1971 as well as another net gain in beneficiaries is expected to boost total benefit payments for 1971 to about \$36 billion.

The following tables indicate the totals for the Nation, Arizona and Maricopa County:

TABLE I.—OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, DISABILITY, AND HEALTH INSURANCE MONTHLY CASH BENEFITS IN CURRENT-PAYMENT STATUS AT END OF DECEMBER 1970, BY STATE AND COUNTY OF BENEFICIARY'S RESIDENCE

State and county	Number of beneficiaries						Amount of monthly benefits (in thousands of dollars)					
	Total	Retired workers	Disabled workers	Dependents of—		Survivors	Special age 72 beneficiaries	Total	Retired workers	Disabled workers	All other beneficiaries	
				Retired workers	Disabled workers							
U.S. total.....	26,228,629	13,349,175	1,492,948	3,210,402	1,172,047	6,470,433	533,624	2,628,313	1,576,534	196,020	855,759	
Arizona.....	222,344	113,162	13,970	28,331	11,577	52,184	3,120	22,554	13,642	1,918	6,994	
Maricopa.....	121,313	63,575	7,454	14,941	5,813	27,792	1,738	12,706	7,782	1,029	3,895	

TABLE II.—OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, DISABILITY, AND HEALTH INSURANCE NUMBER OF BENEFICIARIES WITH MONTHLY CASH BENEFITS IN CURRENT-PAYMENT STATUS AT END OF DECEMBER 1970, BY AGE OF BENEFICIARY AND BY STATE AND COUNTY OF RESIDENCE

State and county	Total	Under age 60						Age 60 and over					
		Total	Under age 18			Total	Age 65 and over			Men	Women		
			Age 18 to 21	Age 22 to 59	Age 60 to 61		Age 62 to 64	Age 65 to 71	Age 72 and over				
U.S. total.....	26,228,629	6,023,943	3,307,698	577,784	2,138,461	20,204,686	359,695	2,311,538	17,533,453	7,496,782	10,036,671	8,145,042	12,059,644
Arizona.....	222,344	58,887	34,472	5,586	18,829	163,457	3,199	22,556	137,702	66,577	71,125	72,429	91,028
Maricopa.....	121,313	29,193	16,841	2,726	9,626	92,120	1,667	12,646	77,807	37,139	40,668	39,778	52,342

VISITORS

Mesa—Mr. and Mrs. J. Darwin Gunnell, Kay and Scott; Stephen J. Carter; Richard S. French; Mr. and Mrs. Dilworth Brinton, Richard and Ann; Mrs. Vida Brinton; Mr. and Mrs. Loren J. James; Mac C. Matheson.

Phoenix—Drs. Wm. A. and Gladys T. McGarey; Thomas R. Woods; E. L. Pastor; Roger Ernst; R. Gutierrez; Jim Boice; John C. Stallings; Terri Cruz; Marvin Hansen; Gary W. Gerhard; Ronald Karp; Catherine Zandler; Mr. and Mrs. Eldon R. Stucky; Hon. William

Mahoney Jr.; Jack Pfister; Alex Stamatakis; J. Woolson; Robert L. Himmelberger; Mr. and Mrs. Richard Miller; Mr. and Mrs. Joe H. McGee; Wes Steiner; Rich Johnson; Frank Scussell; Robertson M. Fort; Howard E. Kraft; Ted and Wanda Tinkler and Carol; Charles

W. Smith Jr.; Mrs. Louis Ziman; Hon. Lorna E. Lockwood; Joe Stertz; John F. Burnett; Walter Chopiowsky; Elmer C. Coker; Mr. and Mrs. E. R. Livermore; Hazel Bennett; Walter L. Stephenson; C. L. Lindberg; Dr. and Mrs. Ellis Shackelford, Sue and Brian; Ellice Higginbotham; Travis Williams; Rev. and Mrs. Donald G. Sapp and family; Herman Chanen; Mr. and Mrs. N. Warner Lee; Mrs. James R. McDonald, Joe and Jim; John W. Simonds; Mrs. Sam J. Myers, Laurie Myers; Hon. Burton Barr; Mrs. Jerry Wisotsky and Ronnie; Mr. and Mrs. Law L. Lovelace; Joe Ralston; Mr. and Mrs. Ed Singer, Mark and Mitchell; Americo Lazzari; Jane Ralston; Hon. Timothy Barrow; Hon. Robert Stump.

Tempe—Barbara Johnson; Adolf P. Echeveste; Mr. and Mrs. John W. Lester, Phil and Janet; David B. Noble.

Scottsdale—J. Robert White, Ken and Rob; Mr. and Mrs. D. G. Taylor; Hon. Bud Tims; Wilson H. Young; R. Parker; Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Powell; Jan P. Powell; Paul F. Huldermann; Mr. and Mrs. Craig R. O'Connor; Charles E. Bell; Bob Yount.

Guadalupe—Olmedo J. Abeyta; Lauro Garcia; Frank S. Luera.

Paradise Valley—Dr. and Mrs. Paul E. Palmer, Kathy, Bruce, Susan, Nancy, and Ellen.

Tucson—Howard E. Jones; Mrs. W. D. Kelley; Jacquelynn R. Williams Egan; Wm. C. Jacquin; Mr. and Mrs. Peter D. Herder and David; Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Mandelbaum; Mr. and Mrs. Dale Chastain and Jim; Bob Webb; Helen Weber, Mr. and Mrs. R. V. Ageton Jr., Mary Clare, Don, and Richard.

Fort Defiance—George E. Burns; *St. Johns*—Jack A. Brown.

Eden—Rod Kempton; *Willcox*—Suzanne Riggs; *Coolidge*—Shari Snitzer.

Gila Bend—Eleanor A. Logan; *Holbrook*—John L. Ashe; Ross Barnes; Raleigh W. Johnson; D. M. Gibbons.

Sells—Don L. Peterson; *Kearny*—Ivor G. Pickering.

Carefree—Joe P. Sparks; *Ganado*—James N. Moss; Larry R. Manuelito; H. Wayne Stuckey.

Glendale—Arthur J. Hubbard Sr.; Gerald I. McCulloch; Roland Skinner.

Yuma—Tom Choules; Hon. James Duke Cameron.

Wellton—C. C. Tabor.

PRESENT EXPENDITURES ON FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR CONSUMERS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the response to an inquiry on costs of present Federal programs relating to consumers by Representative H. Sheldon Parker, Jr., an outstanding legislator from Pittsburgh, serving in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Mr. Parker's request for information on the amount of Federal funds expended for consumer protection is answered by a letter written by Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs. The letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the request of Mr. Sheldon Parker

as to how much the Government spends in the area of consumer affairs.

Summary statistical data on Federal programs relating to consumers primarily cover activities in the domestic area which are intended to inform, protect, educate, or otherwise benefit consumers as they acquire goods and services in the marketplace.

The programs listed below were reported by the agencies as primarily relating to consumers. These are gross figures which can be misleading if their limitations are not kept in mind. In many instances, agency accounting systems do not provide for isolating the consumer from the non-consumer aspects of an activity. Moreover, since there is no common agreement on what constitutes a "consumer program" there can be disagreement on whether a specific activity should be included or excluded. Within these limitations, a listing of selected significant consumer-related activities in terms of approximate costs to the Federal Government for Fiscal Year 1970 follows:

Approximate cost in fiscal year 1970

[In millions]

Department of Agriculture:	
Consumer oriented research.....	40
Meat and poultry inspection.....	114
Agriculture product grading.....	50
Consumer extension education.....	130
Department of Commerce:	
National Bureau of Standards programs	8
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Food and Drug Administration.....	75
Other HEW programs.....	26
Department of Justice:	
Antitrust and other consumer-related activities	10
Department of Transportation.....	24
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	20
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	9
Federal Communications Commission..	3
Federal Power Commission.....	9
Federal Trade Commission.....	15
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	28
Securities and Exchange Commission..	17
Total	578

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA H. KNAUER,
Special Assistant to the President
for Consumer Affairs.

PENTAGON PAPERS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last 2 weeks involving the publication of Pentagon documents by the New York Times and the Washington Post have brought before the American people serious questions of constitutional interpretation and the acceptable extent of powers wielded by the executive branch of the Government. Not only will the future of journalistic freedom, guaranteed for almost 200 years by the first amendment, be decisively influenced, but the administration's power to withhold information from the public will be affected by the decision of the Supreme Court.

In the past 2 years the people of this country have witnessed unprecedented

attacks on the news media by the administration. This most recent attempt to stifle the efforts of newspapers to print historical documents about the destructive war in Southeast Asia is consistent with these actions and with the desire of this and former administrations to maintain an air of secrecy when discussing certain aspects of the Vietnam situation.

Two newspapers which have large circulations among my constituents in New York have recently printed editorials on the Pentagon papers and the Government's legal action against the Times and the Post. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these articles will be of interest to my colleagues and to the American public. I feel it is true that when secrecy "becomes a substitute for honesty and when deception becomes synonymous with diplomacy, the goals of this Nation are compromised." I include the editorials at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Long Island Press, June 16, 1971]

TO PRINT, OR NOT TO PRINT

Two far-reaching, separate sets of questions are involved in the New York Times' publication of a secret Pentagon study of the Vietnam War.

One has to do with the First Amendment right of a newspaper to print such information. The other has to do with the ramifications of the substance of the revelations.

This case is developing into one of the most significant in the long history of the great American dilemma raised by the conflict between the public's right to know and the governments privilege of confidentiality.

No one seriously questions the need for classified information in military matters. As State Secretary Rogers pointed out yesterday, publication of secret documents can also, by violating confidences, cause serious breaches in trust in our relations with other governments. The difficulty, however, is that there can be no absolute determination of where security begins and ends. All too often, secrecy has been used to disguise error and questionable policies rather than preserve security.

Atty. Gen. Mitchell in obtaining a temporary injunction against the Times yesterday, charged that publication of the Vietnam report "has prejudiced the defense interests of the United States" and that further publication would "result in irreparable injury to the national defense." It is now incumbent on him to make overwhelmingly convincing case before such an awesome and unprecedented decision be made permanent. Indeed, it should go all the way, if need be, to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Mitchell's case is not clearcut so far. The events dealt with in the report occurred several years ago. Much of the information merely documents what has since, in general terms, become public knowledge, illuminating—sometimes shockingly—the nation's drift into war.

Considering the lives lost, the pain to so many millions of individuals and the extent to which the war has torn the fabric of American society, every responsible attempt to let the public know is not only the exercise of an American right, but an exercise in American wisdom.

While such publication may be a sign of our vulnerability, it is also a sign of our strength. Even as the demonologists are busy picking through the dirty linen for their favorite bad guys, a fact that seems to be overlooked is that the study was not prepared by the accusers, but by the principals themselves.

There is much that is damning, particularly the cynical failure to inform both Con-

gress and the public of national life-and-death decisions. It is also distressing to note the fallibility of leaders. Operating in what they considered the highest national interest, they threw all their talents and energy into an effort that demeaned American power instead of enhancing it, and contributed so to the economic and social turmoil at home.

They thought they were fighting a limited war, and in a sense, they were right; our full military potential was never unleashed. The result, however, was the opposite of the intention to end the fighting; it was a tragic miscalculation in which enough force was used to kill and maim thousands of people and generate a domestic disaster, but not enough to deter the other side's force and terror.

All this documentation, however, is still the raw stuff of history, not history itself, which is the evaluation and understanding of such material. For those who rush to judgment, there must be words of caution. There is much material that has not yet appeared—the reports of other agencies and other leaders and, most significantly material that may never appear, the documents about the inner workings of Hanoi, Peking, Moscow and other protagonists in this frightful struggle.

As the brilliant book by John Toland, "The Rising Sun," reveals in its analysis of World War II as seen through Japanese sources, opinions and prejudices are easy to come by, but awareness of broad historical truths take patient study of all sides.

Instead of trying to bottle this up through the courts, the administration should cooperate with Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield's intention to hold open hearings, "to see the whole story laid out . . ." because "the congress and the people are entitled to all the elements pertaining to this tragedy."

[From Newsday, June 16, 1971]

WHO IS THE ENEMY?

The critical issue in the case of the United States vs. the New York Times is: Does the Nixon administration fear the effect of the extraordinary "Vietnam papers" on the enemy or on the American people?

Under terms of a ruling by a federal judge appointed four days ago by President Nixon, it will be at least Sunday before the public can learn the next chapter in the incredible history of duplicity and misinformation that accompanied the nation's descent into the Vietnam morass.

This delay, if not the complete suppression of these startling documents, is the responsibility of the Nixon administration, which sought the restraining order on the grounds that publication could "result in irreparable injury to the national defense." It again widens the breach between the White House and those who question, criticize or dissent from the government's handling of the Vietnam war.

The administration's position seems singularly untenable at this point since the papers in the Times' possession do not cover any activities beyond mid-1968—three years ago—and therefore would appear in no way to jeopardize the lives or performance of any present U.S. military forces.

What the documents do jeopardize, of course, is the familiar governmental assurance that it is telling the truth, keeping the people informed and acting in their best interests.

And while the material appearing in the Times dealt only with previous administrations—and primarily with the Johnson years of escalation—this attempt at suppression by President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell perpetuates the spirit of obfuscation and concealment that permeates the official behavior described in the published accounts.

The present controversy also emphasizes the role of the press in public affairs. Although the Nixon administration frequently has criticized the media for its negative attitude toward government, the Vietnam papers underline the necessity for skepticism. The current revelations surely would not have created such an impact had the American press pursued its mission more vigorously when the Johnson administration was selling the war to the American people.

The Times has done a distinct public service in publishing this heretofore secret history of U.S. involvement in Vietnam from the end of World War II. Unsettling as the disclosures may be to those who have insisted upon the right of the government not to be questioned, publication of the report fulfills an essential need of democracy—the right of the people to know.

In this history, which was undertaken by Pentagon analysts at the behest of former Defense Secretary McNamara, it is made clear that our participation in Vietnamese affairs has, again and again, been marked by Machiavellian counterplay, by a disregard for public honesty and by the conviction that a small group of White House policymakers can stage-manage domestic opinion and do whatever else they think necessary to justify their narrow concept of American self-interest.

TONKIN GULF REVISITED

The famous Tonkin Gulf incident, for instance, according to the government's own account, did not occur in the vacuum suggested by the Johnson administration. The August, 1964, "attack" on two U.S. destroyers by North Vietnam followed months of provocative action by U.S.-supported Vietnamese forces and the development of a battle plan for escalating the war. Congress, lacking this knowledge, was so outraged by the administration's report of the Tonkin Gulf affair that it passed a resolution essentially ceding war-waging powers to President Johnson in Southeast Asia. And, on that basis, Washington unleashed its formidable air power on North Vietnam with, as the study notes, "virtually no domestic criticism."

The implications of this study—and its release and attempted suppression—must not be minimized. Central to the matter is the power of the presidency, particularly as it applies in decisions affecting war and peace. Obviously, according to disclosures made by the Times, the people and the Congress were willing, albeit unknowing accomplices, to a series of decisions that saw this nation go from a provider of military aid in the Truman era to a major combatant during the Johnson years—all the time without really understanding the implications of our Vietnamese adventure. Yesterday, the Times reported that President Johnson decided to undertake an offensive ground war in April, 1965, despite the existing policy that counseled against another Korean-type land war in Asia. Mr. Johnson made this momentous choice and then, according to the Pentagon history, ordered that the decision be kept secret.

Although the study does not allude to the Nixon administration, there is no reason to believe that the presidency has become less a repository of power under the present leadership. But, whoever occupies the White House, Republican or Democrat, the people should have a basic assurance that their fate—and the fate of this nation—will not be decided precipitately by an overenthusiastic exercise of power or, simply, by an administrative misjudgment or executive blunder. In order to limit presidential war-making power, a bill introduced last month by Sen. John C. Stennis (D-Miss.) merits enactment. The proposed measure would allow the President to dispatch troops only

to ward off invasion or protect Americans abroad. If, after 30 days, the Congress had not ratified that presidential action, the troops would return—immediately.

In defending its right to publish the Vietnam chronicle, the Times stated that "it is in the best interest of the people of this country to be informed of the material . . ." To say the least, we agree. If the government is unwilling to level with the people, the press must perform that service. Rep. Paul N. McCloskey (R-Calif.), a critic of the Vietnam war, said after the Times series began that "the issue of truthfulness of government is a problem as serious as that of ending the war itself." Too often he said, government cover-ups are "not a matter of protecting secret information from the enemy." Rather, he said, the "intention is to conceal information from the people of the United States as if we were the enemy."

Secrecy may, at times, be necessary in the administration of even the most open of societies. But when it becomes a substitute for honesty and when deception becomes synonymous with diplomacy, the goals of this nation are compromised. The Times case should be a signal to us all that power has been misused in Washington. The people should take every step to see that the abuse does not continue.

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) already has suggested the possibility of hearings into the disclosures. They should be held. As in the case of congressional inquiries into American war crimes, which this newspaper has proposed, the need for the American people to know what has been done in their name is essential if we are to prevent future Vietnams and regain the sense of national pride and purpose that are vital to our survival as a democratic society.

CONGRESS' INTEREST IN THE NEW YORK TIMES AND THE WASHINGTON POST CASES

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 26, the Supreme Court heard the New York Times and the Washington Post cases concerning the publication of the secret Pentagon report on the Vietnam war. Just as we did in the District Court for the Southern District of New York, the District Court for the District of Columbia, the District Court for the District of Massachusetts, the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, I and 26 other Members filed a brief as amici curiae on the side of the Times and the Post.

As the brief indicates, we believe that Members of Congress have a very special and unique interest in having these documents and "a particular and profound interest in having their constituents obtain all the information necessary to perform their functions as voters and citizens." I urge all of my colleagues to read this brief so as to better understand our sincere concern:

[In the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1970, No. 1873]

The New York Times Co., et al., Petitioner, v. United States of America, Respondent.

United States of America, Petitioner, v. The Washington Post Company, et al., Respondent.

BRIEF OF 27 MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AS AMICI CURIAE

This brief is filed on behalf of the following Members of Congress: Phillip Burton, John Dow, Bob Eckhardt, Don Edwards, Michael Harrington, Robert Kastenmeier, Edward Koch, Abner Mikva, Benjamin Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, James Abourezk, Bella S. Abzug, William R. Anderson, Herman Badillo, Jonathan B. Bingham, William Clay, Ronald V. Dellums, Sam Gibbons, Ella T. Grasso, Seymour Halpern, Peter Kyros, Parren Mitchell, Bertram L. Podell, Charles B. Rangel, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., James H. Scheuer, and Lester L. Wolff.

INTEREST OF AMICI

The Members of Congress, on whose behalf this brief is filed, have a vital interest in the outcome of these cases, distinct from that of the plaintiff, the defendants, or the general public. As members of the national legislature they must have information of the kind involved in these suits in order to carry out their law-making and other functions in the legislative branch of the government. They seek to vindicate here a legislative right to know.

In addition as elected representatives of the people in their districts, Members of Congress have a particular and profound interest in having their constituents obtain all the information necessary to perform their functions as voters and citizens. More than any other officials of government, Members of Congress have relations with the public that gives them a crucial concern with the public's right to know.

We agree with the position of the defendants New York Times and Washington Post that the courts have no inherent authority, absent a statute, to prevent publication of the documents involved here, and that no such statutory authority exists. We confine our argument, however, to the broader constitutional issues and urge upon the Court three fundamental propositions: (1) that information which comes to light other than by strictly lawful process is nevertheless entitled to the full protection of the First Amendment; (2) that the attempt by the Government to suppress publication of these documents violates both the legislative and the public right to know; and (3) that the doctrine of prior restraint forbids advance censorship of material published by the press.

I. INFORMATION WHICH COMES TO LIGHT OTHER THAN BY STRICTLY LEGAL PROCESS IS NEVERTHELESS ENTITLED TO THE FULL PROTECTION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT

The general approach which ought to govern solution of the problem now before the Court has been well expressed by James Madison in his Report on the Virginia Resolutions:

"In every State, probably, in the Union, the press has exerted a freedom in canvassing the merits and measures of public men of every description which has not been confined to the strict limits of the common law. On this footing the freedom of the press has stood; on this footing it yet stands. . . . Some degree of abuse is inseparable from the proper use of everything, and in no instance is this more true than in that of the press. It has accordingly been decided by the practice of the States, that it is better to leave a few of its noxious branches to their luxuriant growth than, by pruning them away, to injure the vigour of those yielding the proper fruits."¹

¹ Report on the Virginia Resolutions, Madison's Works, vol. iv, 544.

The Government's approach has been quite different. The Government conceives of the problem as if the only issue were one of stolen goods. It bases its claim upon a proprietary interest in the information involved, urges that it is entitled to recover its stolen property, and contends that neither Members of Congress nor the general public can have any right to the purloined information.²

The Government's position might be valid if all that was involved were a stolen automobile. It might even be sound as applied to the physical documents themselves, or to a copyrighted manuscript of a private author. But this approach has no valid application to information about public events. Such information, whether or not it comes to light within "the strict limits of the common law," is part of the common fund of knowledge available to the general public in its role as ultimate decision-maker. This information, therefore, comes within the ambit of the First Amendment and the issue moves to a higher, constitutional level.

It is well known to observers of public affairs that vast amounts of information become available to Congress and the public in a manner which does not conform to the Executive's national security classification scheme. The affidavits of Max Frankel, Benjamin Bradlee, and other newsmen on file in the present proceedings make this entirely clear. Indeed, one of the principal functions of a free press in this country is to ferret out information which the Executive wishes to conceal. Executive officials themselves consistently disclose classified information, or engineer leaks, for the purpose of influencing public decision-making. Much other classified material emerges in memoirs, government documents taken when the official leaves office, and similar sources. The existence of such a communications system in fact marks the difference between a free press and a controlled press, between a democratic system of free expression and a totalitarian system of controlled expression.

The Executive regulations on classification can govern the internal operation of the Executive agencies. They cannot, under the First Amendment, control communication of information outside the government. To put it colloquially, a cat in the bag cannot be treated the same way as a cat outside the bag. Once the information gets outside the Executive—once the Executive loses its control for any reason—the information becomes part of the public domain.³

The results that flow from this state of affairs are twofold. First, once having lost control of the information the Government can, as a practical matter, rarely get the information back. The events of the past few weeks fully demonstrate the truth of this proposition. Second, whatever the rights of the Executive may be with respect to the person who first obtained the information in breach of the classification rules, the Executive should not be allowed to try to regain control of the information through muzzling the press. Such an effort, involving suppression of information at whatever point it crops up in the communications system, under the guise of fact or opinion or even art or literature, could only be accomplished by the kind of controls that are characteristic of a police state.

² After commencement of the proceedings the President, as a matter of grace, made the materials available to members of Congress. *N.Y. Times*, June 24, 1971.

³ We are not discussing here the right of Congress, one of its members, or the general public to force the Executive to disclose information under powers inherent in the legislature, the First Amendment, or statutes such as the Freedom of Information Act.

II. THE ATTEMPT BY THE EXECUTIVE TO SUPPRESS PUBLICATION OF THESE DOCUMENTS VIOLATES BOTH THE LEGISLATIVE AND THE PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

The defendants in these proceedings have, quite naturally, stressed the protection which the First Amendment extends to the speaker, the writer and the publisher of information. This case also presents, in a way no other case in our history has before, the other side of the First Amendment coin—the right to listen, to hear, and to obtain information. Two aspects of this right to know are involved here. We discuss first the right of Members of Congress and second the right of the general public.

A. The legislative right to know

The legislative right to know derives from the position and function of the legislative branch in the general structure of our government. It has been recognized many times in the decisions of this Court. See, e.g., *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178 (1957). The legislative right to know also derives from the First Amendment. That constitutional mandate was designed to maintain an effective system of freedom of expression and members of the legislature are entitled, as are private citizens, to share its benefits and protections.

It would be hard to overestimate the importance to our form of government of the legislative right to know. That right is indispensable to the performance of every function of the legislative branch. Clearly legislative access to information ought to be at least on a par with that of the Executive. For the legislative function is not only to initiate the basic policies which the Executive branch must follow, but to review the administration of those policies by the Executive and revise them in the light of that knowledge.

The legislative right to know is of particular importance at this period of development in our national affairs. The constant growth of the executive power has been a major characteristic of our age. More and more the people of our country have been concerned that the expansion of executive power has upset the original balance contemplated by the framers of our Constitution, that monopoly of power in the Executive has resulted in the government losing touch with the needs and desires of its own citizens, and that enhanced power in our elected representatives is imperative to restore a healthy division of authority in government.

There are a number of reasons for this unparalleled and dangerous growth of Executive power in the United States. There can be no doubt, however, that one of the principal reasons is the far greater access of the Executive to information, and its unwillingness to share that knowledge with Congress and the public. In today's world, control of the information process is the key to power.

It is crucial to note, also, that the legislature cannot adequately perform its function upon the basis of "official" information submitted to it by the Executive branch. Every observer of government knows that "official" information, in most situations, tells only half the story. Any bureaucracy, by the nature of the institution, tends to reveal only what it believes will support its own position and advance its own policies. A realistic fund of information must depend upon materials which lie far below the surface. The system of checks and balances cannot rest upon such bland sources of information as Executive hand-outs.

In this process of obtaining fuller, richer and more realistic information the press plays a vital role. It is not too much to say that this is perhaps the most important function of a free press. Obviously it is not

a function that can be performed by a press under governmental constraint.

There is no need to stress here that the documents involved in these proceedings could not be more relevant to the issues now pending in Congress. Termination of the war in Vietnam, extension of Selective Service, appropriations for the conduct of the war, and numerous other questions are before the House and the Senate at this very moment. In addition, broader problems going to the respective powers of Congress and the President in connection with the making of war and the conduct of foreign relations are pressing for attention. It thwarts common sense that the information here in question should be withheld from Members of Congress.

In sum, to close off access to the kind of material the Government is now attempting to suppress would cripple the legislature in the performance of its constitutional functions. It would go far to relegate the legislative branch to second rate status in relation to the Executive, to jeopardize the balance of power between the branches of governments and to alter the whole constitutional structure.

B. The public right to know

The public right to know has been repeatedly recognized by this Court as a vital aspect of our system of freedom of expression. As Mr. Justice Brennan said in his concurring opinion in *Lamont v. Postmaster General*:

"It is true that the First Amendment contains no specific guarantee of access to publications. However, the protection of the Bill of Rights goes beyond the specific guarantees to protect from congressional abridgment those equally fundamental personal rights necessary to make the express guarantees fully meaningful. . . . I think the right to receive publications is such a fundamental right. The dissemination of ideas can accomplish nothing if otherwise willing addressees are not free to receive and consider them. It would be a barren marketplace of ideas that had only sellers and no buyers." 381 U.S. 301, 308 (1965).

The public right to know was the basis of the decision upholding the fairness doctrine in *Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. F.C.C.*, 395 U.S. 367 (1969), and the right to read what one pleases in *Stanley v. Georgia*, 394 U.S. 557 (1969). Lower Federal courts have likewise applied the principle to uphold the interests of the public as recipients of information in an untrammelled system of freedom of expression. See, e.g., *Office of Communications of United Church of Christ v. F.C.C.*, 359 F. 2d 994 (D.C. Cir. 1966); *Mandel v. Mitchell*, 39 L.W. 2530 (1971).

Members of Congress, of course, have the same interests as other citizens in protection of the right to know. They also have a particular interest as members of the legislative branch. Effective performance of their duties as elected representatives depends upon a knowledgeable constituency. Members of Congress and the people they represent must operate on a shared basis of understanding, upon a common wavelength. It is vital to the functioning of a democratic system that the electors have enough information to grasp the issues upon which their representatives are voting. It is likewise essential to the Member of Congress that he relate to the ideas and responses of his constituents. This reciprocal relation depends upon the fullest access possible to a common store of information. The public right to know, therefore, takes on a special importance when it concerns matters pending before the legislature.

Once again, it is difficult to imagine any

information more relevant to the public right to know than the documents which the Government is here trying to keep the public from seeing.

The precise degree of protection afforded by the doctrine of the right to know, as embodied in the First Amendment, has not yet been fully developed. It may be some years before the specific rules can be worked out. Yet the starting point is clear. It is that members of the public have, as a general proposition, the right to know all information upon which decisions that affect their lives and property are based. This is the fundamental premise of a democratic system. Exceptions to the general rule must be narrow and specific. They would be recognized only in such special areas as military weapons and operations, current negotiations with a foreign country, or damage to individual reputation by premature disclosure of investigative data.

Wherever the line of exceptions may be drawn it has not been reached in these cases. Judge Gurfein and Judge Gesell have both found, after a full hearing, that no substantial breach of national security is involved. The withholding of the information here in question has a maximum impact upon the constitutional right to know and the function it is designed to perform. There is no sound ground for not giving full effect to the constitutional principle in these cases.

A genuine and whole hearted insistence upon maintaining the right to know is vital to the welfare of the nation and its ability to cope with the many problems that now confront it. Much of the frustration, mistrust and misunderstanding that prevails in many quarters of the land today is due to our failure to keep the decision-making process on a more open and observable basis. Vigorous enforcement of the constitutional right to know would go far to restore confidence in our institutions and evoke support from the people who are most affected by their operation.

III. THE DOCTRINE OF PRIOR RESTRAINT FORBIDS ADVANCE CENSORSHIP OF THE MATERIAL HERE INVOLVED

The doctrine of prior restraint, growing out of revulsion to the English censorship laws, holds that governmental restrictions cannot be imposed upon expression in advance of publication. Even though the expression may be subject to subsequent punishment or can otherwise be restricted at a later point, it cannot be proscribed prior to publication. The doctrine was made part of our constitutional law in *Near v. Minnesota*, 283 U.S. 697 (1931). It has since been repeatedly confirmed. See e.g., *Lovell v. Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444 (1938); *Kunz v. N.Y.*, 340 U.S. 290 (1951); *Carroll v. President and Commissioners of Princess Anne*, 393 U.S. 175 (1968).

The theory of the prior restraint doctrine is that a system which requires a publisher to submit his material in advance to a government censor is so repressive by its very nature as to be inevitably destructive of free expression. The reasons for this have been stated as follows:

"A system of prior restraint is in many ways more inhibiting than a system of subsequent punishment: It is likely to bring under government scrutiny a far wider range of expression; it shuts off communication before it takes place; suppression by a stroke of the pen is more likely to be applied than suppression through a criminal process; the system allows less opportunity for public appraisal and criticism; the dynamics of the system drive toward excesses, as the history of all censorship shows."⁴

⁴ T. I. Emerson, *The System of Freedom of Expression* (1970), p. 506.

So oppressive is a scheme of prior restraint that it is not an exaggeration to say that it smacks of totalitarianism rather than democratic methods of control.

All the parties to these cases, and all the courts that have passed on the various aspects of them, recognize the critical importance of the doctrine of prior restraint. The issue here has turned, not on the validity of the doctrine, but upon whether an exception should be made to it in the case of national security. In a dictum in *Near v. Minnesota* the Court stated that there might be exceptional cases where the doctrine would not be applied, mentioning "actual obstruction to [the] recruiting service or the publication of the sailing dates of transports or the number and location of troops;" "obscene publications;" and "incitements to acts of violence and the overthrow by force of orderly government." 283 U.S. at 716. An actual exception has been made in the case of motion picture censorship boards to the extent of upholding laws which require advance screening of films against possible illegal obscenity. *Times Film Corp. v. City of Chicago*, 365 U.S. 43 (1961); *Freeman v. Maryland*, 380 U.S. 51 (1965). No other exceptions have been permitted. It has never been suggested by any court that the press could be subject to any form of advance censorship.

In the cases at bar, for the first time in the history of this country, various formulations have been proposed for an exception applying broadly to national security matters. The Government, if we understand its position correctly, urges that an exception be made for any classified document would per se constitute such a breach. Judge Gurfein would allow an exception for "information or documents absolutely vital to current national security." The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit approved censorship of items which "pose such grave and immediate danger to the security of the United States as to warrant their publication being enjoined."

We submit that any of the above formulations would effectively nullify the prior restraint doctrine in the area of national security matters and would gravely jeopardize the whole system of freedom of expression. The Government's proposal would permit an injunction against the publication of any classified material unless the publisher could show that the classification was arbitrary and capricious. If this Court sanctions such a rule the press will be at the mercy of the Department of Justice. The Government will be in a position to leak any classified information that serves its own purposes and shut off countervailing information. The Executive would be arrogating to itself dictatorial power over the dissemination of large quantities of information bearing upon national defense, foreign policy, and most of the other important issues of the day.

The formulations of Judge Gurfein and the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, although more stringent on their face, would be almost equally destructive of a free press in America. We do not make this statement lightly. We ask the Court to consider carefully how the doctrines put forward in these courts below would operate in practice. Under any of these formulations the Executive can hold up publication simply by alleging that a serious breach of national security would occur. The Court would then issue a restraining order, allow the Government to present its case, and then decide whether there was sufficient danger to warrant issuance of an injunction against publication. *This process in itself is a system of prior restraint.* It involves an examination of the material by Executive officials, an order to withhold publication, and a governmental decision as to

whether the material could be published or not. The exception has swallowed up the rule.

Moreover, most of the proceeding—certainly the critical parts—would take place in camera. Both the New York Times and the Washington Post cases followed this procedure, on the ground that otherwise the injury to national security would occur in the course of hearing the case. Only the defendants and their counsel were permitted to attend the in camera session. More than that, no one was allowed to be present unless he was first given security clearance by the Government. Hence the plaintiff in the case was able to dictate what individual defendants, and what counsel, were entitled to participate in determination of the issue. Such a procedure can hardly be recommended in a democratic society.

In any event, we submit that any rule for allowing exceptions which would create a system of prior restraint in the very process of applying the rule cannot be reconciled with the First Amendment. We do not say that under no circumstances can an exception to the prior restraint doctrine be justified. But it seems clear that a rule based, as are the rules suggested above, upon the gravity of the breach of security can only operate to install a full, not exceptional, system of prior restraint in the whole "national security" area.

The task of formulating a workable rule for exceptions is a complex one. Any such rule would probably have to be couched in terms of allowing the exception only for certain very specific kinds of information. As the Court suggested in *Near*, information on troop movements in times of war might fall within the excepted category. Perhaps details concerning the design of military weapons would be another category. Beyond the immediate area of military operations there should be few, if any, classes of information subject to advance restraint. Very little consideration has been given to the problem and no one is in a position to give a satisfactory answer at this time.

Even Judge Gesell's formulation in his opinion refusing a preliminary injunction would raise troubling questions unless considered in the context of his rulings taken as a whole. Judge Gesell, after considering these matters in the preliminary injunction stages, gave a stricter formulation than did Judge Gurfein, requiring a "showing of an immediate, grave threat to the national security . . . in close and narrowly defined circumstances." Applying this test Judge Gesell correctly refused to apply any restraint.

The Government's complaint contained no allegation of any concrete facts which would suggest a breach of national security in any specific area that might conceivably be subject to an exception to the prior restraint rule. Under such circumstances no temporary restraining order should have been issued and the complaint should have been dismissed. Therefore, the decision of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia should be further elucidated. "Closely and narrowly defined circumstances" must be shown to be as narrow as those exceptional circumstances alluded to in *Near v. Minnesota*.

We urge the Court to follow this course. Especially we urge the Court not to accept any formulation of exceptions to the prior restraint rule which will undermine the force and vitality of that traditional doctrine.

CONCLUSION

The issues involved in these cases go to the heart of the decision-making process in this country. The tendency of government in recent years has been toward ever more secrecy in its operations, and toward a consequent monopoly of power in the hands of a few high Executive officials. We suggest that this di-

rection of events is fraught with danger. Secrecy in government is fundamentally anti-democratic. It perpetuates bureaucratic errors and leads ultimately to disaster. It is time our constitutional doctrines were called into play in opposition to those forces and invoked to promote conditions under which an open, representative and balanced government will be assured.

We respectfully submit that the complaints in these proceedings should be dismissed.

BOB ECKHARDT,
New Haven, Conn.
THOMAS I. EMERSON,
Washington, D.C.

Attorneys for Amici.
June 25, 1971.

THE VINDICATION OF BARRY GOLDWATER

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the controversy with regard to the Pentagon papers and the New York Times has raised many questions. On the one hand, it poses the problem of whether a newspaper has a right to publish stolen, classified documents. It seems clear that newspaper editors, who have been elected by no one and do not have to return to the people for their approval at a given election date, should not have the right to decide for themselves what is in the national interest and what is not.

The problem we face, however, is not quite so simple. For too long, Government bureaucrats have tended to label as "secret" or "confidential" material which has little relationship to the country's best interests. Often such classifications relate more to the interests of the bureaucrats themselves in avoiding embarrassment as a result of the policies they have initiated, then they do to the vital interests of the country.

One instance of such classification is a document concerning "Operation Keelhaul," an operation under which a million Soviet nationals in German POW camps at the end of the war were handed back against their will to Soviet authorities by the United States and Britain. Prof. Julius Epstein of Stanford University is seeking the release of this document, yet more than 25 years after the end of World War II it remains classified and unavailable.

If nothing else, the Pentagon papers which have been published vindicate the position taken in the 1964 campaign by BARRY GOLDWATER. Senator GOLDWATER told the American people the hard truth that Communist aggression in Vietnam had to be defeated. Lyndon Johnson led the public to believe that Americans would not be sent to war.

In an article appearing in the current issue of *Roll Call*, Columnist Allan C. Brownfeld points out that—

Barry Goldwater knew as far back as the 1964 political campaign that despite his campaign rhetoric, Lyndon Johnson intended to step up the war after his re-election. Why

didn't Senator Goldwater say so? Precisely because the Times and other papers of its viewpoint had made it impossible for Senator Goldwater to receive a hearing. And if he now emerges as the honest man, where does that really leave the Times?

I would like to share Mr. Brownfeld's important article with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

THE VINDICATION OF BARRY GOLDWATER (By Allan C. Brownfeld)

There are two separate questions involved in the publication of classified documents by The New York Times. One is whether or not the Times had the right to publish such material, and the other is what the material, once published, told us.

With regard to the first question, there are mixed feelings on the part of many. There are, of course, some who hail the Times publication simply because they like the substance of these particular documents. Such critics are against the war in Vietnam, feel that these documents prove that the war was initiated as part of a grand deception, and therefore state that "freedom of the press" demands their publication.

In many respects, this view must be discounted, for it does not take into consideration the larger questions involved. No one, for example, benefits more by the publication of material which shows that the Democrats deceived the public than the Republicans. Yet, it is the Republican Administration of Richard Nixon which is seeking to stop the publication. The reason, of course, is that every government has a responsibility to protect its classified material, and if the Times has the right to publish this classified document, and to decide for itself whether or not it is vital to the country's interests, then it will have the right to do the same with regard to other documents.

If that were all there was to the question, it would be simple to condemn the Times, and support the Administration's case. We have, however, been faced for many years with a situation in which government bureaucrats label as "secret" or "confidential" material which in no way relates to the country's vital interests but does, often, relate to the vital interests of the very bureaucrats who have made the classification.

Let us consider one instance of such classification. Professor Julius Epstein of Stanford University is seeking through the courts access to government documents dealing with "Operation Keelhaul" following World War II. Under this operation, a million or more Soviet nationals in German POW camps at the end of the war were handed back against their will to Soviet authorities by the U.S. and Britain. It is commonly believed that they were given long camp terms, if not executed by Stalin.

Professor Epstein states that "In 1954, I discovered the existence of a documentary dossier 'Forcible Repatriation of Displaced Soviet Citizens—Operation Keelhaul' in the Historical Records Section of the Army. . . . When I ordered the dossier, I was told by an embarrassed librarian that it was classified and the index card should never have been placed in the catalogue."

The Times may have no right to publish purloined material which is "classified," but government bureaucrats have no right to label as "classified" all things they would rather keep to themselves. What is necessary is a legislative solution which states clearly what kinds of material shall be classified and which provides criminal penalties for the violation of such classification. In this sense, both the position of the Times and that of the government is less than fully responsive to the real issue we face.

But, beyond this and looking to the Penta-

gon study itself, what is clearly shown is that, seven years after his defeat, Barry Goldwater has re-emerged as that rarity: an honest man in American politics.

Senator Goldwater, in his 1964 campaign, told the American people the truth. He declared that our vital interests were involved in Vietnam and that it would be necessary to increase our commitment. Lyndon Johnson knew these things to be true and, at the very moment he was telling the American people that he would not send "American boys to fight a war which should be fought by Asian boys," he was planning for an increased American force and for the bombing of the North. Senator Goldwater told the hard truth, while Lyndon Johnson used deception as a successful political tactic.

But, the very papers which now boast of their "right" to publish this classified material were the ones which were most unmerciful in their attacks upon Senator Goldwater and most vehement in their endorsements of Lyndon Johnson. Even today, they draw the wrong conclusions. The war in Vietnam is no less Communist aggression because Lyndon Johnson spoke of "peace" rather than war. After all, Woodrow Wilson spoke the same way prior to World War I, as did Franklin Roosevelt prior to World War II. The subterfuge practiced by FDR prior to Pearl Harbor did not make Nazism any less a threat.

The Times seems to ignore its own commentary of the past, and judges others as if its own views existed in a vacuum. Thus, it now condemns President Johnson for having, in 1963 and 1964, precisely the same view which the Times itself held. A Times editorial just after the Saigon coup d'etat that resulted in the murder of President Ngo Dinh Diem praised the fact that Diem's successors "are dedicated anti-Communists who reject any idea of neutralism and pledge to stand with the free world." The editorial noted with pleasure that certain key figures in the Diem government who had "tried to make a deal with the Communist North Vietnamese along lines hinted at by President de Gaulle" were purged from the government along with President Diem.

Who, we must ask, is kidding whom when shock is expressed at reading in the "classified" Pentagon documents what well-informed observers knew anyway? Barry Goldwater knew as far back as 1964 political campaign that despite his campaign rhetoric Lyndon Johnson intended to step up the war after his re-election. Why didn't Senator Goldwater say so? Precisely because the Times and other papers of its viewpoint had made it impossible for Senator Goldwater to receive a hearing. And, if he now emerges as the honest man, where does that really leave the Times?

It is difficult to resist a brief look at the Times' own "deception" of past years. For many years Walter Duranty was the Times correspondent in Moscow. He was there during Stalin's purge trials, during the forced collectivization campaign, and during the famine in the Ukraine. Yet, he reported none of these things accurately to Times readers. Instead, he became an apologist for Stalin. One example will have to suffice at this time. Writing in the Sunday Times of July 19, 1936, he described the Soviet Constitution as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual change in the Russian people and its leaders. . . . In this nineteenth year of the Soviet state, there is introduced a New Constitution, under which the Russian masses emerge their tutelage and are called upon to receive their rights and undertake their duties as a free and democratic people."

This came to Times readers during what Eugene Lyons, in his volume *The Red Decade*, calls ". . . the eve of the bloodiest period in Russia's history and the final confirmation of Russia's emergence as a totalitarian state.

. . . Confessions were being extorted in G.P.U. cellars while Duranty indited these words."

It is unfortunate that life is not more simple, that we cannot halt the Times and condemn the government, or do the opposite.

Only Barry Goldwater emerges from these Pentagon papers as an honest man. It is indeed ironic to see the newspapers which once sought to destroy him now admit that in a cynical age he was a man who told the truth. Their own reputation for truth-telling, however, is so slight that it is no wonder that they mistook him for a charlatan.

CHARLES W. HARRIS OVERCOMES DRUG ADDICTION

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have been named a member of the Republican Task Force on Drug Abuse. This national problem, of course, has no partisan elements and I want to point out that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are certainly making efforts within their own research groups to meet the problem.

Our 16-man task force has the responsibility of not determining the facts and finding the best resources to wage the battle against this insidious problem, but we also have to probe and help find solutions to the cause of the narcotic epidemic.

We are all well aware of the heroin problem the United States faces today. I feel we should devote more emphasis and attention to those Americans who have a special interest in seeing this problem solved—the former addict. They, more than anyone else, realize the horrors of drug abuse. They are potentially our greatest asset in combating this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from an ex-addict willing to do whatever he is able in this effort. Mr. Charles W. Harris is 43 years old and will shortly be released from the Attica Correctional Facility in western New York. He received an honorable discharge from our armed services, but subsequently became a drug addict for 25 years.

In offering his assistance, Mr. Harris enclosed a poem "King Heroin," which indicates not only his interest but his initial contribution. It is an excellent warning to all potential users from a person who has been there.

Mr. Speaker, I include the poem at this point:

KING HEROIN

Behold my friends for I am Heroin.
Known to all as the destroyer of men.
From where I first came nobody knows,
I come from the land where the poppy grows.
Whole nations have gathered to plot my destruction
For I am the bearer of crime and corruption,
My little white grains are nothing but waste
Yet I am soft, deadly and bitter to taste.

I came to this country without a passport;
Since that time I've been hunted and sought

By custom agents and plain-clothes dicks,
But mainly by junkies in need of a fix.

I am seldom pure and often diluted
But once in your blood I'll make it polluted.

I'll capture your will and destroy your mind,
And make you commit your whole life to crime.

Into cellophane bags I find my way
To great men in office and children at play,
From the richest of states to the poorest
of slums,

From the highest status to the Bowery bums.
Be you black, Irish, Italian or Mex
I can make you forget all about sex;
For I'll cheat the wise and destroy the meek,
I'll misuse a fool and make a strong man
weak.

I can make a school boy lay down his books,
And a world famous beauty neglect her looks,
I'll make a good man neglect his wife
And keep him in prisons the best part of his
life.

I'll take gold from the rich and make them
poor,
I'll take a foolish young virgin and make her
a whore,
I'll take your money and poison your brain
With a full course of torture—first pleasure
then pain.

Defy this sharp needle and I'll make you sick
With agony and anguish, but I won't let you
kick.
More potent than whiskey, stronger than
wine,
I am Heroin, truly a threat to all mankind.

Some will sell me, others will buy
For that state of sensation called a "high".
Some think I am a venture of joy and a thrill,
But I'll put a gun in your hand and make
you kill.

Now let me tell you about the powers I
possess,
About my deeds in the East and my crimes
in the West.

I can make a man curse his country and spit
on his flag,
And make a girl sell herself for a five dollar
bag.

In China I stopped an army and I financed
Iran,
I'm honored in Turkey and respected in
Japan.

Whole races of people I've helped to enslave—
I've taken their honor and put them in the
grave.

I can make an honest man go out and steal,
And make a man in trouble forsake his best
friend.

To some I'm salvation, to others I'm a must,
And I'll make their poor souls heavy with
rust.

For all the reckless ones who uses the most
I'll claim their lives with an overdose.
Now you've heard my warning and if you
don't take heed

Then put your foot in my stirrup and mount
my steed,
Sit tight in the saddle and ride me well,
For the White Horse called Heroin will ride
you straight to Hell . . .

CHARLES W. HARRIS.

DONALD S. ROE HONORED

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with the crises affecting all levels of our pub-

lic school system, knowledgeable teachers and school administrators have become an increasingly valuable community asset.

Occasionally, a community is blessed with this sort of leadership in a man also endowed with ample human qualities of warmth and compassion.

Donald S. Roe, superintendent of the Berkley Michigan School District, is such a man.

That rare combination of understanding, experience, and competence, perfected during 34 years working in schools in Ohio, Tennessee, and Indiana, has been enjoyed by residents of my congressional district for the past 10 years.

That is why we all feel such a profound sense of loss at Don Roe's retirement at the close of this school year.

Yet, we recognize how genuinely that retirement has been earned and sincerely wish only happiness and contentment for Dr. and Mrs. Roe in the years ahead.

The esteem in which Superintendent Roe is held in the community is attested to by the resolutions adopted by the Berkley School District and the city commission of neighboring Huntington Woods and an article from the Daily Tribune which follow:

CITY OF HUNTINGTON WOODS—RESOLUTION

Moved by Commissioner Peasley and supported by Commissioner Jones, that:

Whereas, Dr. Donald S. Roe will retire from his position as Superintendent of Berkley Schools on July 1, 1971, and

Whereas, Dr. Roe on that date will have completed ten years of faithful service to the Berkley System and thirty-two years in education,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Huntington Woods City Commission extends its best wishes for a happy and prosperous retirement to Dr. Roe and his family, and applaud him for his many accomplishments in the field of education, be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Berkley Board of Education.

Upon being put to a vote the Commission voted thereon as follows:

Ayes: Mayor Bryant; Commissioners Peasley, Alexander, Jones

Nays: None

The Mayor thereupon declared said resolution adopted.

I, Margaret A. Schulte, Acting Clerk of the City of Huntington Woods, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a resolution duly made and passed by the Huntington Woods City Commission at a regular meeting held on May 18, 1971.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the City of Huntington Woods this 21st day of May, A.D., 1971.

MARGARET A. SCHULTE,
Acting City Clerk.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF BERKLEY, BERKLEY, MICHIGAN—RESOLUTION

Whereas, Dr. Donald S. Roe has served the Berkley School District and its children as Superintendent of Schools for these past ten years, and

Whereas, Dr. Roe has demonstrated consistently his complete professional and personal concern for those school children, and

Whereas, This school district has made significant educational progress during his ten years of leadership and service, and

Whereas, Dr. Donald Roe has chosen to re-

tire from that position as Superintendent of the Berkley School District. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Board of Education does acknowledge his departure with regret, coupled with a loud "thank you" to Dr. Donald Roe for those ten years of devotion to the many thousands of children who have profited educationally from this educational system, and be it further;

Resolved, That this Board of Education calls to the attention of all citizens of the Berkley School District the service and leadership of Dr. Donald Roe, and the educational mark it has made on the students, past and present, of our school system.

This resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Education of the School District of the City of Berkley at its regular meeting on June 14, 1971.

BERKLEY SCHOOL OFFICIAL HONORED

(By Nancy N. Stark)

"I'm changing my life style—but I've done it before," said Donald S. Roe, retiring superintendent, Berkley Schools.

His 10 years as Berkley superintendent end officially July 1 when William G. Keane takes over the job.

Roe's retirement dinner was held Wednesday at Kingsley Inn, Bloomfield Hills, sponsored by the School Board and the Berkley Association of Administrators.

SURPRISE GUESTS

Surprise guests for the dinner were the Roe children—Donald B. Roe and his wife from Washington, D.C., and Mrs. William Fred and her husband from Rochester.

In addition to the party sponsors, other guests included Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Tyndall, he was assistant superintendent in Berkley and is now retired; former assistant superintendent Don Sheldon and his wife, he currently is superintendent, Walled Lake Schools; and Mr. and Mrs. Dana P. Whitmer, he's superintendent, Pontiac Schools. At age 54, Roe is retiring from regular employment earlier than most. "We are fortunate to be able to do what we've planned to do for years—possible with a little luck and some hard work," he said.

FUTURE PLANS

Future plans include purchase of an offshore auxiliary sailboat, big enough for two, he said, to be moored in the Bahamas. Immediate plans are to finish changes in the Lake Orion cottage for a permanent home. That will be our home base," said said.

A life-long sailor, Roe said water activities and camping were what the family enjoyed most. "We've sailed in many places, the Greek islands, the Caribbean. We like to sail eastern central America waters," he said.

A gift from the Berkley Board is the sail vessel made of string which hangs in Roe's office. The Administrators Association gave the Roes a camera and resolutions of commendation were presented by the Huntington Woods City Commission and the School Board. A citation from the administrative group also was presented.

BORN IN NEW YORK

"No one believes it but I was born and raised in New York City—Brooklyn to be exact. But I also consider Louisiana my home. I finished my education there (begun at Central Michigan, Mt. Pleasant), I married a Louisiana girl, we raised our family there and I had my first job there," he said.

A career spanning 34 years took the Roes to Ohio, Tennessee and Indiana before coming back to Michigan. "We've always liked it here—we courted on the shores of Lake Michigan," he said. "The first thing we did when we came to Berkley was to look for a

lake cottage. We found what we like at Lake Orion and that will be our permanent home."

In his 34 years as teacher and administrator, Roe said he doesn't see any great changes except the greater demand for relevance, which is good, he said.

"The best kind of schools create conditions for learning to occur. Forced learning is inefficient, ineffective and mechanical. Most important is self respect and a feeling of self worth," he said.

"I'd like to see more effort directed toward pre-school education and wish I could have done more in that area. I don't like to say I'm retiring because we'll continue to do many things we're doing—but we are moving to a new life style and we're looking forward to it."

ASPIN ASKS FOR MORE MONEY FOR FINANCIAL AIDS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, in the past decade colleges and universities have made an intensive effort to recruit students who might otherwise not have been able to go to college. The education of these students is largely made possible through work-study grants and undergraduate scholarships, available through the Federal Government.

Recently, however, the formula for allocating money has been changed and, while many colleges are helped, many are also hurt—especially those with a majority of students in a middle-income bracket. These are students who cannot afford a college education without financial assistance. Yet, under the new formula, and, more importantly, because of inadequate funding, many of these students will lose this much needed financial aid.

The formula, however, is not at fault. The problem lies in inadequate funding of the entire program. Recently, the House allocated \$116 million—not including \$81 million from fiscal year 1971—for fiscal year 1972 for the work-study program. The Senate subsequently raised this \$116 million to \$200 million. The bill is now before a joint conference committee.

In my district in southeastern Wisconsin, several small private colleges have been hit hard by this low level of funding. A recent report by Ed Tyler, director of financial aids at Carthage College in Kenosha, makes this very clear. The report shows that Carthage College had its funds cut by 30 percent from fiscal year 1971 to 1972. Milton College also had a 30-percent cut. Beloit College suffered a 15-percent cut.

In a time of increased enrollments and rising costs of education, colleges and universities across the country cannot afford these cuts. Mr. Tyler says:

As one can observe, the reductions in allocation means that many students who were able to attend these institutions will either have to drop out of college or find other sources of aid to remain in college.

He indicates the frustration that cuts in Federal aid bring both to our students and our colleges.

The House must realize the problem and encourage members of the joint conference committee to agree to the full amount of \$200 million for fiscal year 1972 allocated by the Senate. Allocating this money is the quickest and surest way of providing more financial aid to the colleges and students.

Mr. Kenneth E. Smith, president of Milton College, said last month:

Many of our students who expected Work-Study assistance during the summer will find themselves looking for a job at a time when the job market is very unfavorable. For these low income students, the prospects are bleak: (1) If they enroll in the fall in hopes of finding work, they will be disappointed and may have to drop from school; (2) If they choose not to enroll because of economic conditions, they enter a job market

next fall that is already unfavorable. In either case, both the student and the college will lose.

We are sorely disappointed in these reductions because they affect the very students we have worked so hard to recruit.

We cannot allow the work-study program to suffer. It provides a much-needed opportunity for students who might otherwise not be able to go to college, and provides society as a whole with a better educated population.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 29, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Morton J. Summer, principal, Hebrew Institute of Rockland County, Monsey, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, our King—

אבינו מלכנו

It has been said that by three things the world is preserved: by truth, by judgment, and by peace. Grant us in Thy mercy the incisive vision to perceive the truth, to see reality as it swirls and eddies about us. Bless those who strive to make our democracy a more perfect way of life. Assist them with calm deliberation, with peace of mind and with good health so that their judgment be clear and their decisions just.

Grant peace unto our generation, let those who have lived through the horror of bloodshed so many times reach the haven of love and tranquillity. Bless us with the gift of compassion and love for our fellow men and for all human beings.

Create within us a pure heart and steadfast spirit so that we glory not in our wisdom nor in our strength nor in our riches.

Let us rather glory in the justice we do, in loving mercy and in walking humbly with our G-d.

אמן וכן יהי רצון

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 744. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the fiscal year 1972 for the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, and

H. Con. Res. 346. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H.R. 5257.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7960. An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 137. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Wyoming to the occupants of the land;

S. 432. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Salmon Falls division, Upper Snake River project, Idaho, and for other purposes; and

S. 488. An act to prohibit the licensing of hydroelectric projects on the Middle Snake River below Hells Canyon Dam at any time before September 30, 1978.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS ELLSWORTH MARTIN, FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a former Member of this House, Thomas Ellsworth Martin, formerly, when a Member of Congress, from Iowa City, Iowa; lately, a citizen of Seattle, Wash. He served 16 years in this House with great distinction. Few men have enjoyed the respect of the Members of this House that Congressman Martin enjoyed. Few Members have been loved more as a public servant in his district and in his home State than was Tom Martin. He was always on the job. He was diligent in all things he did. He was completely and utterly dedicated to the great principles of our country, and served his people thoroughly, well, and effectively while he served in the Congress.

Later he decided to run for the Senate. He was successful, and served for 6 years in the other body, also with great distinction.

Mr. Speaker, here he served first on the Military Affairs Committee during a very critical time in our history during World War II. He, probably more than any man in the Congress or in the country, understood the importance of materiel, and while not chairman of the committee, he served effectively on that committee to strengthen the United States and give it every possible help he

could with legislation through his great influence, insight, and knowledge.

Later, following the war, he asked to serve on the Ways and Means Committee, and the House honored him. Here again he served with great capacity and dedication.

Here was a man who served in public office many years. He had been mayor, a member of the city council, a member of various committees. He served the public and his community, and served his party well. Most of all, while a great party man, he was a great American, a man of great talent with a great sense of dedication, who served well in every opportunity he was given to serve. In war and in peace he was great.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for and received unanimous consent to speak on the life, work, and contributions of Tom Martin on July 6 and I invite all who knew him and served with him to be on hand that day to join with me in an accolade and tribute to a very deserving and honored citizen of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, for those who may want to contact his good wife, Dorris, her address is 5101 Northeast Laurel Crest Lane, Seattle, Wash. 98105.

Memorial services for Senator Martin will be held on Friday, July 2, at the University Congregational Church, 4515 16th Street NE., Seattle, with burial in the Willamette National Cemetery on Thursday, July 1. The Adams Forkner Funeral Home, 4214 University Way NE. in Seattle is making funeral arrangements.

In addition to his wife, Senator Martin is survived by a daughter, Mrs. Raymond Reiser, of Seattle, a son, Richard, of Chicago, nine grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren.

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the Republican leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the very first Members of this body whom I met when I came here in January 1949 was Tom Martin. He was friendly. He was helpful. He certainly was an outstanding legislator.

He was particularly interested in new Members. Although he came from Iowa and I from Michigan, he bent over backward to try to make helpful suggestions and to counsel and advise when matters