

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ANNIVERSARY OF THE POZNAN
WORKERS' REVOLT

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who have heartfelt sympathy for the enslaved people of Poland nothing gives us greater satisfaction than news of overt resistance on the part of our friends. We anxiously awaited developments resulting from the revolt launched at Christmastime in Poland's port cities. We were inspired with the stories of the bravery of the patriotic citizens of Gdynia, Gdansk, and Szczecin who defied the Kremlin and bosses set up to rule Poland.

We are, indeed gratified over the steady assertion of strength by the Polish workers as the upset and make life increasingly more unbearable for the Communist bureaucrats who have so long kept them in bondage. The February strike of the Lodz textile workers is the type of successful revolt which encourages us to feel that the throttles of the Reds is slowly but surely being broken by these courageous workers who have reached the limit of being able to endure increasing oppression and economic strangulation.

Mr. Speaker, June 28 has historic significance because 15 years ago yesterday thousands of workers in Poznan rose up against the oppressive Communist regime which held them in virtual bondage. Lovers of liberty throughout the world were thrilled with the news of this spectacular defiance of Kremlin bullying. Polish people at home and abroad were heartened and gained new hope as they learned of the courage and valor of the Poznan workers.

Although millions of jubilant Polish sympathizers were shocked and saddened by the suddenness of the Soviets' use of troops to quell the revolt, they recognized the significant long-range effects which the uprising was bound to have on the Kremlin and the puppet bosses ruling Poland. Never again would the Polish people feel that resistance was futile and that improved living and working conditions were unattainable. Never again would the Red tyrants feel smug and secure in having complete domination of the Polish people.

Every year since that fateful day, June 28, 1956, people of Polish blood have observed the anniversary of the Poznan workers' revolt. And it well deserves such recognition not only to remind us all of the courage of those who defied the Russians, some giving up their lives in doing so, but this date marks one of the most successful cracks made in the formidable Kremlin wall.

Fifteen years ago today the workers of Poland demonstrated that the Polish people themselves possess the weapons needed to rout the enemy that keeps

them enslaved. With each uprising and each manifestation of defiance since the Poznan incident, the Red bosses have had to yield one concession after another.

Every time these bosses sought to institute new repressive measures or exact heavier tribute without adequate representation, the Polish people have demonstrated resistance sufficient to modify or adjust such objectionable acts. Each time new cracks in the Kremlin wall are made by brave Polish patriots, more freedom seeps through for the oppressed people. Each such crack gives all of us renewed hope for rapid improvement of the lot of the people so long living in servitude. Each crack convinces us that sooner or later the whole wall will tumble and the last shackles of enslavement will be thrown off. But such an eventuality will not occur without our help and our renewed assurances of our determination to win freedom for all people who have suffered the illegal and inhuman oppression of the Soviet Communists.

Mr. Speaker, let us today pay homage to the courageous workers of Poznan for the splendid example they set 15 years ago. Let us pay homage to the ship workers, the textile workers, and the thousands of other Polish workers who have so successfully defied their Communist overseers. Let us wish all the people of Poland the maximum of easements from the extant restrictions under which they are forced to live. Let us assure them of our continuing deep friendship and our determination to achieve complete freedom and lasting independence for all of them.

PLAYING POLITICS WITH
NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial entitled "Playing Politics With National Security" which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of June 27 merits reflective reading by every Member of Congress and every U.S. Senator.

It cogently sets forth the basic reasons why the Mansfield amendment to the pending draft bill should not be adopted. As indicated by the editorial, the amendment constitutes a transgression on the President's constitutional responsibility for the conduct of foreign relations. It would "both rob the President of all flexibility and relieve the Communists of the slightest need to negotiate." And while the amendment is essentially meaningless in a legal sense, its adoption will nonetheless be construed abroad as a vote of "nonconfidence" in our President.

There is no question but that the adoption of this amendment would seriously handicap our President in the

grave responsibilities that are his for the conduct of our foreign relations, and particularly in his efforts to bring about meaningful negotiations with North Vietnam. By legislative action we will have removed any incentive to Hanoi to negotiate.

We used to have a fine old tradition in this country known as a bipartisan foreign policy. It used to be said that partisanship stops at the water's edge. But of late this principle that all partisan or political considerations should not enter into our decisions with respect to foreign policy and with respect to national security seems to have been discarded.

I take considerable pride in the fact that yesterday the House voted not to instruct the conferees on the draft bill to accept the Mansfield amendment. As I expressed in my remarks on the floor at the time of this vote, to instruct the conferees would make it impossible to carry on meaningful negotiations on the issues, including the Mansfield amendment, which the draft bill presents.

The editorial from the Sunday Star follows:

PLAYING POLITICS WITH NATIONAL SECURITY

When the Senate passed the Mansfield amendment on Tuesday, we were inclined, reluctantly, to support it as the cost of ensuring passage of the two-year extension of the draft, which is essential to our national security.

The majority leader's amendment, passed by a 57-42 vote, would make it the declared "policy of the United States" to "terminate at the earliest practicable date all military operations of the United States in Indochina" and provide for the withdrawal of "all United States military forces not later than nine months" after enactment, conditional upon the release of all American prisoners of war held by Hanoi and its allies.

Our original objections to the amendment were threefold. It has been our contention all along that no useful purpose would be served by the enactment of any legislation, however vague, which would unilaterally and publicly establish a withdrawal schedule for the American forces in Vietnam. For this would both rob the President of all flexibility and relieve the Communists of the slightest need to negotiate.

Our second objection to the Mansfield amendment was a constitutional one. The amendment is a transparent attempt on the part of the Senate to formulate and execute foreign policy. Congress does have a role to play in the sphere of foreign relations. But its functions in this respect must be limited; the initiative is and must be in presidential hands—for the responsibility for the success or failure of foreign policy is fundamentally his.

Our third objection was that the Mansfield amendment legally is essentially meaningless, amounting as it does to little more than a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. Nevertheless, the amendment constituted the first major victory of critics of the Nixon administration's handling of the Vietnam war.

These objections to the Mansfield amendment were real and fundamental. But our conviction of the absolute necessity of obtaining rapid passage of legislation to extend the draft for two years was so deep that we were on the verge of supporting the amendment as a necessary evil. Had we done so, we now feel we might have made a grave error.

The decision to stick by our original position of opposition to legislative enactment of any withdrawal schedule was occasioned by the return to Paris Thursday of Le Duc Tho, a powerful member of the North Vietnamese politburo who has been overseeing the stalled peace talks. Tho's travel plans never are casual. He left Paris at the time of the Cambodian incursion, declaring that he would return "when the development of the situation warrants it." He has returned and we can only presume that "the situation warrants it," that something is afoot, that if a breakthrough has not been made the possibility at least exists that one may be made.

And our contacts with the White House suggests that this is the view from Pennsylvania Avenue. Administration spokesmen are letting it be known that Mr. Nixon plans to fight the Mansfield amendment with all the forces at his disposal and that he intends to do so on grounds that passage would—or could—seriously prejudice the chances of achieving a negotiated peace and the return of the American prisoners.

We do not by any means accept everything the White House says at face value. But in the absence of any obvious ulterior motive on the part of the administration, we are prepared to believe—if others are not—that Mr. Nixon says what he means and means what he says. We believe he is trying to disengage the United States forces from Southeast Asia and to achieve the return of the POWs: Since he and he alone will bear the final responsibility for the success or failure of his policies, we cannot deny him the room for maneuver necessary to execute those policies, particularly at a time when some movement seems possible. So we return to our first principles and urge the House to reject the Mansfield amendment.

This means a fight and there is considerable risk involved. The main difficulty is not likely to lie in the House, where the Armed Services Committee conferees are certain to oppose the Mansfield amendment, although there is a chance that a floor fight might develop.

But the return to the Senate of the draft law without the Mansfield amendment surely would provoke a major confrontation there, with the prospect of a lengthy filibuster by Senators Gravel, Cranston and perhaps others. This would continue well past the expiration of the present draft law on Wednesday.

The ability of the administration's supporters to enforce cloture, which requires a two-thirds vote, is highly suspect (the vote for cloture after attachment of the Mansfield amendment was only 65-27, three more than necessary). So, barring a return to rationality on the part of dissenting senators, the only limitation on debate is likely to be their physical durability.

But talk as they will, the filibustering senators will not be able to hamstring the Defense Department. Draft boards will continue to function and the nation's manpower needs will be met, if necessary, by conscripting youngsters who are already registered but have been granted deferments. Nevertheless, this could provoke a wave of resentment throughout the country given the existing mood of anti-militarism and isolationism: Nobody wants to be drafted when the draft law has expired.

So it can be seen that the nation soon may be facing yet another crisis, a constitutional crisis in the Senate and one of confidence in the country. We do not welcome this struggle but it is one that must be both faced and won.

We feel this way not out of any particular affection for Richard Nixon. We supported him in 1968, but it is by no means certain

that we will do so in 1972. This is not an issue of partisan loyalty and it goes beyond the question of presidential prerogative, although that in itself is not an unimportant issue.

The two questions of substance are these: Is the President or Congress better placed to negotiate peace? And is a draft law necessary to the nation's security at this time?

To us it is clear that the President and only he can bring about an end to our military involvement in Southeast Asia and the return of the POWs to their families, ends ardently desired by us all. Congressional intrusion into this field can only confuse the other side and dim the prospects for agreement. Hanoi has to know with whom it must deal, and that person is the President of the United States.

As for the necessity of a draft law, that is too obvious to require detailed discussion. The initial steps have been taken to lay the groundwork for the creation of an all-volunteer army. But that time is not yet, and until it arrives there must be a draft law on the books.

Although publication of the Pentagon Papers did not reflect adversely on the Nixon administration—they dealt only with earlier years—it is clear that the turmoil surrounding their appearance in print had an effect on the Senate when it voted to pass the Mansfield amendment. There is a bitter mood of recrimination and denigration loose in the land and the effect has been to make the Vietnam negotiations and the draft—both of which are national security questions—political issues.

If we are to survive as a free people it is essential that we rediscover a sense of national unity and purpose, that we achieve a consensus of shared ideals and goals free of political partisanship.

A good place to start is with the presidency. Mr. Nixon, whatever his faults may be, happens to be the only President we have. All of us, including United States senators, have an obligation to support him in his effort to extricate this country from Vietnam and to maintain its national security.

Accordingly, we urge the House to defeat the Mansfield amendment and the Senate to accept the draft law without that pernicious rider.

EMPEROR'S NEW CLOTHES

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following may be of some interest:

EMPEROR'S NEW CLOTHES

A few years went by. The North Vietnamese were planning to take over all of South Viet Nam by elections because there were more Northerners to vote than Southerners and because the communists would make sure, by force if necessary, that more people would vote for the North than for the South. The leaders of South Viet Nam refused to take part in elections that they knew would not be fair. This made the communist leaders of the North very angry, and they decided to take over South Viet Nam by force. (U.S. State Department document, "An Explanation of the War in Viet Nam for Primary School Children").

PLAIN PIPE RACK

I am convinced that the French could not win the war because the internal political situation in Viet Nam, weak and confused, badly weakened their military position. I

have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indo-Chinese affairs who did not agree that had elections been held as of the time of the fighting possibly 80% of the population would have voted for the communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State Bao Dai. ("Mandate for Change," by President Dwight D. Eisenhower).

H.R. 5612 TO AMEND THE NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT OF 1966

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a statement I gave before the House Judiciary Committee on June 23, 1971, be printed in the RECORD in its entirety. The statement concerned itself with H.R. 5612, a bill I introduced to amend the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966. My staff and I have spent several weeks talking to the people who run the NARA programs and to State officials with similar programs. I feel that we must amend this law as quickly as possible to help the Federal Government meet its commitment to the narcotic problem of the 1970's. I ask Members to read this testimony as it contains some of the latest information on an important Federal program that is in need of change.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, H.R. 5612: AMENDMENTS TO THE NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT OF 1966, JUNE 23, 1971

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today to testify on my bill, H.R. 5612, to provide new procedures for the civil commitment of drug dependent persons.

The amendments expand the scope of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 (NARA) to include in the definition the term "drug dependent persons," replacing the previous definition of a narcotic addict. This means persons not only addicted to the opiates (heroin, morphine, and the synthetic opiates), but also persons with drug dependencies on the amphetamines, barbiturates, marijuana, the hallucinogens, or a combination of these, would become eligible for Federal treatment and rehabilitation under this amendment. As you know, NARA contained four titles which I will briefly summarize as a reference point.

Title I provided for the civil commitment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in lieu of prosecution of charges against the addict ("drug dependent persons" covered by this amendment).

Title II provided for sentencing to commitment for treatment of addicts in lieu of sentencing to a penal institution (drug dependent persons" covered by this amendment).

Title III provided for voluntary civil commitment of addicts not charged with nor convicted of an offense (drug dependent persons" covered by this amendment).

Title IV provided for rehabilitation and post-hospitalization, for care programs and for assistance to States and localities.

The original Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation

Act had amended three previously existing laws and added a completely new law, title III, the civil commitment provision. In effect, the old NARA really only had one new title (III)—the rest of the legislation amended existing law (titles 18 and 28 U.S.C. and section 341 of the Public Health Service Act). I decided that in order to simplify and focus on the major section of the bill I would move the civil commitment of non-criminal addicts to title I. (Since the inception of NARA, 91% of those treated have come under title III as opposed to 9% under title I.) I then combined the criminal users under title II (titles I and II of NARA); that is, the civil commitment and rehabilitation of drug dependent persons, and placed the beefed up treatment section under title III. Title IV of my bill contains the conforming amendments.

Under my amendment, certain preclusions to eligibility for handling under NARA have been deleted from the law so that (1) persons with two previous convictions or with three prior civil commitments would be eligible for treatment; (2) persons convicted or charged with crimes of burglary and housebreaking would be made eligible for treatment; and, (3) persons charged with sale for their own personal use would become eligible for treatment just as convicted persons are eligible under old title II of NARA.

In title I of my bill (Title III of NARA) the term "related individual" has been deleted so that only the addict himself could make the application for civil commitment rather than a relative.

The definition of hospital of the Public Health Service has been broadened to include other treatment facilities approved by either the surgeon general or the attorney general.

Finally, Section 341 of the Public Health Service Act has been broadened to include "drug dependent persons" as addicts.

Mr. Chairman, as you all know, the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act was enacted in 1966 in response to the serious narcotic problem in America during the mid-sixties, and represented a major change in the attitude of the Federal Government toward the treatment and rehabilitation of opiate addicts.

Those of us in Congress who had high hopes for the program were disappointed at the results that were achieved in the first years of operation. However, I believe that the leadership at the national Institute of Mental Health and at the Federal Bureau of Prisons has begun a program that has promise for the future. In my discussions with officials at NIMH and at the Bureau of Prisons I was impressed by the desire on the part of the managers of this law at the administrative level to see it function at a greater level of efficiency and with broader scope in the years to come. In talking to these people I have become aware of certain restrictions and shortcomings in the law which H.R. 5612 attempts to rectify. For example, as the earlier legislation was passed, it denied treatment to a large percentage of our Federal addicts because it excluded addicts charged with housebreaking or burglary, addicts who had previously failed under three or more civil commitments, and addicts with two or more felony convictions.

I have discussed my amendment with officials in both the Bureau of Prisons and at NIMH. Three years ago they would have objected to the removal of these restrictions because of the newness of the program and the shortage of treatment personnel. However, they now feel that NARA has progressed to the point where they could and should handle these offenders under the progressive provisions of the law.

The face of drug addiction has changed greatly in the United States since the congressional hearings of 1965-1966. In times past, the drug of choice of different abusers appeared to be mutually exclusive, that is,

once a heroin user, always a heroin user; once a barbiturate addict, always a barbiturate addict. However, in recent years, we have seen the phenomenon of multiple drug use where heroin users may use a wide variety of drugs. Conversely, multiple drug users now dabble in heroin. Because of this, I think the law should be changed to cope with the problem of the seventies—the multiple drug abuser. That is why my amendments would expand our Federal drug treatment programs by including those persons dependent upon the depressant and stimulant drugs including the amphetamines (pep pills), the barbiturates (goof balls), and the hallucinogens (marijuana and LSD). Further, my amendment would provide that persons with two prior felony convictions or three previous civil commitments be made eligible for treatment and rehabilitation.

This means that hundreds of drug dependent persons presently excluded from rehabilitation programs would have medical and psychological treatment made available. For example, to date under the NARA program under Title II in the Bureau of Prisons, five institutions housing intensive treatment units have studied 1,077 cases. Of these 744 have been accepted for treatment. The remaining 333 cases were found ineligible and were rejected primarily because of two or more felony convictions on their record. It became increasingly evident to the management of the Bureau of Prisons that while a large segment of the offender population with drug problems did not meet the standards for inclusion under NARA for treatment, they had needs the same as those who were eligible. As a result of these exclusionary clauses, the Bureau of Prisons has begun to set up a stop-gap secondary drug treatment program similar to NARA in an effort to get at federal addicts who need treatment but who are excluded under current law.

This treatment program within a treatment program began on June 1, 1971 and it will treat those offenders currently in the federal prison population for whom drugs are a contributing cause to their criminal behavior but who do not qualify under NARA. There is no need for two programs to handle the same kinds of addicts. My proposed amendment would eliminate the need for such a wasteful process.

Figures made available to me indicate that under Title II even though the number of inmates is comparatively small, the plan does seem to work. As of December 30, 1970, 414 inmates had been released to after-care following an average institutionalization of slightly over 15 months. 297 or 72% were still active, and 28% had violated or absconded. I feel the fact that 72 percent were in a relatively law abiding condition is a tremendous improvement over the old figures we used to hear of a 2% cure rate of addicts in federal institutions. I feel that the provision to expand those eligible under NARA is a critical one. Only 1,000 addicts have been found to be eligible. This despite the fact that 30 percent of all admissions to the Bureau of Prisons have regularly used narcotics or marijuana.

That means that in any one year, between 6,000 and 7,000 federal prisoners are regular users of drugs.

There is ample evidence that three civil commitments should not prevent an addict from benefiting from treatment the fourth, fifth, or even the ninth or tenth time around. Medical experience has shown that the more relapses an addict experiences the closer he is to ultimate abstinence from narcotics and partial if not total rehabilitation. Addiction is a chronic disease where relapse is the expected rather than the exceptional behavior. Medical experience has shown that every relapse may bring the addict closer to rehabilitation and that with proper help addicts tend to mature out of their dependence on drugs, especially after the age of 30.

Most important of all, however, the three previous civil commitment exclusion did not take into consideration the fact that the treatment program for addicts differ throughout the country both in nature and quality and since all such programs can be expected to improve as we gain more experience, failure under any program in the past should not deny an addict the improved treatment methods of the future. While many Members of Congress anticipated it, experience has now proven that the original restrictions have excluded many of those addicts who could obtain the greatest benefit from treatment offered under the act. In testimony before Congressional committees, legal groups who represent drug addicts on a day to day basis have testified that the act is self-defeating and that the standards for eligibility border on the absurd.

In this amendment I have recommended deletion from the current law the offenses of housebreaking and burglary from the definition of crime of violence. According to officials from NIMH and the Bureau of Prisons, these are fundamentally property crimes which make up a large percentage of the offenses committed by narcotic addicts and drug dependent persons. In 1966 many Members of both Houses fought this particular exclusionary provision, especially those in the field of law enforcement who were familiar with the crimes of drug addicts. Events since the passage of the Act have proven that these provisions were over-reactive. The amendment we are discussing today is consistent with the socio-legal-medical view that large numbers of addicts who are actually treatable were eliminated from treatment and given straight confinement in penal institutions.

For example, Charles P. Lamb, Jr., a prominent Washington attorney who served on the Legal Aid Agency of the District of Columbia testified before a congressional committee on the experience of that agency with the restrictions in NARA. He said, "after the passage of NARA, many defendants who were in need of hospitalization were denied it because they did not fall within the criterion of an 'eligible offender'. Specifically, excluded from the scope of the act are those who have been convicted of housebreaking at night. A rather absurd criteria. Consequently, many addict defendants who had to be incarcerated and could not qualify for NARA could get no treatment whatsoever, the Lorton Reformatory being totally lacking. The defendants could expect little more than to serve out the 3 to 9 or 5 to 15 year sentences with little hope for parole and to re-enter the community as they had left—a drug addict in remission."

Under the old law we provided that a related individual could sign a petition and civilly commit a person who is addicted. A father could turn in his son. A wife could turn in her husband, and so forth. Experience under title III of NARA has shown that this provision has not met the expectations of its advocates. If an addict is not motivated to treatment it is difficult to force him into a treatment program, especially if he is committed or has not been arrested for any crime.

Officials at NIMH who run the NARA program have told me of case after case of failure with this type of commitment because the addict was intractable and simply did not want treatment. In one bizarre case in New York City, a wife turned in her addict husband. He subsequently pulled a gun on the psychiatrist in charge and threatened to murder him if he did not certify him, the addict, ineligible for treatment. For this reason, the professionals in this area have supported the deletion of the term "related individual." Experience in various State civil commitment programs supports this position. For example, Milton Luger, the chairman of the Narcotic Addiction Control Com-

mission for New York State informed my staff that civil commitments by a relative or a third party constitute "the most difficult cases to handle in treatment." These addicts are most resentful because they are put in against their will. Their attitude is that "somebody else turned me in." Luger claimed that they are not motivated for treatment and that there is "little we can do with them."

Another State where addicts can be turned in by a relative or a third party is in California. In that State there are two classes of petitioning. Either by a relative or a friend, or by a police officer or probation officer. Roland Wood, the head of the entire California narcotic addiction program informed my staff that only four percent of the addicts in California's treatment program (130 cases) were admitted by relatives in 1970. Seven percent were committed by police officers or probation officers. While California has experienced minimum success with the commitments made by relatives, in the latter category Wood explained that the addicts experience great resentment in having been "kidnapped" and are much more intransigent and difficult to treat than those people who turn themselves in. The California experience is not really comparable to NARA, however, because there is no minimum amount of time that a civilly committed addict must serve. The minimum is zero. This means that, unlike NARA where the addict is advised that treatment may last 42 months with a possible 36 months in an institution, the addict is not faced with the prospect of spending long periods of time in incarceration.

While this is an area of some controversy, I feel the facts speak for themselves. Psychologically, and in terms of treatment, the total experience in the United States with civil commitment by a relative or a third party has not been successful. I would urge the committee to consider this amendment to remove the term "related individual" from the civil commitment provisions of NARA.

Another desirable provision in H.R. 5612 would allow a person to be eligible for civil commitment in lieu of prosecution if he has been charged with the sale of dependent drugs for his own personal use. This is a justifiable provision in my judgment and is completely in line with the provisions of the comprehensive drug abuse prevention and control act which passed the Congress just last year.

Finally, the amendment stipulates that not only the facilities and programs of the Public Health Service, but that other facilities approved or established by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, be used for the treatment of all drug dependent persons. The reasons for this are obvious to anyone who reads the newspapers. They are compelling. We must expand the Nation's facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug dependent persons. We not only have an out of control drug problem in this country, but we also have the problem of our returning servicemen, young boys who have been exposed in a foreign land to an avalanche of highly potent, easily available heroin, marijuana, opium, and all the drugs commonly found in the pusher's bag of drugs. This means there are thousands upon thousands of returning servicemen who will need immediate and long range treatment for drug dependency. Yet recent testimony before Congress indicates that only 50 percent of the people committed under NARA could be retained for treatment because of a shortage of staff and facilities. And while a major step has been taken with the doubling of funds available to the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Branch of NIMH for fiscal year 1972 I am certain that this will not be enough

to handle the colossal drug problem that is facing this Nation.

In summation, Mr. Chairman, I offer this bill as a vehicle to expand the commitment of the United States Congress to the treatment and rehabilitation of our young narcotic addicts here at home and those who will return from serving their country overseas. Until now, the Federal program for addiction has fallen far short of our expectations. The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Branch at NIMH reported to me that there were 10,481 addicts in some phase of treatment as of April 30, 1971. 1,860 were in Fort Worth, Lexington and 5 community in-patient facilities. Another 8,416 were in 23 community programs funded by NARA grants.

This is not nearly enough when we realize

the size of the addict problem in this country.

However, we have established under NARA a cadre of people with expertise in the field as it has set up a sub-structure of patient care and community assistance grants that should be expanded and must be expanded as quickly as possible to handle our ram-paging drug problem.

That is what my amendment is designed to do: Make all drug dependent persons eligible who need treatment, and make all the facilities and assistance available for those who need it.

Mr. Chairman, I have some exhibits that I would like to have included in the record relative to the NARA program and a brief comparison of my bill with NARA.

TITLE COMPARISON OF N.A.R.A. AND H.R. 5612

<p>P.L. 89-793: (NARA)</p> <p><i>Title I</i></p> <p>Civil commitment in lieu of prosecution. (Amended title 28 U.S.C.)</p> <p><i>Title II</i></p> <p>Sentencing to commitment for treatment. (Amended title 18 U.S.C.)</p> <p><i>Title III</i></p> <p>Civil Commitment of persons not charged with any criminal offense.</p> <p><i>Title IV</i></p> <p>Rehabilitation and post-hospitalization care programs and assistance to states and localities.</p> <p><i>Title V</i></p> <p>Sentencing after conviction for violation of law relating to narcotic drugs or marijuana.</p> <p><i>Title VI</i></p> <p>Miscellaneous provisions (Amends Sec. 341 of the Public Health Service Act.)</p>	<p>H.R. 5612: (DRUG DEPENDENT PERSONS REHABILITATION ACT OF 1971)</p> <p><i>Title I</i></p> <p>Civil commitment of persons not charged with criminal offense. (Similar to title III of NARA)</p> <p><i>Title II</i></p> <p>Sec. 201—Civil commitment and rehabilitation of drug dependent persons. (Amends title 28 U.S.C.) (Similar to Title I of NARA)</p> <p>Sec. 202—Drug dependent persons. (Amends title 18 U.S.C.) (Similar to title III of NARA)</p> <p><i>Title III</i></p> <p>(Similar to Title I of H.R. 5612)</p> <p><i>Title IV</i></p> <p>(No change)</p> <p><i>Title V</i></p> <p>(No change)</p> <p><i>Title VI</i></p> <p>Title III: Rehabilitation programs under the Public Health Service Act. (Amends Sec. 341 of the Public Health Service Act.)</p>
---	--

NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION BRANCH

PATIENT DATA

[Number of patients remaining in Branch treatment programs

	NARA I	NARA III	Grants	Tota]
Apr. 30, 1971.....	205	1,860	8,416	10,481
June 30, 1970.....	159	1,497	3,165	4,821
June 30, 1969.....	80	991	2,021	2,862
June 30, 1968.....	35	272	(¹)	307

¹ No data.

BUDGET HISTORY

NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION BRANCH

	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Patient care contracts.....	\$1,682,000	\$2,233,000	\$4,295,000	\$7,194,000	\$10,346,000
Community assistance grants.....	4,000,000	8,000,000	9,900,000	14,500,000	27,000,000

CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTERS

Lexington, Ky.....	\$6,401,000	\$6,010,000	\$6,310,000	\$6,594,000	\$7,090,000
Fort Worth, Tex.....	4,652,000	4,175,000	4,590,000	4,855,000	1,428,000

REVENUE-SHARING PROPOSAL
INTRODUCED

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee will be shortly beginning executive deliberations on the issue of general revenue sharing. After listening to extensive public testimony on the matter, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9347, which I consider to be the most balanced and equitable revenue-sharing proposal. This measure is identical to S. 2080, introduced by Senator ROTH of Delaware, and is composite and refinement of the various proposals made to date.

We can all concur that our States and localities are in desperate financial shape, and can all adhere to the goal of revitalizing our federal system. However, in our desire to alleviate their plight, we must not rush headlong into a program that would fail to help those areas most in need, that would not encourage State

and local entities to develop their own taxing power to meet their specific needs, or that would violate the principle that the level of government that imposes the tax should be responsible for the manner in which it is spent.

The measure which I have introduced has some unique features which I believe meet the above objections.

This bill is only a temporary revenue-sharing measure. It would allocate—for use by State and local governments—1.3 percent, or about \$5 billion, of total Federal income taxes collected each year—but only for a 5-year period. Each State would receive the portion of the total revenue-sharing fund derived from that State, but it would be put on notice that these funds would be coming only for a limited time. This would induce them to improve their own tax-producing capabilities in order that they would be able to meet their specific needs.

As an incentive for them to accomplish this task of raising revenues, a tax-credit system would be phased-in during the last years of temporary revenue sharing. A taxpayer would be allowed as a credit against his Federal income tax payment 40 percent of State and local

income taxes paid. Hopefully, this would encourage the States to utilize the progressive income tax which is the most equitable method of taxation, and would satisfy the principle that the unit of government which is expending funds for its particular needs has the responsibility for raising these funds.

This measure would be more beneficial to urban areas—the places where additional revenues are so urgently needed. It limits the immediate pass through of funds to cities of 50,000 or more, and cities above 75,000 which are located in standard metropolitan areas above 500,000 in population would receive a share equal to 1.25 times the city's percentage of the State population.

I have mentioned some of the features of this legislation which I believe make it a unique cross between revenue sharing and tax sharing. It will help the States and localities over their immediate fiscal crises while at the same time providing a means to enable them to meet their problems in the future.

You will, I think, find the following tables of interest as you compare this legislation with other proposals:

CHART 1.—APPROXIMATE STATE SHARES UNDER S. 2080, ADMINISTRATION BILL, AND PRESENT AID SYSTEM¹

State and region	S. 2080 share ²	Percent of United States	Administration share ³	Percent of United States	Ratio of percent of Federal aid to percent of Federal taxes ⁴
United States	\$5,000,000,000	100.00	\$5,000,000,000	100.00	100/100=1
New England	351,800,000	7.016	266,000,000	5.320	⁵ 1.150
Maine	17,900,000	.358	23,000,000	.460	1.200
New Hampshire	17,100,000	.342	15,000,000	.300	.880
Vermont	8,400,000	.169	12,000,000	.240	2.240
Massachusetts	164,500,000	3.290	136,000,000	2.720	.830
Rhode Island	24,800,000	.495	21,000,000	.420	.970
Connecticut	119,100,000	2.382	59,000,000	1.180	.521
Mideast	1,297,300,000	25.946	1,063,000,000	21.260	⁵ .995
New York	612,200,000	12.245	534,000,000	10.680	.842
New Jersey	225,700,000	4.514	154,000,000	3.080	.510
Pennsylvania	298,800,000	5.977	246,000,000	4.920	.790
Delaware	17,400,000	.349	13,500,000	.270	.602
Maryland	120,600,000	2.412	92,500,000	1.850	.610
District of Columbia	22,600,000	.452	23,000,000	.460	2.640
Great Lakes	1,112,100,000	22.242	902,000,000	18.040	⁵ .755
Michigan	247,000,000	4.940	229,000,000	4.580	.752
Ohio	284,800,000	5.695	212,500,000	4.250	.690
Indiana	123,900,000	2.478	116,000,000	2.320	.740
Illinois	358,800,000	7.176	220,000,000	4.400	.719
Wisconsin	97,600,000	1.952	124,500,000	2.490	.873
Plains	331,800,000	6.636	411,000,000	8.022	⁵ 1.448
Minnesota	78,200,000	1.564	107,500,000	2.150	1.082
Iowa	56,200,000	1.123	74,500,000	1.490	1.005
Missouri	105,800,000	2.107	96,500,000	1.930	.959
North Dakota	7,900,000	.158	20,500,000	.410	2.400
South Dakota	9,200,000	.185	19,000,000	.380	2.500
Nebraska	28,000,000	.560	39,000,000	.780	1.100
Kansas	46,500,000	.930	54,000,000	1.080	1.040
Southeast	\$758,100,000	15.160	\$1,044,000,000	20.880	⁵ 1.586
Virginia	99,300,000	1.986	104,500,000	2.090	.940
West Virginia	29,500,000	.590	41,500,000	.830	2.100
Kentucky	50,200,000	1.003	78,000,000	1.560	2.110
Tennessee	70,200,000	1.403	87,000,000	1.740	1.300
North Carolina	83,000,000	1.661	113,500,000	2.270	1.110
South Carolina	37,400,000	.748	56,500,000	1.130	1.300
Georgia	81,000,000	1.621	107,500,000	2.150	1.402
Florida	146,000,000	2.921	167,500,000	3.350	.750
Alabama	50,000,000	1.000	82,000,000	1.640	1.900
Mississippi	24,500,000	.490	61,500,000	1.230	2.400
Louisiana	62,000,000	1.240	101,500,000	2.030	1.800
Arkansas	25,000,000	.500	43,000,000	.860	2.140
Southwest	329,900,000	6.598	390,000,000	7.800	⁵ 1.901
Oklahoma	43,800,000	.875	63,500,000	1.270	2.100
Texas	237,900,000	4.758	243,000,000	4.860	.963
New Mexico	15,500,000	.310	32,000,000	.640	3.100
Arizona	32,700,000	.654	51,500,000	1.030	1.500
Rocky Mountain	92,000,000	1.840	139,000,000	2.780	⁵ 2.200
Montana	10,800,000	.217	19,000,000	.380	2.300
Idaho	11,200,000	.223	20,000,000	.400	1.710
Wyoming	6,600,000	.131	11,500,000	.230	3.400
Colorado	46,200,000	.925	60,000,000	1.200	1.400
Utah	17,200,000	.345	28,500,000	.570	2.300
Far West	700,900,000	14.018	753,000,000	15.060	⁵ 1.802
Washington	90,400,000	1.807	92,000,000	1.840	1.020
Oregon	45,700,000	.914	57,000,000	1.140	1.400
Nevada	15,800,000	.315	14,000,000	.280	1.200
California	549,000,000	10.981	590,000,000	11.800	1.300
Alaska	6,800,000	.137	8,500,000	.170	4.230
Hawaii	19,000,000	.379	23,500,000	.470	1.741

¹ Statistics provided by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

² Based on origin of Federal personal income taxes—calendar year 1968, returns filed in calendar year 1969.

³ Based on population and revenue effort.

⁴ Ratio of percent of all Federal aid (fiscal year 1969) to percent of all Federal personal income taxes for calendar year 1968.

⁵ Average.

CHART 2.—States which receive a larger percentage of shared revenues using "origin of revenue" formula (S 2080) than under population-revenue-effort formula (administration)¹

New England: New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.
 Mideast: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland.
 Great Lakes: Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois.
 Plains: Missouri.
 Far West: Nevada.

CHART 3.—REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL AID FISCAL 1969¹

Region	Total (in millions of dollars)	Per capita	Percent of State and local government general revenue
New England.....	1,173	101.93	17.9
Mideast.....	4,113	97.01	15.2
Great Lakes.....	2,989	74.92	14.0
Plains.....	1,511	93.40	17.0

¹ Found in special analysis of the 1972 budget, p. 240.

Region	Total (in millions of dollars)	Per capita	Percent of State and local government general revenue
Southeast.....	4,530	107.21	22.8
Southwest.....	1,714	116.33	21.2
Rocky Mountain.....	665	136.30	23.3
Far West.....	3,043	115.25	14.9
United States....	20,287	100.47	17.4

CHART 4.—APPROXIMATE SHARES OF SELECTED CITIES OF 75,000 OR MORE LOCATED IN STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS OF 500,000 OR MORE UNDER PROVISIONS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1971 AND UNDER ADMINISTRATION PLAN

State, city	Intergovernmental Revenue Adjustment Act of 1971 ¹	Administration plan ²
Alabama: Birmingham.....	\$5,437,500	\$3,531,004
Arizona: Phoenix.....	13,364,875	6,360,085

Footnote at end of table.

¹ Based on statistics provided by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—see Chart 1.

CHART 6.—TAX CREDITS—ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL REVENUE FOREGONE AND STATE-LOCAL REVENUE GAIN FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1970, 1971, AND 1972 UNDER 4 HYPOTHETICAL CONDITIONS

Estimates in parentheses assume that the acceleration in State income tax collections attributable to tax credit action will reduce the growth in State and local sales and property tax receipts and consequently the drawdown on the Federal Treasury attributable to the itemization of these tax payments

[In billions of dollars]

Hypothetical conditions	1st year, 1970			2d year, 1971			3d year, 1972			
	Estimated State income tax collections	Federal revenue foregone ¹		Estimated State income tax collections	Federal revenue foregone ¹		Estimated State income tax collections	Federal revenue foregone ¹		State-local revenue gain
		Total	Due to credit		Total	Due to credit		Total	Due to credit	
1. No change in present law (deduction of State-local income tax payments).....	8.5	1.9		10.0	2.2		12.0	2.6		
2. Congress adopts a 30-percent ACIR-type credit (relatively weak acceleration effect on State income tax collections) ²	9.4	3.1	1.2 (1.1)	0.9	11.5	3.8 (1.5)	1.5	15.0	5.0 (2.4) (2.2)	3.0
3. Congress adopts a 40-percent ACIR-type credit (moderately strong acceleration effect on State income tax collections) ³	10.6	4.5	2.6 (2.5)	2.1	14.0	5.9 (3.5)	4.0	19.2	8.1 (5.5) (5.1)	7.2
4. Congress adopts a 50-percent ACIR-type credit (strong acceleration effect on State income tax collections) ⁴	13.6	6.9	5.0 (4.7)	5.1	20.0	10.2 (7.4)	10.0	30.0	15.3 (12.7) (11.7)	18.0

¹ Assumes an average State income tax writeoff against Federal tax of 22 percent under present law and the following percentages under the ACIR-type credit: 30 percent credit—33 percent; 40-percent credit—42 percent; 50-percent credit—51 percent.
² Assumes that it will take 3 years before the increase in State income tax collections will offset additional amount of Federal income tax forgone. Specific acceleration assumptions: 10 percent 1st year, 15 percent 2d year, and 25 percent 3d year, and no further State income tax collection acceleration after the 3d year attributable to the tax credit.
³ Assumes that the breakeven point will be reached in the 2d year. Specific acceleration assumptions:

25 percent 1st year, 40 percent 2d year, 60 percent 3d year, and no further acceleration in State income tax collections after the 3d year attributable to the Federal tax credit.
⁴ Assumes that even in the 1st year the increase in State income tax collections attributable to the tax credit will more than offset the reduction in Federal revenue. Specific acceleration assumptions: 60 percent 1st year, 100 percent 2d year, 150 percent 3d year and no further acceleration in State income tax collections after the 3d year attributable to the Federal tax credit.

Source: ACIR staff estimates.

State, city	Intergovernmental Revenue Adjustment Act of 1971 ¹	Administration plan ²
California:		
Anaheim.....	\$5,490,000	\$1,390,130
Garden Grove.....	4,117,500	530,287
Los Angeles.....	99,261,250	34,721,456
Riverside.....	4,792,500	962,580
Sacramento.....	8,921,250	3,179,135
San Bernardino.....	3,431,250	1,127,197
San Diego.....	24,018,750	6,382,633
San Francisco.....	24,705,000	23,954,657
San Jose.....	15,783,750	3,452,084
Santa Ana.....	5,490,000	967,647
Colorado: Denver.....	13,686,750	10,527,896
Connecticut: Hartford.....	7,741,500	2,322,391
Delaware: Wilmington.....	3,197,250	1,823,650
District of Columbia.....	28,250,000	2,915,149
Florida:		
Fort Lauderdale.....	3,832,500	1,981,867
Hollywood.....	2,920,000	968,786
Jacksonville.....	14,235,000	2,859,870
Miami.....	8,937,500	4,617,813
St. Petersburg.....	5,837,500	4,276,375
Tampa.....	7,482,500	3,981,297
Georgia: Atlanta.....	10,935,000	7,647,341
Hawaii: Honolulu.....	9,975,000	4,917,712
Illinois: Chicago.....	134,998,500	47,601,259
Indiana:		
Gary.....	5,265,750	1,848,739
Hammond.....	3,407,250	1,045,054
Indianapolis.....	22,302,000	5,612,259
Kentucky: Louisville.....	7,028,000	8,661,641
Louisiana: New Orleans.....	12,710,000	9,907,090
Maryland: Baltimore.....	34,974,000	14,285,058
Massachusetts:		
Boston.....	32,907,500	10,700,523
Springfield.....	5,963,125	2,191,749
Michigan:		
Detroit.....	46,621,250	24,901,847
Grand Rapids.....	7,101,250	2,215,551
Minnesota:		
Minneapolis.....	11,143,500	5,143,400
St. Paul.....	7,917,750	3,734,244
Missouri:		
Kansas City.....	14,283,000	9,114,435
St. Louis.....	17,721,600	15,120,157
Nebraska: Omaha.....	8,190,000	3,459,983
New Jersey:		
Clifton.....	3,103,375	1,000,362
Jersey City.....	10,156,500	4,246,309
Newark.....	14,952,625	7,551,318
Paterson.....	5,642,500	1,928,007
North Carolina: Winston-Salem.....	2,697,500	1,036,046
New York:		
Albany.....	4,821,075	1,100,900
Buffalo.....	19,896,500	5,846,479
New York City.....	329,057,500	189,348,578
Rochester.....	12,244,000	3,341,859
Syracuse.....	5,356,750	2,338,845
Schenectady.....	3,290,575	571,380
Ohio:		
Akron.....	10,093,000	4,421,170
Cincinnati.....	15,664,000	13,508,542
Cleveland.....	25,276,000	11,227,393
Columbus.....	18,156,000	5,225,749
Dayton.....	8,188,000	4,124,377
Youngstown.....	4,984,000	1,547,709

State, city	Intergovernmental Revenue Adjustment Act of 1971 ¹	Administration plan ²
Oklahoma: Oklahoma City.....	\$7,165,000	\$7,554,222
Oregon: Portland.....	10,625,250	7,928,286
Pennsylvania:		
Allentown.....	3,361,500	940,735
Philadelphia.....	60,252,500	39,781,536
Pittsburgh.....	16,434,000	7,433,529
Rhode Island: Providence.....	5,828,000	2,243,861
Tennessee:		
Memphis.....	13,952,250	5,408,621
Nashville-Davidson.....	10,003,500	5,742,847
Texas:		
Dallas.....	22,005,750	10,557,412
Fort Worth.....	10,408,125	4,658,714
Houston.....	36,577,125	12,953,581
San Antonio.....	17,247,750	4,685,184
Utah: Salt Lake City.....	3,547,500	2,547,835
Virginia:		
Norfolk.....	8,192,250	3,805,469
Portsmouth.....	2,979,000	1,055,155
Richmond.....	6,702,750	3,510,825
Washington: Seattle.....	17,628,000	8,820,093
Wisconsin: Milwaukee.....	19,764,000	7,942,274
Total for United States.....	5,000,000,000	5,000,000,000

¹ Calculated from the Advance Reports 1970 Census of Population, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, December 1970; statistics made available by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

² From Department of the Treasury, General Revenue Sharing, February 1971.

CHART 5.—Roots of the fiscal problems of metropolitan center cities

1. Loss of tax base resulting from the departure of middle class citizens, decline of retail sales and the disappearance of employment opportunities.
2. Tax rates which are already more burdensome than elsewhere.
3. Relatively greater expenses in areas not aided by Federal and state governments.
4. As cities become large there is a diseconomy of scale as regards expenditures for police, fire, sanitation and sewers, and parks and recreation.
5. Necessity of providing services for non-resident, often non-taxpaying, commuters.
6. Increasing proportions of "high cost" citizens—the poor, aged, etc.
7. Social conditions which leads to higher governmental costs such as: higher crime rates; greater population density; lower educational levels; more unsound housing; greater unemployment; lower income levels; more families in poverty; and a larger percentage of non-white population with special problems.

GEN. ROBERT L. SCOTT, JR. SPEAKS
TO AMERICANS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in a speech entitled "The Bitter Cost of a Bogus Peace," Brig. Gen. Robert L. Scott, Jr. retired professional soldier, emphasizes in an impassioned tone his love of dedication to God and country while elaborating on the bitter price we pay for a tenuous, bogus peace—the erosion of liberty and of the God-given freedoms bequeathed to us by our U.S. Constitution.

Being the realist that he is, General Scott rejects the "inevitable wave of the future" propaganda being repeatedly hammered into the consciousnesses of the American people to condition them to accept apathetically without resistance the "blowing winds of change" even when they are obliterating our U.S. Constitution and traditional American way of life.

General Scott knows from first hand experience that people cause things to happen. Someone is prohibiting our military commanders from winning the Vietnam war which retired military commanders affirm could be won with conventional weapons in a matter of months. The exportation of sophisticated electronic computers to the Soviet Union and such items as diesel engines and parts, aircraft propeller assemblies, electron tubes, and generators to East European satellites of Russia—countries which provide 80 percent of the materials of war to North Vietnam for use against American servicemen—just did not come about automatically or by accident. They were the result of people. Certain anti-Americans made these decisions. Just as when the dedicated patriot Otto Otepka was dismissed from his State Department security position where he exposed actual and prospective employees as security risks, one or more real persons at a higher level ordered him purged.

General Scott, best known for his bravery and achievements as a World War II flyer and for his several books, especially "God Is My Co-Pilot," reminds his audience that while each new administration promises changes, America keeps losing; and he states:

At last, though, there is a faint glimmer of hope. Not that we are about to win even a scrimmage, but that finally, more Americans come to realize that our bungling policymakers are not stupid fools or just doing the best they can in their complicated thankless job, but are part and parcel of the greatest, the most insidious conspiracy the world has ever known. Following carefully-laid plans for our convergence with the Soviet Union as the base for dictatorial government of the world. (Where, as Senator — says, there'll be no armies, no navies, no air forces except those of the United Nations. In fact, there'll be no United States as we know it.)

On the west side of Park Avenue in New York City, sit two imposing buildings sort of kitty-corner to one another. One is the Soviet Embassy to the United Nations, the other the Headquarters of the Council of Foreign Relations, the infamous C.F.R. Prob-

ably the most influential, surely the most secretive of societies, not only for the foreign policy of the United States, but for the world. That one world. Formal membership is composed of 1400 of the most elite names in the worlds of government, labor, business, finance, communications, the foundations, and the academies. And despite the fact that it, the Council of Foreign Relations, has staffed almost every key position of each administration since F.D.R., it is doubtful that one American in a thousand so much as knows its name. Or that one in ten thousand can describe anything about its function. Such anonymity can hardly be an accident.

I insert the text of General Scott's timely and significant speech at this point in my remarks. I urge that our colleagues read this speech and get better informed with facts about the Council on Foreign Relations—CFR—the influential organization which has led and continues to lead America on a retrogressive course of destruction, by reading "The Invisible Government" by the noted writer, Dan Smoot.

Since the national news media is afraid to tell the American people about the CFR, I exhort our colleagues to do so in order that the people may know the truth, a knowledge of which is essential for taking prudent action to reverse the present trend and to preserve our country and Constitution.

If the people know the truth, they will keep America free.

The speech follows:

THE BITTER COST OF A BOGUS PEACE—IS THE
BROKEN CROSS OUR SYMBOL OF BETRAYAL?

(By Brig. Gen. Robert L. Scott, Jr.)

When the man who is the President of the United States now, made the best of acceptance speeches that ever has been made, at Miami Beach in 1968, every American must have been not only pleased but thrilled, because in the strongest of voices he said words such as these: "When the nation which can land an army upon the shores of Normandy in 1944, and capture a continent, cannot now take a dinky little beachhead of guerrillas in Vietnam, then I say this nation needs a change in leadership." And on and on he went, inspiring all Americans. There was the new Administration, the new leadership we had all been praying for. He promised the stopping of riots in our streets, dignity would be restored to our police, our nation's campuses would be freed of revolutionaries parading as dissatisfied students. We would aid the enemy no longer. We'd recognize the Communist for what he was—the enemy—and go to work. All of these things if only we elected him. There would be changes.

Well, we believed him. And we elected for America a new Commander-in-Chief. And now we would have leadership. Only, there has been nothing but more of the same. We still wage that no-win war of attrition bogged down right where the enemy wants us, using weapons that enemy carefully selected for us, and back home we are torn apart internally, primarily because there is no leadership. So, disgusted at all this, we sit down and write letters to Mr. Nixon asking why, and sometimes there are replies such as this one.

"THE WHITE HOUSE,
November 5, 1970.

"DEAR SIR: On President Nixon's behalf, I wish to acknowledge your letter and to thank you for letting him have your views. You may be sure your comments on problems facing our Nation at home and abroad have been fully noted.

"The Administration believes that the massive destruction of facilities in the cities of North Vietnam would not spell victory but

would instead admit defeat by indicating the inability of the United States and its allies to cope with 'a war of national liberation.' This sophisticated form of aggression uses terror and subversion to gain the allegiance or the submission of those it purports to liberate.

"Such aggression must not be allowed to succeed. Our objective therefore is not the annihilation of one country but the protection of another. This is the victory we seek."

Oh, there was more of the double-talk in the reply that I received, given gratis in the name of the President, but surely as you let those words rattle around in your mind, there's no need to further bore you with additional quotes. I can only be respectful to the White House and the President, even with this idealistic guff. Yet what frightens me, given as it is, it has to be the policy of this Administration. Signed by one Noble N. Mellonkamp, Staff Assistant to the President of the United States. Wishing me best regards, and adding finally, "you may be sure that President Nixon is determined to continue the pursuit of our country's goal of a just and lasting peace in Vietnam."

Ladies and gentlemen, as a professional soldier, I feel flattered when I receive any communication, even indirectly, from the Commander-in-Chief. But after reading and re-reading such utter drivel, I am astounded that we are so naive. Can it be that we are already in the hands of the enemy? We are not only being buried as Khrushchev shouted while he beat his shoe upon the U.N. desk; we are helping the dirt being shoveled into our own graves.

Now my mother used to say to me, those last years of her life when I was Director of Information of the United States Air Force, and I dared even then to find fault with the way the White House was running this same no-win war: "Son, she would admonish me, please don't criticize the President. I'm certain he does the best he can." And she would terminate the discussion by adding, "though things may look dark, I truly believe everything will come out alright in the end."

In fact, that last is just about the essence of the opinion I hear voiced across the United States as I cover this land making speeches. And there comes upon me the horrible realization that the way things are going, the President of the United States does not run this country. Doesn't run it as my mother used to think, and as the average American rests assured of today. What a blatant thing to say! What would my mother say if she heard me now?

Administrations come and go with elections—particular heads vested in the Nixons and Johnsons and Kennedys, promising changes and improvements—but nothing really changes except the name. The riots and the treason and the no-win fiasco bleeding us to death continue. America keeps losing.

At last, though, there is a faint glimmer of hope. Not that we are about to win even a scrimmage, but that finally, more Americans come to realize that our bungling policymakers are not stupid fools or just doing the best they can in their complicated thankless job, but are part and parcel of the greatest, the most insidious conspiracy the world has ever known. Following carefully-laid plans for our convergence with the Soviet Union as the base for dictatorial government of the world. (Where, as Senator Blank says, there'll be no armies, no navies, no air forces except those of the United Nations. In fact, there'll be no United States as we know it.)

On the west side of Park Avenue in New York City, sit two imposing buildings sort of kitty-corner to one another. One is the Soviet Embassy to the United Nations, the other the Headquarters of the Council of Foreign Relations, the infamous C.F.R. Probably the most influential, surely the most secretive of

societies, not only for the foreign policy of the United States, but for the world. That one world. Formal membership is composed of 1400 of the most elite names in the worlds of government, labor, business, finance, communications, the foundations, and the academies. And despite the fact that it, the Council of Foreign Relations, has staffed almost every key position of each Administration since F.D.R., it is doubtful that one American in a thousand so much as knows its name. Or that one in ten thousand can describe anything about its function. Such anonymity can hardly be an accident.

Now don't worry, I'm not going to give you a lecture on that diabolical society. But if you doubt my implications, as my mother would surely have doubted them, and you are interested enough and want proof, well in the back of this room there are books on sale at half-price. And if you don't want to even invest in them at that figure, I will pay for them for you, if you will only read them and pass them on to other Americans before it is too late. Read about the C.F.R. and come to know it, because this is the society that designed the United Nations, under whose banner your sons and brothers and husbands die in Vietnam, while you keep thinking they died under Old Glory.

Designers of disaster are they, with good American names such as Harold Stassen, John J. McCloy, John Foster Dulles, Adlai Stevenson, Dean Acheson, Nelson Rockefeller, the Fords, all lumped unassumingly together with brother members who call themselves Owen Lattimore (the most articulate conspirator within our C.I.A., much to do with our sell-out of our allies at the Bay of Pigs), right along with Alger Hiss (a convicted Communist spy), right along further with 47 members who were among the United States delegates to the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945. Right along with others who were at the elbow of President Roosevelt at Tehran, Potsdam, and Yalta, when hundreds of millions of human beings were delivered into the hands of a Communist murderer named Josef Stalin.

In fact, one more reason for you to know your enemy, is that so completely has the C.F.R. dominated the United States Department for over 40 years that every Secretary of State except Cordell Hull, James Byrnes, and the present Mr. Rogers has been a member in good standing of the Council. So maybe President Nixon's Cabinet looks better than most, with the absence of a Secretary of State who is a member of the C.F.R. Except, of course, that every major sub-Cabinet job is held by one of the brotherhood. Besides, what does Mr. Rogers really matter after all? Henry Kissinger is not only a member, but is on the super-staff of that Council, and being President Nixon's chief advisor on all foreign policy, we have the story.

So like they say, Administrations come and go like the Ides of March, but Spring never arrives because the C.F.R. is always there. Its dedicated one-world members staffing everything, just as the Communists staff the United Nations. The fix, you see, is at the top, where these insiders bent on control of the world, pull the strings as though we were puppets. We have been sold out! Not so much by our Communist enemies, whom we may have suspected, as by Americans among us, some of them we proudly elected to office.

And the bitter price we pay is the future eroding away of liberty, and our God-given freedom under the Constitution, what was once the United States. Our Constitution, that sacred document, divinely inspired and written by the hands of our Founding Fathers, guaranteeing freedom to the people and unequivocally limiting government, provided that government is one of law, not of men.

But even there, once that document was written, its preamble, its seven articles, and it was approved by our Founding Fathers,

still they didn't trust it. So they went right to work on that 17th day of September, in 1787, and immediately drafted and set down and voted approval to the first ten amendments, to be called the Bill of Rights. Each one of these further guaranteeing the rights of the individual and limiting mighty government from impertinence. In fact, the ninth and tenth amendments take it from there and spell it out, seeming to reiterate, "If we forgot anything to further protect the rights of the people, let these two catchall amendments protect those people, protect Americans yet unborn."

It is in such a state thus that we arrive today in our predicament. Our Constitution, drastically altered and abridged and reinterpreted by our Supreme Court, to become a shell of what it was once envisioned to be by those staunch men who put it all together. Today we find it reinterpreted, used as a seal for generacy. Further, protecting misfits in society, granting amnesty to our criminals, our revolutionaries, our anarchists, protecting even the infiltrated enemy in our midst. This, along with finding our once great Nation hopelessly bogged down in a land war of attrition in Vietnam—a war which our military professionals could have won in a few weeks, much less years and years, if we had only allowed them to win. And should our soldiers there fight and destroy the enemy, we bring them home in disgrace and try them as war criminals, while our enemies laugh in glee.

And rest assured all of this is not the simple destruction of a drop-out lieutenant named Calley, but the cold-blooded planned destruction of our professional armed forces.

Now in case I've been misunderstood, I stoutly maintain that Vietnam was rigged. All of it. Just as the thing in My Lai was rigged. That no effort whatsoever has been made to allow our men to win. And that war could have been won, as acknowledged in sworn testimony by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces before the Senate Armed Services Committee. You don't have to take my word, they swore to this. And this victory could have come without risking the intervention of Red China and Red Russia. In fact, that demonstration of guts by the United States would have been the best way to guarantee they would not enter.

Far worse, morally, we persist in supplying the enemy with the goods of war with which to murder our sons. In fact, again we make a mockery of what is an honorable profession, the training and deployment, and the logistics of military might. Take Cambodia. We informed the enemy where, when, and how we would go in. And even added as an addendum how we would retreat. Take our feeble attempts at rescuing our prisoners. Through the United Nations we informed our enemy of our intentions. Therefore, is it any wonder that we made our men fall again, as they were sent in to rescue their brothers? It was such a carefully planned failure, which brings us right down to the crux of it all.

You see a great part of our failure has been made possible by the most educational media of all times, our modern television. The way we permit it to be used, it has become the most dangerous weapon of all, replacing the dreaded bomb. Look back! The architects of Communism have been warning us for a long, long time—just telling us this, unemotionally, not bothering to threaten or to warn—setting it down in their books: "We will never fight you. We will not have to. We will just wait until you are ready, and fall into our hands like ripe fruit. We will just wait."

And besides that, here they say are rules for revolution: Corrupt the young. Divide America: the young against old, white against black. Destroy the integrity of the military, destroy them without having to face them on any battlefield. Be entertained. Keep

American minds off of the important things. Keep them busy with inconsequential like ping-pong. And we do all that for them with our television, instead of carefully explaining why we are in Vietnam.

Distasteful as this war is, there are some very honorable and some very valid reasons why we are there. And these have not been explained by this mighty educational and entertainment media of ours. Such as, we are in Vietnam to stop the tide of Communist aggression, which has been enveloping the world like a fog ever since World War II—unopposed! We are there because we have made promises to brave allies, regardless of whether we agree with their politics or understand their oriental customs. They are fighting and dying alongside our men in Vietnam, and too, they do this amid the destruction of their own families and their own homes. We are in Vietnam for the cause of peace, and not for one iota of aggression, no matter what our highly-paid television commentators keep telling us to the contrary.

And lastly, we come to My Lai, the lies of My Lai. I have to call them that, because Pinkville fiasco could have been explained too. First it appeared in the Communist *Daily Worker* and only after that was it taken up and mushroomed by the whole media, as we actually paid for its distribution. The propaganda of our enemy—and we paid to distribute it.

And though I must have been subjected to a million words about My Lai to date, in the staccato voices of Roger Mudd and Walter Cronkite, or the patronizing measured cadence of the John Chancellor types, not once have I heard the simplest truth or explanation about what Pinkville really was. The networks presidents have had their chances, and even the President of the United States could have done so. He has innumerable press conferences; why couldn't there have been one about Song My, My Lai, and Pinkville? I think it's important to justify such a thing. I went there and walked among the villages and questioned and talked with natives who were there, and talked with sergeants and corporals—no officers (By then they were so scared, they were scared of the very names of the villages!).

Here the media commentators moved. They have the best intelligence system. They all slanted the news. They all implied Pinkville was an area of innocent native villages, and our sons were murderers. That's all it was.

It was a hard core, combat ready, enemy stronghold. And had been so for over twenty years, dating back to the French failure in the days of Dienbienphu. Regardless of the ages and the sex of those who did the dirty work, they were the enemy. Certainly, all of this should have been explained to Americans, especially to this young generation. Listen to what a sergeant who was there told me.

"We would go to this village. There would be nobody there but women and children. Where were the young men? They had been taken away by the V.C. We would search the huts for weapons. They had to be there because we had been fired on from that village many times, we had been booby-trapped from there. Well, when the other sergeant took some men into those huts, claymore mines went off, and many of them were killed. They were blown up, my buddies and the sergeant. A little old lady, sitting on some string—which she pulled when she saw our men going to the right hut. They had prepared mines. Even innocent looking kids were used at My Lai by the Cong. Any time you see a kid holding out his arms as though he want to hug you, grinning at you, begging for candy, look out. Chances are he's got a grenade in that little box or clutched tightly to his chest. He's been taught by the Cong to pull the pin soon as he has his arms around your neck, hugging you. All he wants to do is give the Yank a surprise, like the Vietcong

told him to do. Sure the kid blows up along with your buddy, only the kid wasn't told anything about that."

Then there was my own experience at Song My. I was driving a jeep toward the village, was almost there, and we came upon two little girls digging in the dirt of a narrow road right in the ruts. They couldn't have been more than three or four years old. I steered around them real slow, almost stopped and talked, but there was a truck behind us and I didn't want to block the road. Barely seconds after we had passed, there was this sharp explosion, and as I looked back they had just disappeared. There was a hole right in the rut on that side of the road, from the mines they had been planting. Had we come out a few seconds later, I guess we would have been the ones to blow up, or that truck of GIs behind us.

None of these accidents or incidents have ever been explained on television or in the press as far as I know. Nor has it ever been brought out that 40% of Lt. Calley's Charley Company was wounded and booby-trapped and sniped at and nearly destroyed by that nice little village of Vietnamese. So I don't know exactly what Lt. Calley did. But had I been there in his place, in the same circumstances that I've found out a little about, I would probably have done the same as he did. Even to those women and children. We were both soldiers. We just fought in different wars. And what strikes me right in the nerve, maybe a lot of it was due to the way it was handled on national television. Of course, way back there in World War II, there wasn't any such thing to destroy the people back home, in living color with instant replay.

But be that as it may, Calley and My Lai are far more important than just this drop-out lieutenant and a burned-out little jungle village in the Quang Ngai province of Indo-China. They are both pretty big milestones along the route of the systematic destruction of our professional military system. And they both surely will make it more difficult for such a panacea for the draft as any so-called volunteer army.

When I was a boy I'd have crawled across my state of Georgia to enlist and wear the uniform of my country. And had I had half the assurance that I could fly in Air Force planes, I'd have made that journey crawling over broken glass. Well, I volunteered then, over forty years ago, and I got to fly all those planes, millions and millions of miles. But I don't know that I would do it now, not under the present circumstances, not in uniform, not in the uniform I've been proud to wear most of my life, because now all that morale and *esprit de corps* has changed.

We have all sat by, and let it be eroded away by the enemy. Why today, when I see a man in uniform, who dares to be seen in it, I feel like saluting him. Just for having the guts to put it on, and taking the abuse he's likely to be subjected to, in that most honorable attire. No, I wouldn't volunteer, nor would I recommend the service today as any career. It used to be stated proudly, on every post office, on every bill board, Uncle Sam pointing his finger, "I want you!" But now cringing and weakly pleads, "the Army wants to join you." It may be an overused worn-out cliché, but I know nothing else that fits the occasion so appropriately: How stupid can we get! How lowly the mighty recruiting sergeant has fallen. I surely wouldn't want to spend a career in a service that we have sat by indifferently and permitted to be perverted by the enemy. And as for the possibility of a drug problem among our servicemen in Vietnam, if my country trained me to kill my enemy with the most sophisticated weapons of all time, displaced me from my home and family and just sent me over to those Hell holes, and then instead of letting me fight and win, and come home as fast as the job can be

done, made me sit out there in abject boredom, maybe I would try to loose myself in the feelings of pot, too. If there is a drug problem, then our leaders are responsible for that, too.

None of our young men that we ordered anywhere to fight for us, had anything to do with involvement in Vietnam. None of our old soldiers had anything to do with being there either. In fact, every professional I've ever heard of, from General MacArthur on, advised strongly *against* any land involvement in Vietnam. Our men were ordered there by the failure of our diplomats and other politicians, after another generation of young men had fought, and many of them had died, and had won a victory. But then our diplomats and our politicians, and those of the enemy, met and decided they couldn't keep the peace. And so when they had admitted failure they called on the military again.

This time we gave our troops no chance. We forgot them, we never backed them, we broke all the rules, we gave our sons the backs of our hands. They had all the obvious lessons, but they had none of the least obvious and the most important—such as our unswerving support. The war we failed to make our Congress tell what it was, a war. Propagandized by our enemy with our help, to be the most unpopular conflict in history. Propagandized until we all became sick and tired of the word Vietnam, became disgusted, became *conditioned*. Only in such a way can we have become soulless enough to sit indifferently by and watch our armed services used, even brought home in chains to be tried as war criminals. Exactly what the Communist enemy had counted on, from what they called "the fat, decadent democracy." They have found a way to destroy our armed forces without ever having to face them in combat.

If our men were backed by us at home, no enemy on the face of the earth would have had a chance. I can't help comparing my return from World War II with that one today of the long-suffering GI. Surely, I was as much a murderer, if soldiers are such in the performance of their duty, as was Lt. Calley, because I doubtless killed more enemy human beings—not just those in the planes I destroyed in aerial combat—but in my strafing of troop columns through innocent native villages then in Burma, and China, and Indo-China and Korea.

But murderer that I could have been, my home town gave me a full fledged parade, because they still loved me. They even rented a water buffalo at great trouble and expense from a circus in Florida, so I could ride in splendor up Cherry Street in Macon, Georgia. Oh, but they didn't know how much I despised that cantankerous sharp-horned animal, or how much I learned in China from experience how much he hated me. But nevertheless I rode him, though that ride was just as harrowing as any of my combat missions. But I had to ride him, for the Governor had declared it Robert Scott day. How could I get out of it? Anyway, like I started to say, compare that with the return of the men in uniform today. Our modern Jobs I call them. They're not all treated as badly as Lt. Calley, but the uniform certainly has lost its so-called glamour. And those *real* forgotten ones, the sixteen hundred prisoners we forego more each day, that the enemy tortures and starves! Never forget what that miserable Presidential hopeful, Senator _____, said about them a few weeks ago, when reminded that to just arbitrarily pull out of Vietnam as he advocated in his campaign speeches would leave all those sons of ours hopelessly abandoned. All he said was, "So what? They never should have gone over there, fighting in this war of aggression."

Sometimes when our boys do come home—at least their ashes return in those pathetic plastic bags—we award them our best insult,

by our failure to make certain they are honored by every single American they died for, especially by every member of this young generation. Every other American belongs to that crucial category, which aggregates some 100 million young Americans. By just the numbers alone, they represent our most vital society. Therefore, it's not only imperative they understand, but that they and all these facts be accurately presented on this great entertainment and educational media of ours, television.

The picture I'm shown does not portray this generation accurately. Now those who die for America and fight for it, or those millions who grow up and go to school to be good Americans, right there could be the heart of this problem. Could it be that somebody, other than real Americans as we think we know them, has gained control of that communication miracle, television? Think back to what George Washington told his men that cold Christmas night nearly 200 years ago. He had every opportunity to make a long and stirring speech, because they were out-numbered and all they had to do was listen across the Delaware River and they could hear the Hussein mercenaries shouting what they were going to do to this "bed-ragged rabble" who dared oppose them.

But all General Washington said was, "Get into the boats. And let us tonight be certain that only Americans are on guard." And that dear friends, is exactly what I advocate we make certain of now. Even to including the jealous freedom of the press, even the national television, are they in the hands of real Americans? Because the battle for Vietnam never has been fought over there in that far country, it's been fought right here at home in the press and on television, with squadrons of actors and writers, commanded by producers and high corporate officers.

I cannot conceive them to be Americans who do not simply report the news impartially, but shape it, slant it, evaluate it, interpret it and sometimes, utterly destroy that with which they do not agree by a casual shrugging of the shoulder. Whether it's a high ranking Admiral from Vietnam—oh, that equivocal raising of a high-solid eyebrow. Let us run a check on all of them, all who claim they are Americans. This is the dangerous control I feel the news media have over our minds today, especially young minds among us and their most pliable years. And as this benefits Communist enemies I must conclude that Communists planned it that way, because I know the Communists never leave anything to accidents.

In just such a way have most Americans been taught to have a guilty complex about that horror we invented called the atomic bomb. As terrible an accomplishment as that was, I still see as a trust assigned this nation, we were made custodians by the will of God; delivered unto our hands for stopping World War II and the saving of a million American lives who were supposed to be lost in the invasion of the Japanese islands. And after that would remain a true deterrent. But to remain a true deterrent it would have to remain a secret.

For preventing further wars—and it could have done that—what that capability actually meant was stability for the entire world. The United States had the power to dominate the people. There was no need to destroy any part of this world, but we could have guaranteed peace with absolute power. Never before in history had any nation such an overwhelming superiority over its enemies nor such a sacred trust to hold for its weaker friends.

In 1945 the United States held that key. Held the power to lead for freedom. Instead of leading, we retreated, and we have been retreating ever since. The enemy disarmed the United States with propaganda, by instilling in gullible people—who love comfort and so-called "peace" more than they loved honor and heritage—by instilling in

them a mission for the frantic search for a bogus peace which to me is ideally represented in that pagan "broken cross" symbol.

This became our goal above all else—peace—so American might was nullified. The free world was open to Communist aggression. Stalin wasn't disturbed because, first of all, Americans were giving him and selling him atomic secrets right out the front door of the White House. And besides he knew too well the dying Roosevelt's fixation to create a permanent peace through a fanciful dream, the United Nations. A fixation that had surfaced before, in the time of another President named Woodrow Wilson, when the same idea was the League of Nations. Only where Roosevelt had his Harry Hopkins living right there in the White House, Wilson had a man named Col. Edward House living there, the architect of the C.F.R. We started out talking about.

Well, is it too late? And even if not quite too late, what can we mere people do about it? Essentially, it's a matter of people like you and me working even harder than we've ever worked—then we ever thought we could work—to inform the uninformed, the indifferent people in this tottering country; the old and the not so old; the middle aged and especially the young.

Real Americans must be united to throw the rascals out of government. Throw them out legally with votes. And this can be done by making certain that people receive the unadulterated truth. That is the way! Truth to the grass roots levels of our society. Every Democrat, every Republican from the top to the bottom, who has been supporting the elected policies and the taxes for this one-worldism cancer should be replaced as rapidly as the electoral process will permit.

Public officials can no longer be equated in terms of being nice, merely possessing seniority much less being good television personalities. Each must be coldly scrutinized: is he or she an American? If there be any question or if there be any evidence he is a mere lackey of the Establishment, be he a fellow-traveler, be he a dupe, he has to go. Establishment henchmen should all be replaced by men and women who are totally committed to restoring the norm of society to its traditional position within the framework of the United States Constitution, that which was visualized by those founding fathers of ours.

If you study carefully any of the failures that we have had you will find that practically every one is related to violation or series of violations of our Constitutional principles. We had a great system going which had been betrayed.

So back to the first question; is it too late? Not if we become as aroused as we evidently became for an injustice to an Army lieutenant named Calley; not if we become as involved and as loud as the revolutionaries in our midst; become as dedicated and work as hard for America as they work against it; become as diligent as our enemies. That's all.

Rise and demand that our elected leaders, from the President down, explain why we have betrayed our men in Vietnam by ordering them to face an enemy we as a nation supported and still are supporting. And explain too why this present Administration, and the one before that, and even the one before that, guaranteed sanctuaries to our Communist enemies. Why we guaranteed his war making capacity, while denying our men their unalienable right to destroy that which made it possible to be murdered. Such a parallel to this last cannot be found in recorded history.

A warning though, in closing: Our enemy will do all he can to prevent this drastic change in the indifferent rank and file of the American people. Because there is nothing the Communists fear so much as that the "Silent Majority" will awaken in time and

learn the truth. It's the same right here at home with the traitors among us. Many are in positions of influence and power; they are counting on you becoming tired and more disgusted and giving up. Well, are we going to give up? That's the heart of the question.

LOSING THE NO. 1 SKY SPOT?

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Col. Ansel E. Talbert, executive editor of Air Transport World magazine, is a gifted writer and a dedicated American. He has won many writing awards including the prized Strogg Trophy of the Aviation Space Writers Association. Colonel Talbert is a former war correspondent and military and aviation editor of the old New York Herald Tribune.

Colonel Talbert recently prepared an editorial for 900 television and radio stations throughout the Nation. I commend this editorial to the Congress and to the American people.

LOSING THE NO. 1 SKY SPOT

The United States aircraft manufacturing industry—now second to none in the world—has been hard hit by the cancellation of its commitment to build a supersonic transport plane with government funding. Skipping arguments about the merit of the action, it's going to throw as yet uncounted thousands out of work, not only at the plants of the prime contractors, Boeing and General Electric, but at factories engaged in subcontracting.

There is another threat to the industry, now a cloud no larger than a man's hand, but one which is likely to spread and grow during the next five years. This is the sales program which the aircraft industry of the Soviet Union is launching throughout the world. And for the first time, the Soviet Foreign Office has informed the U.S. State Department officially that it wants to negotiate a general "airworthiness agreement" between the two world aircraft manufacturing leaders—a necessity before sales of any Russian aircraft could be made here.

Much discussion centers around the possibility of the Russians selling their supersonic transport, the Tupolev Tu-144, to us and to European airlines, now that we decided against building one. This may happen, but airlines, almost without exception—favor the British-French Concorde SST. The reason: good reputation of both British and French for spare parts availability. The Tu-144 may go in other parts of the world, however, where trade agreements based on barter might be arranged.

The Russian Yakovlev Yak-40, a tri-motored smaller jet plane, fits into a slot where there is no competing U.S. type now being developed.

This same aircraft carries up to 34 passengers; can operate on paved runways, and needs only limited areas for takeoff and landing.

Yes, it can happen here!

An aircraft dealer in Louisiana announces that he has made a deal to sell Soviet aircraft in the U.S.—from the Yak-40 to the supersonic Tu-144.

With foreign automobiles, television sets and many other items making inroads into U.S. domestic and overseas markets, this Soviet aircraft sales effort is something which Congress and all Americans better watch with an eagle U.S. eye.

HE IS CALLED WARMONGER BY MINISTERIAL FRIEND

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the other day I read an essay which made me feel as if a fresh wind had temporarily blown away the tiresome stench of anti-everything which has hung in the air for so long. The article was written by the Reverend Norman C. Miller, pastor of the Morgan Park Methodist Church in Chicago, and printed in South Carolina's The State newspaper.

It seems that Reverend Miller returned from 2 weeks' Army Reserve duty and was promptly branded as a warmonger by his colleagues in the clergy. The good reverend is not one to let this now common type of drivel go unchallenged, however, and his eloquent reply is well worth reading.

As is usually the case, Mr. Speaker, those who most need exposure to well-reasoned arguments such as those advanced by Reverend Miller will never bother to read and consider them. But in hopes that there is still time to reach the closed-minded, I ask that Rev. Norman C. Miller's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

HE IS CALLED WARMONGER BY MINISTERIAL FRIEND

(Editor's Note: The following was written by The Rev. Norman C. Miller, pastor of the Morgan Park Methodist Church in Chicago.)

I have just returned from my two weeks Army Reserve duty at Camp McCoy, Wis.

During my absence I missed a ministerial meeting. Last week when I attended the meeting, one of my ministerial friends smiled as I walked in, "Well, here comes the warmonger."

He aroused my anger and I said, "Why are you fellows in the ministry?" One replied, "We want to help where we can. We want to save souls and lives, not take them."

"I admire your zeal and your enthusiasm," I said, "but why are you so selective as to whom you will help and save?" I could see they were puzzled.

"You are saying a man drafted by his country to serve in the Armed Forces is not worthy to receive the word of God. You told me you had no words of comfort, no compassion for the wounded and maimed, no benediction for the dying. You tell me, in your action, that you have no consolation for the heartbroken parents, for a shattered dream of a wife and children."

I feel sorry for those who have college degrees, yet are able only to see life in one aspect, and come to only one conclusion.

We had one of our young men who served in Viet Nam return to a base in California. His sergeant told him, "If you go into town don't wear your uniform. But if you must wear your uniform, for God's Sake don't wear your Viet Nam ribbons . . . you will be called a butcher and a murderer."

What is wrong with a nation which calls its young men and women to fight for freedom and the abolition of the oppressed and then rewards them by ridiculing and degrading them?

War is horrible and tragic. It is a shame so many are called to die to protect freedom. Yet, in the last year America has lost over 58,000 in automobile deaths. More than the total lost in the Vietnam war. However, you do not find young men burning their drivers

license in protest, or dismantling their autos. Have you ever seen a well-meaning clergyman, solemnly intoning the names of the 58,000 automobile deaths from the steps of the national or state capitol?

I admit I find it very difficult to understand those who plead for peace and are willing to use any violence to obtain it. Who preach love and peace while their faces mirror abject hatreds; who break the laws, rejoice in the spilled blood of authority, who greet those who disagree with them with shouts of "pigs."

These are those who claim "establishment," without realizing that there is always the establishment." Russia, China and Cuba, whom they admire so much also have an establishment, an establishment that does not allow criticism, no freedom to march, no freedom of speech.

I hate war and know what war can do to the human spirit, as well as the body. Yet I will not join the peace moratorium, I will not be a party to the vilifying of our President and our Nation. For my Bible tells me there is something worse than war, it is human slavery, human bondage, in which man is no longer man, either in spirit or body.

I shall work for peace, and pray for peace within the framework of my government and I shall hope in God.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DESTRUCTION OF THE FREE BALTIC STATES

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, from June 12-16, Baltic peoples all over the

world were mourning the 31st anniversary of the annexation of their homeland by the Soviet Union, and with it the destruction of these States as independent countries. At that time, the United States raised its voice in protest. It is only fitting that it be raised again and again until the pressure of world public opinion becomes so strong that the restoration of liberty in the Baltic States is achieved.

Their's has been a long history of brief independence, thwarted time and time again by expanding empires. The peoples living on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea have long been the victims of the accident of geography.

In the late 18th century, the States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were overrun and incorporated into Czarist Russia. Through more than a century of oppressive czarist rule, the Balts retained their distinct national traditions and their undying love for independence.

At the end of World War I, in 1918, they achieved their national goal of independence, only to have it taken from them again in the late 1930's. First it was the Soviets who robbed these peoples of their sovereignty in June 1940. Under extreme pressure from Red army guns, "elections" were held. The Kremlin then claimed that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia had voted for inclusion into the Soviet State.

This was just the beginning of one of the most brutal occupations of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Balts were either killed or shipped out to the Arctic or Siberia. The Nazis employed similar abhorrent practices during their occupa-

tion from mid-1941 on for about 3 years. Then, in late 1944, the Soviets reoccupied the Baltic lands.

However, since the very beginning of the Soviet occupation, the Balts have utilized both organized resistance and, more recently, passive methods in their continuing fight for freedom.

These brave peoples have persisted in their struggle for freedom and we in the Congress and in the United States should commend and support the Baltic State's efforts for self-determination. Therefore, I commend efforts calling for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, to my colleagues as being a proper step toward mounting world opinion pressure on the Soviet Union.

On this 31st anniversary of the destruction of the Baltic States, I join with others in Congress and around the world, who pay tribute to the courageous Baltic peoples and fervently hope that their day of self-determination and peace will be close at hand.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in April I mailed my 1971 questionnaire to every boxholder within my 28th Congressional District of New York. Within 30 days I received 26,757 returns. For the benefit of the other Members of Congress, I am introducing the results of this poll in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN HAM FISH, JR.—CONSTITUENT RESPONSE

(Amount in percent)

	Male	Female		Male	Female
1. What do you feel is the best U.S. policy in Vietnam?			6. To fight pollution would you support:		
(a) Increase military effort to achieve a military victory	7.3	5.1	(a) Enactment of President Nixon's \$10,000,000,000 clean water program?		
(b) President Nixon's policy of removing U.S. troops by steps, while strengthening South Vietnamese forces to assume own security	59.2	56.8	Yes	37.3	34.0
(c) Withdraw all U.S. troops immediately	20.4	23.6	No	8.8	7.0
(d) Publicly setting an absolute date for withdrawal, regardless of events	10.6	11.0	Undecided	7.2	8.7
(e) No opinion	0.5	0.9	No response	46.7	50.2
No response	2.0	2.6	(b) Spending even more money and passing stricter laws?		
2. To fight inflation which action would you favor?			Yes	33.4	31.3
(a) Wage and price control	54.9	53.8	No	11.6	10.0
(b) Spend less on domestic programs	12.2	10.1	Undecided	3.8	4.9
(c) Spend less on national defense	23.1	25.4	No response	51.1	53.8
(d) Raise income taxes	1.3	0.9	(c) Imposing user fees and/or taxes on all polluters and users of water in order to fully finance Federal water pollution abatement programs, even if this means higher prices?		
(e) No opinion	2.9	4.1	Yes	45.9	43.3
No response	5.6	5.8	No	8.0	6.9
3. To fight unemployment which action are you willing to have the Federal Government take this year?			Undecided	4.3	5.6
(a) Establish public service employment programs to create jobs	52.7	53.7	No response	41.8	44.3
(b) Adopt President Nixon's full employment budget with its projected deficit	20.7	18.2	(d) Leaving the job up to the States?		
(c) No opinion	15.2	17.1	Yes	18.7	19.9
No response	11.4	11.0	No	26.8	25.1
4. President Nixon has proposed a program of national health insurance, which one would you favor?			Undecided	3.8	5.0
(a) A program financed and operated by the Federal Government	21.4	21.8	No response	50.7	49.9
(b) A federally operated program financed by employer and employee contributions	26.9	26.5	7. Would you favor legislation I have introduced calling for \$100 minimum Social Security benefit, an increase of the earnable allowance from \$1,680 to \$2,400 and an automatic cost-of-living increase clause?		
(c) Income tax credits for the cost of purchasing private health insurance	26.8	25.3	Yes	83.0	83.1
(d) No new legislation in this area	15.1	12.5	No	9.1	6.4
(e) No opinion	5.1	8.0	Undecided	4.3	5.2
No response	4.8	5.9	No response	3.7	5.4
5. Do you favor returning a share of Federal tax to State and local governments to help solve local programs?			8. What action should the Federal Government take in connection with possession and use of marijuana?		
Yes	66.9	66.4	(a) Legalize it and eliminate present penalties	17.3	14.6
No	20.8	16.4	(b) Reduce present penalties	16.8	18.4
Undecided	7.5	9.7	(c) Retain present penalties	15.3	15.5
No response	4.8	7.4	(d) Increase present penalties	41.1	42.0
			(e) No opinion	4.5	4.5
			No response	5.1	5.2

CONGRESSMAN HAM FISH, JR.—CONSTITUENT RESPONSE—Continued

[Amount in percent]

	Male	Female		Male	Female
9. Federal farm controls and subsidies should be:			11. As an alternative to the present welfare system, President Nixon has proposed a work incentive and job training program while calling for a basic level of financial assistance. Would you favor such a program?		
(a) Phased out within 5 years.....	50.2	43.3	Yes.....	79.1	75.0
(b) Continued substantially as is.....	2.2	2.2	No.....	8.4	7.2
(c) Made permanent with increased subsidies.....	1.6	1.4	Undecided.....	5.9	5.7
(d) Continued with a limit on amount any one farm could receive.....	32.4	30.2	No response.....	6.6	12.1
(e) No opinion.....	8.1	14.0	12. How do you grade the Nixon administration so far?		
No response.....	5.5	8.9	(a) Excellent.....	9.1	8.5
10. Regarding consumer protection, the Federal Government should:			(b) Good job in most respects.....	44.9	44.2
(a) Limit its role to consumer education.....	11.0	8.7	(c) Only fair.....	26.0	25.9
(b) Push for more stringent controls over manufacturers.....	68.3	70.8	(d) Poor.....	14.8	14.1
(c) Continue only to enforce existing laws.....	11.9	9.0	No response.....	5.1	7.3
(d) No opinion.....	3.1	4.0			
No response.....	5.7	7.4			

COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN LEGISLATIVE STATESMANSHIP CITATION TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn that the Council for Exceptional Children recently awarded a citation for legislative statesmanship to our colleague, Congressman JOHN BRADEMÁS.

During the last Congress, Congressman BRADEMÁS, who is chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor's Select Education Subcommittee, shepherded two major pieces of legislation of benefit to exceptional children—

Public Law 91-61, which provides for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped;

Public Law 91-587, which authorizes Gallaudet College to maintain the Kendall School as a demonstration elementary school showing new media and methods for teaching young deaf children.

His continued interest and leadership in additional legislation for education of exceptional children—the brilliant or the slow to learn, the gifted and the handicapped—is also indicated by the attention he and his subcommittee have given to legislation which would create a National Information and Resource Center for the Handicapped and to provisions to safeguard the interests of handicapped children in the comprehensive child development bill.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the Record the Council for Exceptional Children's Citation for Legislative Statesmanship, and Congressman BRADEMÁS' remarks at the presentation in Bloomington, Ind., June 18, 1971:

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN CITATION FOR LEGISLATIVE STATESMANSHIP IS PRESENTED TO JOHN BRADEMÁS

The Council for Exceptional Children commends The Honorable John Brademas, member of Congress from Indiana, for his leadership in securing legislation to meet the educational needs of exceptional children. Of particular note are his efforts in securing passage of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act, the National Center

on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped Act, and the Act which allowed Gallaudet College to operate the Kendall School as a demonstration elementary school for the deaf. The Council is most appreciative and expresses its gratitude for Congressman Brademas' efforts to achieve greater educational opportunity for our nation's exceptional children.

JAMES J. GALLAGHER,
Chairman, Awards Committee.
S. C. ASHCRAFT,
President, The Council.

Ladies and gentlemen:

It is a pleasure and an honor to be with you tonight, men and women who have dedicated your lives to teaching handicapped persons.

As a member of Congress and Chairman of the subcommittee with responsibility for legislation that affects the education of the handicapped, I want to talk to you tonight about the subject that is our common concern.

The opening lines of the report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children can serve as an eloquent beginning for what I have to say to you this evening:

"We proclaim that we are a nation devoted to its young. We believe that we have made great strides toward recognizing the needs of children and youth. We have enacted child labor laws, established a public education system, created treatment services for our disturbed and handicapped and devised imaginative programs such as Head Start for our disadvantaged young.

Yet we find ourselves dismayed by the violence, frustration, and discontent among our youth and by the sheer number of emotionally, mentally, physically and socially handicapped youngsters in our midst. It is shocking to know that thousands of children are still excluded from our schools, that millions in need go untreated, and that many still suffer from hunger and malnutrition. . . .

In spite of our best intentions our programs are insufficient; they are piecemeal, are fragmented and do not serve all those in need. Unwittingly, we have failed to commit our vast resources to promote the healthy development of our young. We have yet to devise a strategy which will maximize the development of our human resources."

I can understand how difficult it must be for you who have dedicated yourselves to the task of educating handicapped youth to sense the great wealth of our nation and still live with such harsh realities as these:

That 60% of our 7 million handicapped children receive no special education assistance at all;

That over 1 million handicapped children are excluded from school and exist in a no-man's land among school, institution, and home;

That 70% of handicapping conditions could be prevented or ameliorated with appropriate early intervention and yet in 1969, only

10% of the 2.5 million handicapped children under age 6 received any type of service under the various Federal preschool education and day care programs;

That out of the \$1,000 per citizen spent by the Federal Government, only 50 cents is directed toward educating handicapped children;

That in our own State of Indiana, there are approximately 150,000 handicapped children of whom only 90,000 are receiving the special education they need, and

That it is estimated that an additional 7,000 special teachers will be required here in Indiana to do the job.

I can remember vividly that bright, sunny day in August of 1963 when Martin Luther King, standing on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, spoke of his dream for America. "I have a dream", he said, echoing what Carl Sandburg had said years earlier about America:

"The republic is a dream," said Sandburg, adding that "Nothing happens unless first a dream."

So let us all dream for a moment, let us look away from the despair of America today to foresee a time which the opportunity to develop one's potential to the fullest is a birthright, a time when the institutions of our society are responsive to the uniqueness of the human spirit.

Let us dream of an America where the opportunity for the basic needs of life will be a right for everyone and not a charity; of a society where every child can receive the education and health he needs without having to plead for assistance or wear the label of deviance implanted on his forehead.

Let us dream of an America:

Where deaf children can learn the vocational skills necessary to work on an equal basis with those who hear;

Where the severely retarded child of poor parents can live a life of self-fulfillment and social benefit like that of the retarded child whose parents happen to be wealthy;

Where all children will be free of the ravages of Rubella and of other crippling diseases.

I suggest to you the dreams like these must be our dreams, and I am glad to be able to report to you that during my 13 years in Congress, I have observed such dreams become more and more reality.

Just reflect for a moment on these facts:

That thirteen years ago, the concept of a Federal role in helping meet the problems of education, health, and poverty was considered heresy . . .

That thirteen years ago, only 10% of the nation's handicapped children were receiving special educational assistance, while today 6 times that many are being helped.

Just recall that . . .

Thirteen years ago, the Federal Government spent less than \$1 million on the education of the handicapped, but that this sum has grown over 200-fold.

Or turn your minds to this fact, too: You and I know that thirteen years ago, the benefits of early education and day care programs were limited to a fortunate few. But during that period, Head Start and the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act began to turn the attention of the nation toward these critical earliest years, and more and more young children are now being served by these programs.

Of course, there are those in Washington who would suggest that the last thirteen years of Federal activism and initiative have been an excursion into folly and that we ought to return to the "good old days" where the needs of the handicapped were left totally to the whims and politics of State and local government.

I suggest to you that had this philosophy prevailed over the past thirteen years, this meeting might not be held today, that special education training and research programs might not even exist, and that today might not be brighter than yesterday for handicapped children. Fortunately, this philosophy of hostility to a role for the Federal Government in supporting programs to benefit the handicapped has not prevailed and does not hold sway today in Washington, D.C.

Even as recently as the last Congress, the 91st, we have sought to push back the frontiers of darkness and widen the horizon for the handicapped child. I refer to legislation, written by my own subcommittee, to create a National Center for Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped and to expand the role of the Kendall School in Washington to enable it to act as a demonstration center for learning new ways of teaching deaf children.

Both these laws are based on the sure knowledge that here are developments—new inventions and techniques pioneered by men and women like yourselves—which can help the handicapped if only they are made available.

The National Center for Educational Media and Materials is now law and in the planning stage within the Administration, the Act will broaden the opportunities for handicapped persons and the parents of handicapped children to find the talking books or captioned films, the special teaching materials and appropriate learning aids which can alleviate the effects of their handicaps.

The Kendall Elementary School for the Deaf at Gallaudet College in the nation's capital has historically served the very young. With the new authority made possible by our action in the 91st Congress, the Kendall School will now be a working demonstration center where new techniques, media and technology can be used, improved and shown to educators across the country.

So we have been moving ahead, but we still have a long way to go to devote enough resources to meeting the needs of the handicapped.

In this respect, I am pleased that the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sidney Marland, has designated education of the handicapped as one of the national priorities of the Office of Education. Under the capable leadership of Dr. Ed Martin, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has become a potent voice for handicapped children within the Administration and the chambers of Congress. National organizations, such as the Council for Exceptional Children have pledged an invaluable role in stimulating a sense of consciousness about the handicapped in Washington.

But, as I have said, we still have a long way to go.

Let me take advantage of this opportunity to tell you about two legislative measures with considerable significance for education of the handicapped, before the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I chair.

For the past 2 years, during the 91st Con-

gress and now the 92d, our subcommittee has worked hard on a major bill that takes seriously the knowledge we now have that what happens to a child in his first 5 years of life can have an immense impact on the rest of his life.

The legislation on which we are working is known as the Comprehensive Child Development Act. This bill, while giving priority to economically disadvantaged children, will open child development programs to children from all income groups. Such programs would include education, nutrition, physical and mental health services, and family consultation.

I am pleased to say that last week and this week we have been working to "markup" this bill. This means we are in the last stage of subcommittee work prior to reporting the bill favorably to the full Education and Labor Committee. You will be interested to know that in the course of markup, it has been proposed that at least 7% of funds under the Child Development bill be set aside for handicapped children, and I can assure you here tonight that I will support that amendment.

So I hope this pioneer legislation will become law in this Congress and I hope, too, that the Nixon Administration will support the necessary resources for its full implementation. The potential of the Child Development bill for all children is great, but its implementations for handicapped children are monumental.

I should add, by the way, that our bill requires that communities, in planning for the needs of their preschool children, include planning for their children who are handicapped.

Let me turn now to the second important matter before my subcommittee, educational research.

One of the most exciting proposals for American education is the National Institute of Education, proposed by President Nixon in his 1970 Message on Educational Reform. As President Nixon put it at the time:

As a first step toward reform, we need a coherent approach to research and experimentation. Local schools need an objective national body to evaluate new departures in teaching that are being conducted here and abroad and a means of disseminating information about projects that show promise.

The purpose of the National Institute of Education would be to begin the serious, systematic search for new knowledge needed to make educational opportunity truly equal.

We spend annually in this country over \$65 billion dollars on education. Yet of this whole amount less than 3%—under \$200,000,000 a year—goes to research, development, and directed innovation . . . 3/10ths of one per cent, by way of contrast with 10% of all national defense expenditures earmarked for research and development, or the nearly 5% of our health expenditures we put into research and development.

If the same happened in defense, we would still be flying B-29's. If agriculture were operated with so little research, there would be no land-grant colleges, no county agents, no soil test stations, and precious little advance in genetics, biology or veterinary science.

Yet, with so little investment in research into new ways of teaching and learning, we are surprised that there are problems in education!

It is now more than forty years since John Dewey wrote his book, "The Sources of a Science of Education". Yet Charles Silberman can comment even now in his "Crisis in the Classroom" that:

"The degree of ignorance about the process of education is far greater than I had thought. Research results are more meager or more contradictory and progress toward the development of usable theories of learning and instruction is far slower."

Clearly the effort being made by the National Center of Educational Research and Development in the Office of Education is like watering a desert with a garden hose; we have to do better.

We need a system through which we can find out as it happens what is going on in our classrooms, what the results are for the children, and which strategies of investment in curriculum, teacher training and other kinds of educational change can improve the ways in which people learn.

More immediately, we need hard thought and experimentation to find out how to provide genuine equality of educational opportunity for all our school children.

The vehicle for the major effort in research and social engineering, development and directed innovation which will be needed to confront these problems can be the National Institute of Education. And clearly one of the areas to which the NIE must turn significant resources and energies is education of the handicapped.

These then, are two of the most important events in education today, the effort to extend to all young children the benefits which some have had under Head Start and the effort to create a research base for the reform and renewal of American education. And both these measures, to reiterate, are rich in potential benefits for America's handicapped children.

As I close tonight, let me leave with you some words of a man—a physically handicapped man—which represent a challenge to you—as special educators, and to me, as a legislator:

"For the test of progress," said President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his second inaugural address, "is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have too much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

You who are providing for the needs of some of these who have too little, the handicapped, should know then that you are engaged in America's most important work.

ADDRESS BY DR. NATHAN PUSEY
OF HARVARD

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Nathan Pusey retires tomorrow after 18 years as president of Harvard University. Dr. Pusey's last speech to the Harvard student body is especially significant and timely, and I am pleased to include here a press account from the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, June 16, 1971]

PUSEY CALLS REVOLUTIONARIES "DELUDED"

(By Robert Reinhold)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—In his last speech to students before retiring as president of Harvard University, Nathan M. Pusey denounced today the "power-hungry revolutionaries" who have made the last few years so difficult for him. He termed them "grievously, even malignantly, deluded."

"In recent years," Mr. Pusey said, "campus revolutionaries, here and elsewhere, have held that a debilitating and dehumanizing contagion, allegedly springing from the interests and arrangements of the world outside, has so deeply penetrated and widely infected the activities and structures of academic societies, and has so controlled them—has made them so thoroughly deceitful and corrupt—that the only acceptable attitude

toward them must also be one of hatred, denigration and attack.

"This has disturbed me more than any other development during recent years."

"If they are to be believed, the world, unready as yet to be set right by them, is totally corrupt—governed, controlled and manipulated by schemers, of whom I suppose, at least in the minor way, I must be considered one," he went on.

He said he could not "see any significant correspondence between the world which I have experienced and have come to respect and the world they describe."

Mr. Pusey, a 64-year-old classicist who will retire on June 30 after 18 years as head of the country's oldest college spoke at the school's annual baccalaureate service. About 200 of the 1,337 Harvard and Radcliffe seniors who will be graduated Thursday attended the service in Memorial Church.

LEGACY SEEN INFLUENCED

After retirement, Mr. Pusey will head the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation in New York. He stepped down, two years earlier than had been expected, in the wake of sometimes tumultuous student demonstrations in 1969 and 1970.

The bitter legacy of those days appeared to influence his words today.

"We profess to eschew materialism, aggressive self-interest, competition and derogation," he said. "We talk endlessly of love and one escape from crassness of feeling. Yet we manifest less and less regard for others outside the immediate circle of our intimates."

"In the midst of much bitter name-calling, love or even charitable regard for others—unmarred by self-seeking or the desire to impress or to impose a personal viewpoint on others—would seem rapidly to be vanishing from the earth," he said.

Specifically, Mr. Pusey complained about those who "express rhapsodic concern for the environment," yet who burn automobiles and buildings, tack posters on trees, spray paint walls and public monuments, break down bushes, trample grass, discard trash by the roadside."

And he decried those who "amplify their rhetoric in public parks, shriek their calls to action over bullhorns and sound trucks within the groves of academe, repetitively spreading private—and usually very inane—doctrines."

"It is hard to discern in all this just who is kidding whom, but surely something is sadly mixed up, and there is room in our society for serious doubts about motives and behavior," he added.

LEGISLATIVE SKIN GAME TAKES TAXPAYERS FOR A RIDE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the great 92d Congress "legislative skin game" is underway with billions of dollars of uncollected taxpayers' dollars tossed in the pot. In fact, the thief of Baghdad could learn a few tricks by reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and so would the taxpayers who will be losing their shirts, and probably more, if many of these Federal programs are implemented as planned.

For instance, the House passed a \$1 billion per year Emergency Employment Act, which will presumably create approximately 200,000 jobs in the public

service field for the unemployed, with the Federal Government financing 90 percent of the program and the local governments financing the other 10 percent.

Not content with establishing this makeshift work program, the House just this week passed H.R. 1, the so-called welfare reform act, which also includes still another provision to create public service jobs. This so-called welfare reform bill authorizes \$800 million in Federal funds to pay for 200,000 public service jobs only in this program the Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the cost the first year; 75 percent in the second; and 50 percent in the third. Of course, you can bet this will later be changed to allow the Federal Government to pay all the costs, if the cities can not meet their obligations once the program begins.

Proponents of this new idea of the old WPA jobs claim that there is a difference in the two programs on the basis that the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 will allow any unemployed person to be eligible for the city and State jobs; but H.R. 1, however, allows only welfare recipients to qualify for these new jobs.

Furthermore, it is made clear in both bills that the Federal minimum wage must be paid to those employed unless the local prevailing wage is higher.

The new Federal jobs will be created on a first-come basis immediately upon the President's signing of the Emergency Employment Act into law. The plan will continue for 2 years if the unemployment figure remains at 4½ percent or higher. Areas having 6 percent or higher unemployment rate will receive additional Federal funds for the program.

Under H.R. 1, if it becomes law, public service jobs will be created upon its enactment, but it still must be debated in the Senate and who knows what the money figures will be then.

Supporters of both these programs argue they are needed to reduce the high unemployment rolls. Unfortunately, I cannot see how more and more Federal spending will improve the economy of the country, especially since it is so plagued by inflation caused, to a large degree, by the current deficit Government spending. Our Nation is in financial trouble as can be readily seen from our national debt figure.

In the past, we encouraged private industry to take care of the unemployed by giving tax incentives and considerations on taxes. We used to assist the private sector, so our economy could expand enough to take care of unemployment, train the unskilled, and put them to work.

But today, the attitude is different. Instead of less Federal interference and less taxes, we are witnessing ever-increasing Federal programs to create jobs. All of which creates a greater burden on the taxpayer, and will drive many to the poor house.

The cost of these new public service jobs alone will total a minimum of \$2 billion annually.

But this is not all. We must also include the new welfare reform act—it would better be called the taxpayers reform act—which is estimated to increase the Federal outlay by \$13 billion per fis-

cal year, and \$17.7 billion per year by our 1976 bicentennial.

The new so-called welfare reform act will upon enactment double the number of Americans who will be on relief rolls, as almost 26 million Americans will be eligible for relief of some kind under this act, one in every eight Americans.

The guaranteed annual income part of the bill will allow a family of four to receive \$2,400 per year and more depending on the size of the family, but you can bet that politics and demagoguery being what they are this amount will be increased in just a matter of months.

Already, the welfare rights organization, which is a group of unionized welfare recipients, is demanding a \$6,500 guaranteed income per family, per year. Some in Congress are encouraging this figure as the base, and if all this does not sound like socialism or communism then I do not know what does.

The worst part of the passage of H.R. 1 is that it is tied up with a social security increase, which in my opinion, was an insult to those on social security. Instead of being effective immediately, it provides for an increase of only 5 percent effective next year.

I want to charge now that the Social Security System is close to bankruptcy, if in fact it is not actually bankrupt now.

The Congress may, or may not be able to save it, but one thing is sure, the present attitude of the Congress regarding social security is nothing but plain demagoguery. To do the job, the Congress must begin to review the entire program from its very beginning.

To me, it is an insult, not only to the social security recipients, but to those employers and employees who are paying social security taxes to have this program coupled with a welfare reform bill.

Congress must, if it is to save the social security program, look into the increased costs of this entire program; find out where the social security funds are; or what substitute security there is. The true costs of the social security pensions must be determined as to who gets them and how much they will actually receive; what these are costing all taxpayers in goods and services; what interest is being paid into the fund by those who have the use of these huge sums; and more important what guarantee there is to recipients in the event of an economic collapse.

Let us hope the "Big Spenders" learn before it is too late, or we may have a sad, sad 1976.

SPACE SHUTTLE

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning an article appearing in the Washington Post on the space shuttle program disturbed me deeply. It cited some arguments put forth by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. MONDALE, which I feel are fallacious

and which I cannot in good conscience let go unchallenged.

The Senator queries the types of dividends that would flow from this program, asks why the Air Force itself does not request funds for the project, and questions whether the program can, indeed, be justified economically.

The prime justification for the space shuttle program is the greatly increased capability and flexibility that it can bring to both our civilian and military space operations.

In the first place, the shuttle would have a beneficial impact on our military operations. It would provide additional flexibility that would enhance our ability to respond quickly, it would assist in unplanned mission changes, it would improve the potential of our communications network; and it would aid us in the area of military detection and surveillance. Certainly, even though there is a strong tendency to want to reduce military-related expenditures, we cannot completely disparage those ventures which will redound to the benefits of our national defense and provide us with an increased military potential.

The tangible benefits which will accrue to our society from the operations of this shuttle are almost limitless.

Sensors and equipment can be flown aboard the shuttle for such things as weather observation and prediction, pollution detection and environmental studies, mineral and water resources studies, and crop and forest surveys. Because the shuttle will be ready for flight in about 2 hours, it can also be utilized for spot assignments dealing with checking earthquake damage, tidal waves, hurricanes or tornadoes, or storm fronts.

Automated satellites, such as weather, earth resources, and other scientific satellites, will be placed in earth orbit by the shuttle and later brought back by the shuttle for repair and reuse or modified and repaired in orbit. Many benefits for mankind are inherent in this program, and anyone not cognizant of this suffers from myopia.

The Senator accused the Air Force of having no interest in the program where the truth is the administration made the decision to contract funding of the program under civilian direction. It was agreed that military would supplement the program in the area of defense needs.

I wish to cite testimony by the Air Force Secretary, Dr. Robert Seamans, which elucidates their role in the development of the shuttle:

The USAF role for the present is to provide to NASA the data necessary to help assure that the Shuttle configuration will be of maximum utility to the DOD. At the time, we will plan, as necessary, for DOD use of the system when it becomes operational. Funding for development will be the responsibility of NASA. We will continue to support the NASA budget requests based upon our needs. The DOD investment over the next two to three years is planned to be small. However, in the future, we will require major funding to equip a DOD fleet and to provide unique DOD hardware, facilities and operational support. Depending on development progress, this could be a requirement during the middle and latter part of this decade. I would like to say that the DOD investment

should amortize itself in a few years: in fact, as presently visualized, the national investment could be amortized in about a decade after the system becomes operational.

Let me now move on the area of coordination between the Air Force and NASA. I want to emphasize the effective working relationship which exists between these two agencies. We have always worked closely since there are so many large areas of common interest in space and aeronautics, and this is particularly true in the case of the Shuttle program. Our goal, of course, is to achieve the highest possible degree of hardware and operational commonality, while satisfying mission requirements in a manner that best serves the national interest.

Because of the need for frequent coordination, a joint Space Transportation System Committee was established by agreement between the Air Force and NASA in 1970.

The Committee activity has enabled the Air Force to acquire a detailed understanding of the NASA program.

We feel that NASA has been responsive to the overall national needs and that the Shuttle configuration which is evolving holds promise for providing an economical and effective means of launching both DOD and NASA payloads.

I feel that NASA has been completely open and aboveboard insofar as the economics of the shuttle is concerned. Last year it placed Mathematica, Inc., under contract to conduct an independent analysis of the shuttle so as to preclude the bias that tends to creep into any in-house assessment of this type. It represents an economic analysis of the shuttle as a national system using combined NASA, Department of Defense, and other user traffic models. This study is now nearing completion and some conclusions have already been reached.

Mathematica concludes that using even the most conservative economic analyses that, at a 10-percent social discount rate, the allowable nonrecurring costs for "buying" a fully reusable space transportation system are \$12.9 billion at an annual activity level of 46 space shuttle flights. Average U.S. yearly flights for the period of 1964 through 1969, in which the shuttle could have been used if it had been available, were five.

These conclusions are based on what Mathematica considers to be realistic and, indeed, conservative projections of space activities in the 1980's—with most of the projected unmanned space programs operating below the level maintained during the 1960's.

The Mathematica analysis has been conducted entirely on the basis of quantifiable estimated benefits, specifically associated with the shuttle launch savings and payloads savings. However, I am convinced that benefits of the shuttle go beyond those that are measured only in this way, and include the benefits to our national economic posture, to our national security, and to our world leadership that evolve from the thrust of the development effort and the yet-to-be discovered uses of the capability that will be realized when the system is in operation.

It is irresponsible for any of us to suggest that the program does not have any earth benefits in it.

At this time I want to state for the record that I fully support the NASA shuttle request.

THE 1972 AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION APPROPRIATION ACT

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1971, the House passed H.R. 9270, the fiscal year 1972 agriculture-environmental and consumer protection appropriation bill. This bill will benefit all Americans, either directly or indirectly. It is particularly significant because this is the first year that environmental and consumer programs have been reviewed by one committee of Congress. This joint review will help assure that comprehensive programs are developed, while at the same time guarding against expensive, and unnecessary duplication.

The bill, as passed by the House, includes a total of \$12,423,896,050. This is \$321,182,200 over the budget as submitted by President Nixon, and \$2,874,988,500 more than the funds appropriated for similar programs last year.

The bill includes four titles, and some of the most significant provisions of each title are as follows:

Title I.—Agricultural programs—total \$5,260,771,050.

A total of \$279,186,650 is provided for agricultural research. Of particular importance is an increase of \$500,000 for corn blight research. This, together with \$1,500,000 in the cooperative State research service—state experiment stations—provides a total of \$2,000,000 for an attack against this important disease.

A total of \$320,400,000 is provided under the Public Law 480 program. Under this program long-term credit arrangements are developed to improve our exports of farm products abroad. In addition, surplus agricultural commodities are donated to friendly nations and peoples in disaster situations and to help developing economies—Food for Peace.

The sum of \$2,500,000 is provided for the dairy and beekeeper indemnity program. This, together with \$3,500,000 provided in an earlier supplemental, will make a total of \$6,000,000 available to indemnify dairy farmers and beekeepers who, through no fault of their own, suffer economic damages either because of pesticide residues in their milk, or because their bees are killed by pesticides.

The sum of \$13,000,000 is provided to the land grant colleges of 1890, which includes Lincoln University, at Jefferson City, Mo. While the exact distribution of the funds has yet to be determined, this is a very significant action since only \$289,000 was provided for similar purposes last year.

Title II.—Rural development—total \$932,847,000.

The sum of \$230,000 is provided to establish a separate rural development service in the Department of Agriculture. This action by the Congress is intended to demonstrate the deep concern for the development of rural America.

The sum of \$545,000,000 is provided for the Rural Electrification Administration.

This is \$208,000,000 more than was provided for the same program last year. This is the biggest 1-year increase in the history of the REA program and should be of tremendous importance.

The sum of \$30,000,000 is appropriated for the new Rural Telephone Bank. This new corporation is intended to help improve telephone service in rural America, and this initial funding is a very important first step toward this goal.

The Congress added \$75,000,000 over the amount requested by the President for farm operating loans. This will provide a total of \$350,000,000 for this very important program which helps give farmers the working capital required to plant and harvest their crops.

The bill includes \$1,605,000,000 for insured loans by the Farmers Home Administration. These funds will help meet the vital needs of rural America for housing.

A total of \$100,000,000 is provided for rural water and waste disposal grants. This is \$58,000,000 more than requested by the President, but the Congress felt a larger program was necessary to meet the large backlog of needs in this area.

Title III.—Environmental protection—Total \$3,467,255,000.

The sum of \$2,432,100,000 is provided for the Environmental Protection Agency. This is the first full year financing for the Agency, and an increase of \$1,128,696,000 over the amounts spent for environmental programs last year. This almost 50 percent increase includes an extra \$1,500,000,000 for waste facility plants to treat sewage, a primary pollutant and a critical problem.

The bill also includes \$2,300,000 for the Council on Environmental Quality. The Council is the principal adviser to the President on the entire range of environmental questions, as distinct from the Environmental Protection Agency which is the primary regulatory agency.

A total of \$700,000,000 is included for water and sewer grants in HUD. This is \$500,000,000 more than the President requested and again is an indication of the vital importance Congress places on pollution problems.

The sum of \$315,305,000, an increase of \$43,238,000 over last year and \$1,011,000 more than the President requested, is included for the Soil Conservation Service. The SCS is one of the original environmental agencies, having been engaged in conservation projects for over 30 years, and this large increase is an indication of continued confidence.

The sum of \$195,500,000—\$55,500,000 more than the President requested—is provided for the rural environmental assistance program. This program, formerly called the agricultural conservation program, has also for many years provided for many environmental improvements. The committee also condemned the executive branch for its failure to spend the full amount of funds approved by the Congress last year.

Title IV.—Consumer protection and services—total \$2,763,023,000.

The sum of \$1,400,000 is provided for the Office of Consumer Affairs, which is the primary office advising the President on consumer activities. This includes \$450,000 for a newly established Con-

sumer Products Information Coordinating Center, which will make available to consumers the information the Government obtains in making its own purchases.

The sum of \$99,681,000, an increase of \$14,060,000 is provided for the Food and Drug Administration. These increases will provide for increased food inspections, review of the efficacy of drugs, and increased emphasis on product safety.

The sum of \$2,001,184,000 is provided for the food stamp program. This is \$331,184,000 more than was available in 1971, and will help assure that food is available to needy individuals at prices they can afford. The committee also tried to get at the problem of abuses by providing additional moneys for investigations, and by directing that cases of violations be turned over to State welfare agencies.

The Congress also approved \$140,000,000 for the special milk program. This program, which provides milk to children in school, has been deleted by the President in his budget request, but the Congress added it back in.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HEARINGS SCHEDULED ON ENERGY CRISIS AND CONCENTRATION IN ENERGY FIELD

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Special Small Business Problems of the House Small Business Committee will resume hearings July 13 on the energy crisis and the problems in the field of fuel and energy production.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the subcommittee, is to be commended and congratulated for this initiative as I am confident these continuing hearings will be helpful and informative.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place a news release concerning the hearings in the RECORD herewith.

The release follows:

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE SCHEDULES HEARINGS ON ENERGY CRISIS AND CONCENTRATION BY COMPETING RAW FUEL INDUSTRIES IN THE ENERGY MARKET

Representative Joe L. Evins (D-Tenn.), Chairman of the House Small Business Committee, today announced that the Subcommittee on Special Small Business Problems, chaired by Representative Neal Smith (D-Iowa), will conduct hearings on July 12, 13, 14 and July 20 and 22, to investigate problems related to oil companies acquiring competing fuel resources and other corporations making acquisitions in the energy field which may have the effect of lessening competition. Price increases and the reliability of natural gas reserve estimates will also be examined.

Chairman Evins said, "Several large oil companies have gained control of a majority of the 15 largest domestic coal producers. This concentration by competing raw fuel suppliers of energy resources may have con-

tributed to the recent shortage of coal available for use in the generation of electric power, resulting in increases in electric rates. The lessening of competition through acquisition and mergers may have resulted in artificial price levels which render economic injustice upon those who can least afford it."

Congressman Smith stated that "The effect of utility price increases on the small businessman and consumers is harsh. Both large and small coal users complain that they are unable to obtain adequate supplies at reasonable prices. Many areas of the country face the possibility of brownouts and blackouts because of the unavailability of coal for use in the generation of electricity. It is the small businessman, the homeowner and the consumer who will suffer the most, since they will ultimately have to pay for the lack of coal supplies by increased utility bills.

"Competition which is predicated upon unrestricted entry into economic markets must be encouraged. Vast coal reserves exist in this country. Yet, recently available supplies have dwindled to critically short proportions. The presence of coal reserves under the control of large oil companies and conglomerates could lessen competition, artificially driving up prices and raising barriers to prospective entrants into the coal industry. We hope to determine the extent of the concentration in the coal industry to enhance our understanding of the facts surrounding recent price increases and the trend toward concentration of competing raw fuel suppliers.

"The course of these hearings have been expanded to include an investigation of the validity of data used by the Federal Power Commission in estimating the natural gas reserves and their relationship to price increases. Due to the importance of certain FPC documents which have come to our attention, we feel it necessary that the public should be given the facts about the reliability of FPC reserve estimates.

"The energy supply picture is not bright and will continue to grow dimmer unless a concerted effort is made to encourage competition among raw fuel suppliers in order to maintain a price structure that will provide the public with energy at the lowest possible prices."

The hearings will include representatives from the following: Continental Oil Company, Humble Oil Company, American Public Power Association, Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, National Rural Electric Co-Op Association, American Public Gas Association, American Petroleum Institute, Federal Trade Commission, Atomic Energy Commission, Department of the Interior, Federal Power Commission, Department of Justice, and the Center for Study of Responsive Law, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality.

The Members of the Subcommittee are Neal Smith (D-Iowa), Chairman, Joseph P. Adabbo (D-N.Y.), William L. Hungate (D-Mo.), Fernand J. St Germain (D-R.I.), Joseph M. McDade (R-Pa.), James T. Broyhill (R-N.C.).

Representatives Evins, Chairman of the full committee and Silvio O. Conte (R-Mass.) ex officio Members of the Subcommittee.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 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?

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the mental health need of our society were aptly demonstrated by testimony received from psychiatrists and psychologists at the recent concluded Minneapolis health hearings.

Dr. William Hausman, professor and head of the University of Psychiatry at the University of Minnesota, emphasized the need for "research on socially relevant therapy" to assert minority groups alienated from the broader spectrum of society. In my opinion this type of psychiatric service is of the highest priority. Dr. Hausman, in response to my request also undertook a review of the provisions of H.R. 22, the Health Security Act of 1971, relating to psychiatric services. That is included also.

Dr. Paul E. Meehl, regents professor of psychology, raised some very crucial points concerning the role of psychologists and coverage for services performed by these mental health professionals. The points raised by Dr. Meehl are of great importance in light of the hearings shortly scheduled to begin in the House on the various health reform bills.

Dr. David J. Vail, director of the Medical Services Division of the Department of Public Welfare for the State of Minnesota presented a statement adopted at the Surgeon General's Annual Conference of the State and Mental Health Authorities. Dr. Vail also undertook an evaluation of H.R. 22 and discussed, among other things, the State's role in mental health services. I commend his remarks to my colleagues.

Dr. William Jepson of the Hennepin County General Hospital addressed the problem of shifting responsibility in mental health care especially as it relates to the needs of alcoholics and those addicted to drugs. He calls for providing a specific location, rather than permitting a continuation of the present shifting responsibility among Federal, State, and local governmental units.

I have also received the following letter from Dr. Robert Challman who is chairman of the legislative committee of the Minnesota Psychological Association. Dr. Challman has asked that I include his letter setting forth his concern about H.R. 22 as well as a statement from the Minnesota Psychiatric Newsletter of January 1971 in the hearings. Dr. Challman in his letter raises some very interesting and relevant points concerning health reform legislation. His comments and suggestions are thoughtful and deserve very careful consideration by all those

vitaly concerned with the reform of the delivery of health services.

The material follows:

HEARING ON HEALTH CARE REFORM HELD BY REPRESENTATIVE DONALD FRASER, MINNEAPOLIS, FEBRUARY 27, 1971

In responding to your request for participating in these important hearings on Health Care Legislation, I view this as an opportunity and a responsibility to express myself on the mental health aspects of possible new legislation.

I speak in the role of Professor and Head of the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Minnesota, as Director of the Psychopathic Hospital at the University Hospitals and as an individual who for many years has had a strong commitment to the concept of social and community psychiatry. Prior to coming to Minneapolis in 1969 I had the opportunity to participate in planning for the mental health aspect of a pre-paid health care program developed by Johns Hopkins School of Medicine in the new city of Columbia, Maryland. That experience gave me some perspective into the importance of the matching health care delivery plans to the needs and unique characteristics of the community in which the program is to be established, a principle which I feel should be kept in mind in the writing of any legislation affecting the health needs of the nation.

My remarks will be limited to some thoughts on the mental health aspects of any federally sponsored health care system and particularly as they relate to the needs of the Twin Cities and the state of Minnesota. In planning for a system of health care it is essential that the needs of the psychiatrically handicapped individual be met as an integral part of any comprehensive health care system. If this is not accomplished a large number of seriously handicapped people will be deprived of needed care and thus of their capacity to earn a living and to maintain their roles in society, and their self-esteem. On the basis of survey data it is estimated that between 10 and 24 percent of our population suffer from "mental disorder" or are "seriously impaired by mental disorder", 2% or more will suffer from schizophrenia during their lives. The early recognition of mental illness and the early availability of appropriate therapy can be expected to have long range consequences for the psychiatrically ill patient and for his family in terms of costs to them of subsequent treatment and in terms of incapacity. There is a developing body of data which points to the need for early recognition and effective intervention to avoid extensive hospitalization and chronicity. Psychiatric care is, of necessity, expensive because it involves a great expenditure of professional time to carry out effective treatment in any setting. The average individual, including those in the middle class, cannot afford such cost and thus is often deprived of the benefits of early treatment. At present most private insurance programs are limited to payments only for brief periods of hospitalization.

As an educator in the field of psychiatry it is evident to me that there is a continuing need for training in the mental health professional and subprofessional fields. Such education requires the availability of patients for treatment and the employment of faculty who have the time available to work in depth with trainees in order to assist them in developing appropriate skills and competence. Any system of payments for the treatment of the mentally ill should be written in such a way as to recognize the needs not only of the private sector and public mental health centers but also of the special requirements of educational programs in this area.

Another aspect of the treatment of the

mentally ill, particularly of those in lower socio-economic groups, and especially the various ethnic minorities is the need for research on socio-economically-specific and ethnically-specific treatment approaches. It would be most valuable for the well being of this country if a bill for funding medical services could recognize the need for research on socially-relevant therapy approaches to include pilot programs that could test and model specific techniques for the mental health needs of those minority groups that find themselves alienated from the broader society and unable to make effective use of treatment approaches that are now basically designed for a middle class society.

In considering priorities for funding of mental health services in any new legislation special emphasis should be placed upon the availability of support for a variety of treatment approaches. These start with crisis therapy and should also include brief psychotherapy, day hospitalization, brief hospitalization (2 to 6 weeks) and follow-up care programs. Despite an ambitious start the federal community mental health program has failed, due in large measure to lack of available funds to reach the goals originally envisioned in the Kennedy mental health bill. For this reason some provision for the development of community mental health programs should also be included in any new legislation intended to reform the health care system.

Other issues that are essential in considering care for the psychiatrically disabled include designs for systems that recognize the dignity of the patient and the need for the mentally or physically handicapped person to maintain and increase self-esteem as a first step toward a return to health. Such programs should also approach the issue of community participation in a more sophisticated way than has been evident in the past. This topic would require much more elaboration than is possible in this statement but is clearly an issue that will become increasingly significant during the next decade. Child psychiatry needs special development at all levels, including a major emphasis on training professional workers in this area. Finally, a recognition of the need for programs for training sub-professional mental health workers and for supporting their activities, especially with ethnic minority groups, should be built into health care reform legislation or into companion programs.

In taking advantage of the opportunity to present my views at this hearing, I have focused more upon general issues relating to mental health care than to specifics of the needs of the University Hospitals. It is my understanding that a statement will be presented at this forum by representatives of the Clinical Chiefs of the University Hospitals and therefore I have attempted to avoid redundancy with the remarks of those colleagues.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,

April 30, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Before I comment on the proposed Health Care Legislation, HR22, of which you are a co-author, I would like to express my great thanks to you for your interested response to my last letter and for your assistance in helping with the fiscal crisis that we in psychiatric education are approaching as a result of recent administration policies. I feel particularly concerned about this as I believe we are on the threshold of developing more socially relevant programs for our field and find it painful to learn that some of our support may be held back just as the field is beginning to come of age.

I have read your bill several times and have gone over the section by section analy-

sis, provided to me by Hal Hegburg, in some detail. In this letter I would like to comment on those aspects of the bill where I feel competent to make considered judgments. I am fully aware that fiscal and political considerations must inevitably enter into the final product.

I will make my comments on a section by section basis following your outline, with emphasis on the areas involving psychiatric care. I am particularly impressed with section 22, subparagraph 2, in part A. I would agree that it is unrealistic to expect such legislation to encompass long term support of psychotherapeutic activity by private psychiatrists. This section appropriately encourages the development of mental health centers, with or without coordination with other types of medical programs. I also agree that where the center is organized on a capitation basis there is no need to set limits on the number of consultations covered. Rather the budget should include funds to be allocated for psychiatric care. It may be helpful, in considering the solo practitioner, however, to recognize those unique situations in which a patient needs brief supportive visits throughout the year in order to maintain him in society and out of the hospital. Wording that would permit brief visits, either in groups or individually, at a cost that might be pegged at a figure no greater than one quarter of ordinary consultation charge might permit the long range follow-up of the otherwise-hospitalized patient, particularly in areas where no mental health center is available. This would place that individual in a position comparable to the sort of arrangements that would be set up by an effective mental health center for the chronic patient needing support out of the hospital setting.

Section 24, paragraph 2, limits the psychiatric benefits to 45 consecutive days of active treatment. Unfortunately some of the patients who require hospitalization may profit from a series of brief hospitalizations far more than they would from one longer period of treatment. It might be helpful if the term "consecutive" were omitted to permit a total of 45 days of active treatment during the benefit period. Better still, the bill might consider a total of 60 days of active treatment including no more than 45 consecutive days on any admission.

In Section 27 the bill prohibits payment to the independently practicing psychologist. In many communities such professionals provide effective care for patients who are not under regular medical supervision. My reading of recent developments in the mental health field suggests that psychologists are receiving increasing recognition by insurance carriers and others for their services. While I would prefer to have most of them working in mental health centers I think it may be considered unreasonable to preclude the possibility that fees might be paid to appropriately licensed clinical psychologists for services to certain classes of psychiatric patients. If you would like I can probably get more documentation in this area from the psychologists on our own staff.

Moving to Part C, I fully agree with the provisions of Section 44 and feel that this provision will be a helpful one in many states in insisting upon the differentiation of custodial from active treatment care. In subsection (a) of the same section it may be important to define the services that a health care organization must furnish as including psychiatric care of an active type or including evidence of collaborative arrangements with an appropriate psychiatric treatment program to provide such services. It may be helpful to designate a minimum proportion of the capitation payments to support the psychiatric program. The reason for this is that in many traditional settings psychiatric care is considered an "add on" luxury, and where funds are limited it may be

excluded, often to the detriment of those patients who have need for psychiatric consultation and active treatment. My own impression is that such an approach rather than increasing the cost will often tend to reduce the cost of repeated visits to the clinic as individuals who have psychiatric problems, in lieu of effective psychiatric care, continually present themselves for treatment to practitioners in inappropriate medical specialties. Without such provision being built into the funding of comprehensive programs it is possible that this type of service will be shunted aside, based on more traditional patterns of medical care in this country, and the patient will be the loser.

I fully agree with Section 48 which insists that the medical foundation must accept for enrollment any resident of the area it serves. Unless such a provision is in the law it is quite likely that we will continue with the segregated patterns of health delivery that exist in the largely middle-class-oriented practice patterns of today.

I note that under Section 49, subsection (a), (3) the Board may contract directly with public or other non-profit mental health centers and "mental health day care services." This latter provision, in my view, is particularly important if health care delivery is to become more appropriate to the needs of our patients and if we are to move away from the very limiting provisions of current insurance carriers which do not provide for day care or other partial hospitalization and thus increase the cost to the carrier and to the community. We need to take a major step forward in partial hospitalization services. It may be important to consider this factor also in the world of some of the earlier sections which deal with hospital services for psychiatric patients. One example of this, moving back to part A, section 24(2) might be to consider the funding of partial hospitalization for a greater number of days than allowed for full hospitalization inasmuch as the costs are proportionally lower while the care provided is often equivalent or even better. In our own situation, I know that such a provision would serve as a major incentive for us to move more actively into the day care area with the knowledge that such a program would not entail fiscal penalties.

Moving to Part E, Section 82, I am particularly pleased to see the special recognition in subsection (c) for the position of practitioners in remote or deprived areas. I think that this group must have special recognition as in many of these remote areas, particularly in Minnesota, it is not presently feasible to consider the grouping of practitioners. The reimbursement for continuing education is particularly pertinent to the needs of these individuals.

Section 84 appears quite reasonable in the case of the separate psychiatric hospitals.

In Part F, Section 104 I agree with the need to support the development of programs that organize medical facilities for providing comprehensive care if we are to avoid simply placing old programs into new clothing. Somewhere in here also I would suggest that there be specific provisions for the training of health care administrators who can develop the sophisticated knowledge necessary to institute and successfully carry through the new types of programs that you propose. A part of their training certainly should focus upon the very complex and important issue of consumer participation. Perhaps some wording of this sort might be placed into section 105.

Section 134, which attempts to discriminate between treatment facilities in order to maintain fewer beds for overlapping functions is, I believe, important if the program is going to maintain any degree of fiscal responsibility. In my view this area and many others are overbedded for certain types of disorders. Such a practice tends to result

either in inefficiency of hospital management, with resulting increase in per day cost for the patients or in overutilization of hospital beds when such utilization is, in fact, inappropriate. It might be useful, however, to suggest here, or in other parts of the bill, a recognition of the special needs of primary teaching hospitals for including a cross section of patients in order to carry out their teaching requirements. Under such circumstances they probably should take priority in any consideration of closing down parts of hospitals so that they do not become handicapped by this progressive legislation. This is particularly important because the teaching hospital generally represents a more expensive base for treatment and therefore one that may be more easily singled out for reduction of services.

As you can no doubt surmise from my comments I am generally enthusiastic about the concept embodied in H.R. 22 and believe that it is a well thought out and sophisticated attempt to resolve many of the difficulties and dilemmas in current medical practice. Its principal problem, in my view, is its cost. However, sooner or later we must come to terms with that factor if we are to make medical care equally available to all of the people in this country at a cost that is not prohibitive.

I wish you success in the hearings on this bill and again repeat my willingness to be of assistance in any way that you may wish during the course of your guiding this legislation through Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM HAUSMAN, M.D.,
Professor and Head.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
March 9, 1971.

Re health bill.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: I did not respond to your invitation to contact your Minneapolis secretary about appearing personally at the public hearings on the health bill, because I did not feel that what I have to say in this letter is of sufficiently general importance to the overall problem of health care to warrant taking up time at a public hearing. Nevertheless, speaking as a mental health professional, I believe that the issue I am raising in this letter is of considerable importance. I want to discuss the exclusion of clinical psychologists as qualified psychotherapists in the language of the present bill (assuming that it is the bill printed some months ago in the Congressional Record after having been introduced, if I recall correctly, by Senator Kennedy in the Senate). Since legislators become understandably case-hardened and cynical about persons writing in support of their particular "trade union," I may point out, before embarking on the argument, that I personally do not have the faintest economic stake in this. Being mainly a University teacher and researcher with a deliberately limited private practice, and being one of the top-prestige psychologists in my geographical area, "getting patients" has never been my problem! As a matter of fact, beginning about 1951 (when I took over the chairmanship of the Psychology Department at the University of Minnesota) my main problem about patients has been the lack of really competent psychotherapists in the Twin City area to whom I could make referrals with a straight face. Over the last twenty years I have probably averaged a ratio of 10 patients or clients referred elsewhere to every one case accepted. I have therefore been very "choosy" about clientele, taking only persons (a) Whom I believed I could help, (b) Of types I found scientifically interesting, and (c) From the University community. I could charge (literally) twice as high a fee as I do, and get it,

from persons in this community—some of whom would have insurance coverage for my professional services, others not (but able and willing to pay). What I am saying is that while I naturally have an identification with my profession, I do not write out of any personal financial concern about this legislation.

Knowing how busy Congressmen are, I shall not write at length. I merely wish to challenge some of the supporting language that appeared at the time the Kennedy version of the bill was first introduced, where outpatient psychotherapy by clinical psychologists was explicitly excluded from insurance coverage, the justification for this exclusion being that psychologists do not provide complete professional care. I take this to mean that psychologists cannot prescribe psychotropic medication, which of course we cannot. This argument is not devoid of all merit. But it is, on balance, not persuasive, given the present state of the mental health professions and their delivery of services. My rebuttal is based on two considerations. I am confident that if you press these two considerations with any physician, whether he is a psychiatrist or in some other medical specialty, you will find that he has great difficulty replying to either of them. I would be surprised to find many younger-generation psychiatrists who would even be interested in replying. Most young psychiatrists with whom I have contact would take the same position I am taking in this letter.

1. The concept of one professional providing "complete professional care" to the patient is not the current concept in the healing arts generally, as almost any person who had had contact with physicians in recent years can attest from his own personal experience—unless he happens to live in a rural area or be lower middle class. If he is middle class or above, he will go to a practitioner who will, more often than not, refer him to a *specialist* on anything that doesn't come under the heading of internal medicine. If he is too poor to afford this, he will go to a charity hospital or clinic, where he will also make the rounds of the specialties. The referral to those professionals having greater expertise bearing on the particular patient's problem is (a) a matter of social fact and (b) generally advocated as preferable treatment. The point is that whether we talk about the M.D. or Ph.D. in the mental health area, or *within* those helping professions, it is generally taken for granted that one professional rarely provides "complete care." My personal physician for many years, Dr. Howard L. Horns (Chief of Medical Services, Nicollet Clinic) has referred me or members of my family to at least a half-dozen other physicians, most of whom are on the staff of the Nicollet Clinic (but even that has not been invariably the case).

2. More important than the preceding, which might conceivably produce some tortured disagreement, is the following, which I will assert dogmatically without the tiniest fear of successful contradiction: There is no professional who provides "complete" care in the mental health area. Setting aside legal or "trade-union" considerations, I will absolutely guarantee that you cannot locate *one single professional person* (M.D., Ph.D., M.S.W., Marriage Counselor, Clergyman, or whatever) that is competent—or will even *claim* to be competent—in all of the following procedures:

- (a) psychoanalysis.
- (b) (non-classical) psychoanalytic therapy.
- (c) behavior modification.
- (d) desensitization.
- (e) rational psychotherapy.
- (f) aversive conditioning.
- (g) psychotropic medication.
- (h) electroconvulsive shock.
- (i) hypnotherapy.

CXVII—1466—Part 17

- (j) ethico-philosophical counseling.
- (k) educational-vocational counseling.
- (l) group therapy.
- (m) psychosurgery.
- (n) nondirective psychotherapy.

All 14 of these techniques are relevant to psychological problems, and each of them is, at times, the treatment of choice. But there is nobody—I repeat and emphasize—*nobody* who would be so foolish as to claim real professional competence in even half a dozen of them. Most practitioners would claim competence in only one or two. (If you doubt this, try asking a few psychologists and psychiatrists.) I want to emphasize that the above is not a cooked-up list in which, in order to make a long list, I have dragged in all sorts of odd-ball kinds of wizardry and quackery. If one were to include all kinds of psychological helping that are presently practiced by reputable, professionally trained persons with doctorates in medicine or psychology and who have post-doctorally taken their specialist board examinations (for M.D.'s, in psychiatry or child psychiatry; for Ph.D.'s, in clinical, counseling or industrial psychology) and who are licensed or certified to practice medicine or psychology in their respective jurisdictions—I mean all sorts of things like sensitivity training and Gestalt therapy and psychodrama and existential analysis—the list could have been expanded to two dozen or more. (Dr. Robert A. Harper, in a paperback which we used to use here in our psychotherapy training program, lists some 33 different therapeutic approaches!) No, the point about the above list is that these are all techniques for which more than a tiny minority of the professions concerned will go to bat, and some of which (e.g., behavior modification, developed by psychologists rather than by psychiatrists, I may say) have strong evidential support of a quantitative nature.

If you run into any psychiatrist or hear any psychiatric testimony in consideration of this legislation which takes the form of claiming that only a psychiatrist can provide complete care for psychological disorders, I strongly urge that you *press him on the points in the above list*. And don't let him simply "write off" some of them as not being good methods—ask him whether he has any scientific evidence that they are not good methods in comparison with those he happens to prefer. I myself am competent at only three of the above. (Many practitioners are dubiously competent at any, although I don't wish to press that point here!) I am not skilled, for instance, at hypnosis. When I have a patient for whom hypnosis seems to be indicated as a good possibility for treatment, I refer him. I don't ask myself whether the hypnotist to whom I refer him is a physician or a clinical psychologist, which is irrelevant. (The membership of the American Society for Clinical Hypnosis is, I believe, about evenly divided between physicians and psychologists—plus some dentists.) I ask myself whether he is a qualified hypnotist, whether I have had success referring patients to him in the past, whether he is financially and geographically accessible to the particular patient, and the like. This is what all professionals do who are concerned primarily with patient care and not mainly with getting rich or bolstering up their own "trade union."

I presume you are aware that psychiatrists, while physicians, do not usually perform a physical examination of the patient or accept the responsibility for the strictly "medical" aspects of his troubles (e.g., peptic ulcer). Psychiatrists strongly in the Freudian tradition avoid doing a physical examination on principle. Many psychoanalytic psychiatrists avoid prescribing drugs. Is this complete care by one professional?

I do not enter into the details of how I think the legislation ought to be amended with regard to psychologists. At the very

least, I would want to argue that psychotherapy by a clinical psychologist who is a Diplomate of the American Board of Professional Psychology and who is licensed or certified as a psychologist in his jurisdiction, should be covered by Federal health insurance. An oddity I noted in the Kennedy bill: Outpatient psychotherapy by clinical psychologists is covered if the patient is seen in a Federally-supported hospital or Community Mental Health Center, but not—as I read it—in a group practice medical clinic. Does this make any sense? In the Nicollet Clinic, where I work part-time, it is preposterous (and considered so by my medical brethren) that if an internist or gynecologist or dermatologist refers a patient for the kind of psychotherapy that my psychiatrist colleagues Drs. Cranston and Lane provide, the patient's group insurance will usually cover it—although not always, if he is seen on an outpatient basis. Whereas, if the referral is from one of the clinic physicians to me, or to my psychologist colleagues Drs. Powers or Underwager, there is a good chance that the particular policy will not cover it. I can tell you concretely what this means in practice: It means that if Doctors Cranston and Lane are currently "full up", and the patient is not economically well-heeled, he will go essentially untreated. It also means that a patient for whom my particular training and skills may be optimal cannot always be referred to me by one of my psychiatric brethren because of the insurance coverage problem. I cannot think that we want to embody this kind of social absurdity in Federal health legislation.

Should you wish to discuss this with me further, when you are next in Minneapolis, or even perhaps wish me to testify before a Congressional committee, feel free to get in touch with me.

Cordially,

PAUL E. MEEHL, Ph. D.,
Regents' Professor of Psychology, Adjunct Professor of Law; Past President, American Psychological Association.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
St. Paul, Minn., January 18, 1971.
HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
U.S. Representative, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: In view of the increasing national concern for some form of federal health insurance and in view of the forthcoming consideration of this subject by the Congress I would like to call your attention to the attached resolution from the Annual Conference of the State and Territorial Mental Health Authorities.

I would like to call to your attention the recommendations of this group that considerable attention be given to providing incentives that will help keep down and/or reduce costs, such as providing reimbursement for outpatient and partial hospitalization services when ever possible. These can be delivered substantially cheaper than can the same service if the person must be hospitalized on a 24 hours basis in order to qualify for insurance coverage.

We would hope that such forthcoming legislation as the Congress may pass would also address itself to the relationship between the public and private health care sectors.

We strongly urge that attention be given to coverage for mental health services in any forthcoming legislation. As you probably know, Minnesota is moving ahead in the improvement of its services to persons cared for in our state hospitals. In addition our entire state is covered by a network of community mental health programs that are second to none in the nation. The state has borne the brunt of supporting these services in the past and will undoubtedly be a major supporter of them in the future. At the same time

we would look to assistance from the federal government in meeting the ongoing operational costs which are not covered by the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Centers Act or by the provisions of Titles 18 and 19.

Your consideration of these recommendations is greatly appreciated. Please be assured that I will be happy to provide you with any additional information that you may request relative to these matters.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID J. VAIL, M.D.,
Director, Medical Services Division.

RESOLUTION: SURGEON GENERAL'S ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE STATE AND TERRITORIAL MENTAL HEALTH AUTHORITIES, NOVEMBER 4-6, 1970

Whereas: The delivery of health services is variable from area to area and from person to person,

Whereas: Existing prepayment plans emphasize economic relief primarily,

Whereas: Existing private and Federal plans have tended to increase the demands on the health care system and to encourage use of high-cost services,

Whereas: Increase in demand escalates cost,

Whereas: Public mental health services are cost-controllable and are of wide availability, Now therefore be it resolved that:

1. The major thrust of planning for a Federal Health Insurance program must emphasize as a first priority the improvement of delivery of health services, and

2. Planning for Federal Health Insurance must include planning for inclusion of public as well as private health care delivery systems, and

3. Planning for Federal Health Insurance must include the utilization of and payment for services within mental health delivery systems whether the services are provided under public or private auspices.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
St. Paul, Minn., February 22, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: I would like to express my thanks for your referring a copy of H.R. 22 to our office. We are deeply interested in the progress being made by Congress on this matter of a national health plan.

After reviewing H.R. 22, I feel that generally the proposed bill is far reaching and comprehensive in scope. Of particular interest is the specific reference made to preventive services. If any positive impact is to be made on the health level of our nation's populace, I feel that a sizable effort will have to be exerted in the preventive sphere of health care. As I'm sure you are aware, all too little third-party coverage emphasizes preventive medical care thus, among other things, failing to provide the proper incentives to medical care providers for keeping people optimally healthy.

Also, psychiatric care is an element of the health care spectrum that historically has not been given adequate consideration, leaving a sizable gap in the achievement of a comprehensive health care system. We here in Minnesota have been actively carrying on community mental health programs since the mid-fifties and feel that the community-based approach best provides for the needs of the individual patient and the community. Thus, I feel that the inclusion of outpatient psychiatric services, as provided by community mental health centers, in the coverage of the bill will strengthen what I feel to be an essential and much needed community resource. By allowing community mental health centers to be designated as participating providers new dimensions in treatment modalities can be molded, thereby expanding the heretofore rigid physician

dominated "medical" model of psychiatric care by allowing paramedical professionals a greater role in the treatment process.

This, I feel, will lead to a more efficient and effective use of scarce professional mental health manpower from the psychiatrist to the trained psychiatric technician, and allow maximum flexibility for the entire treatment team to respond to individual patient needs.

However, there are certain segments of the bill that leave some questions in my mind. Specifically, I refer to Part C—Participating Providers of Services and Part E—Payment to Providers of Services.

First, Part C. In Section 47(a) a comprehensive health service organization(s) as a provider is defined. As I read the provisions, it appears that only a nonprofit organization can be designated as a comprehensive health service organization and that only indirectly can profit-making entities become involved. I question the wisdom of such a measure in that it would seem that many potential provider resources would be eliminated or at least limited in their ability to participate.

In its present form the Bill would require an intermediary between such a profit-making provider and the payment source, similar to the present Medicare program. I feel it would be to the benefit of the proposed health security plan to do away with this middleman and allow the profit-making providers and the payment source direct contact.

I say this because, to my knowledge, most prepaid group practices are profit making ventures and the simpler the administrative structure required of such organizations, the more attractive participation will be. This is to say nothing of the reduction in administrative costs that would result.

Closely linked with this are my comments regarding Part E. In this section, participating providers are given two distinct options: (1) to be independent practitioners or be affiliated with a health service organization and (2) be reimbursed by the fee-for-service or by the capitation (prepaid) method. As I read this section I feel that, if anything, the incentive is for practitioners to opt for independent status and the fee-for-service reimbursement method, a choice I do not feel to be in the best interest of a national health plan.

I say this because, first of all, one can seriously question the efficiency of the old independent practitioner system (cottage industry) of medical care and, secondly, the fee-for-service reimbursement model places the emphasis on treating sickness, as compared to maintaining positive health.

Would it not be better to provide more positive incentives to practitioners for choosing the prepaid group practice model, a model that (based upon all available information) provides a higher level of health care and in a more efficient manner.

For example, such incentives as special consideration in terms of availability of loans for facilities construction, equipment, etc., could be proffered prepaid group practices consisting of, say, four or more physicians aggregately providing a certain minimum of primary and secondary medical services; also, special financial incentives could be given to such groups willing to locate in poor health areas.

In your letter you also asked my view regarding the future role of the state in the field of mental health. Regarding this, I feel that mental health resources should be developed on the local level with the financial aid of the state government with the state per se providing only those services proving too costly to be economically provided on the local level. Thus, the state's role would be that of providing financial aid to local communities for the development of local resources and of setting operational standards for these resources. Services provided directly by the state would be restricted to those

persons not responding to the treatment modes available at the local level—the chronic mental patient requiring maintenance services for the most part.

This would seem to fit into your proposed national health plan in that the psychiatric services covered therein are of the type provided in an active treatment program of care, excluding maintenance per se.

In closing, please accept my thanks for allowing me to express some of my ideas regarding this very important issue of national health. Feel free to contact my office at any time regarding this or any other matter you feel I can be of assistance.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID J. VAIL, M.D.,
Director Medical Services Division

JUNE 16, 1971.

HON. DONALD FRASER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: We are writing you on behalf of the Minnesota Psychological Association with respect to H.R. 22—the Health Security bill.

First, we believe the bill to have many desirable features. Among these are 1) the emphasis on group practice of a non-profit, prepaid, and preventive character, 2) the emphasis on quality of care through peer review, continuing education and the like, 3) the coverage of effective drugs and appliances, 4) the provision for medical service to underserved areas, 5) the encouragement of the use of paramedical employees and finally, 6) the provision of representatives of the consumer on the advisory boards (in our opinion, however, the consumer should be given still more influence).

As to the role of psychologists, however, we believe the bill needs marked revision. Including psychological services as one of the "supporting services" Sec. 27(b) "to assure that whenever services of this nature are provided they are under appropriate medical supervision . . ." (quoted from Section-by-Section Analysis) ignores a number of facts. For one, the Committee on Allied Professions of the Minnesota Psychiatric Association states, "The committee affirms that each profession (psychiatry and psychology) is autonomous." Secondly, the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) compensates psychologists for their services without a physician referral. Thirdly, the laws of seven states (Kentucky, Colorado, California, Utah, Michigan, New Jersey, New York) require that a psychologist be reimbursed by health insurance plans for mental health services exactly the same as a psychiatrist would be reimbursed. Fourthly, although psychologists share many techniques with psychiatrists and social workers, they have special proficiencies in the assessment of behavior, counseling, behavior modification, desensitization, aversive conditioning, and non-directive psychotherapy.

In addition, when the supply of mental health professionals is so scanty in relation to the need, no law should decrease the availability of mental health services to the public. Instead, it should obviously increase them. As we see it, this can best be accomplished in H.R. 22 by adding the phrase "or qualified psychologist" whenever the word "psychiatrist" appears. (For example, this would permit the qualified psychologist as well as the psychiatrist to have twenty consultations with a patient in any benefit period).

One of us, Dr. Challman, is looking forward to discussing this question and related ones with you in your office at 1:30 p.m. Monday, June 28th.

Sincerely yours,

SAM C. SCHER, Ph. D.,
Executive Off. cer.
ROBERT CHALLMAN, Ph. D.,
Chairman, Legislation Committee.

[Reprinted from Minnesota Psychiatric Association, Newsletter, January 1971]

Dr. Jepson, Chairman of our Committee on Allied Professions, received from Dr. Herbert Klemmer, Chairman of the Assembly of District Branches Committee on Allied Professions, reports from that committee and also from the Fall committee of the Council on Professions and Associations. They are essentially congruent and report a rather substantial consensus of the leaders of the APA. The following statements on psychiatry and psychology were moved and approved by the committee.

(A) The committee affirms that each profession (psychiatry and psychology) is autonomous.

A profession is responsible for the maintenance of standards, the definition of its fields of practice, the quality of training, the competence of its practitioners, and the protection of the public.

We should, in every positive manner, inform the public about the specific skills of the psychiatric profession.

(B) The concept that psychotherapy is a medical procedure only places us in a vulnerable and indefensible position.

Since there are overlapping areas of practice which could lead to public confusion, it is incumbent upon the psychiatric profession to define what its skills are to the public.

(The committee recognizes the potential dangers of stirring up controversy and of polarizing the membership. It felt, however, the responsibility of leadership. The issues and arguments are old and stale, nothing is gained by obscurity and a defensive posture. In addition, because of the manpower shortage, the battle over exclusive rights to psychotherapy is one we are obviously going to lose).

(C) Responsibility in collaboration.

1. In a medical setting the responsibility is medical. The social worker and psychologist are ultimately responsible to the psychiatrist.

2. In a psychological setting or social work setting, as in clinics operated by these disciplines, ultimate responsibility resides in the professions operating the clinics even though psychiatrists are utilized as consultants.

3. In private practice settings a psychiatrist may refer a patient to a psychologist or social worker for psychotherapy or case work, treatment and terminate his treatment of the patient. The psychiatrist should be explicit about this to the patient in making a referral. The responsibility is then the psychologist or the social workers. Their professional autonomy makes further consultation or supervision by the psychiatrist unnecessary unless requested. Since psychiatric treatment is terminated under this arrangement, matters of payment to the psychologist or social worker should be decided by the government or insurance company that may be involved. (The treatment under these circumstances is either psychological work or social work, not medical).

If the psychiatrist refers a patient to other professionals, but also continues his treatment, collaboration follows the model of treatment in the medical setting and the psychiatrist retains the ultimate responsibility.

Where the psychiatrist sees a patient in consultation on request of a social worker or psychologist, the psychiatrist does not assume responsibility. He reports to the referring professional in the same fashion as when he is consultant to a fellow physician. He should, however, be aware of his responsibility both legal and moral to the patient and to the person requesting the consultation.

If a patient who is in psychotherapy with a psychologist or social worker requests a

consultation with a psychiatrist without referral by the psychologist or social worker the patient should get acquiescence from his therapist. If he does not then the decision is an individual one, but it is recommended as a general guideline that the psychiatrist relate to the psychologist as he does to physicians.

If a patient is under medical care the physician has the responsibility for arriving at a diagnosis. Otherwise, the autonomy of allied professionals at arriving at a diagnosis should be respected.

Each profession should be responsible for its standards, its training, and the protection of the public. Psychiatrists should continue to cooperate with other professionals in their training programs by making its facilities and patients available, reserving however the final responsibility of the psychologist. If psychologists wish to establish independent training facilities this should be their decision.

Scientists, marriage counselors, pastoral counselors, etc. should not be regarded as professionals in the same sense as our psychologists and social workers since they are not yet recognized professionals.

With regard to Standard 15, the committee favored a psychiatrist with administrative skills as the program director of a psychiatric facility that is not a hospital (e.g. a community mental health center, but on a practical level this does not now seem feasible).

This certainly represents a liberalization of the APA position although it remains acutely aware of its responsibility to the public and no longer seeks to discharge this concern by determining what other professions may or may not do. Instead this is an effort to more clearly define the role and scope of psychiatrists' responsibilities. It also makes more explicit the practices involved in the collaboration with the APA which were heretofore vague. Furthermore, it recognizes that the care of persons with mental and emotional illnesses and certain problems of social disruption does not lie entirely in the domain of psychiatry. Over the years there has been far too much polarization in our relationships with our associates and we can all be pleased that our organization has made a positive step toward improving these relationships in the interest of the patients we serve. It is certainly timely.

THE CONTROVERSY OVER FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND PRESS: ONE AVENUE OF APPROACH

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current controversy over freedom of speech and press, the following quotation in the June 27 Washington Post indicates one possible avenue courts and legislators might explore.

The quotation follows:

In just the last few years, a new reading of the First Amendment has been developed by some legal scholars which puts modern newspaper management on the defensive. The theory holds that "freedom of the press" belongs to everyone, not just the people who own the newspapers, and the crucial test is whether everyone's viewpoint is given fair access to the news columns. That departure raises deep and largely unexplored questions about who controls the printing presses and whether monopoly ownership inhibits the freedom protected by the First Amendment.

WELFARE REFORM NEEDED

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I voted for H.R. 1, the Social Security Amendments of 1971.

No single piece of legislation can cure the social ills of a nation that have evolved over many generations.

No single piece of legislation is perfect in every way, and certainly H.R. 1 is not an exception.

There are both weak and strong points in this bill, but I think it is legislation that had to be passed.

It has been clear for a long time that we must have welfare reform. And the only way to accomplish this difficult feat was for the House to pass H.R. 1, despite its defects, and give the Senate the opportunity for an essential second look that hopefully can be adjusted by a committee on compromise.

In the first place, title IV, the welfare section of H.R. 1, offers a constructive beginning in the long needed reform of the Nation's welfare program. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the number of welfare recipients in the AFDC category—families with dependent children—has risen by 50 percent, or 3,441,000 persons, during the last 2 years.

It is unjust that so many people, including large numbers of children, are dependent on the chaotic and unfair terms of present AFDC programs. Title IV replaces AFDC with two programs, both offering a Federal floor of \$2,400 for a family of four. The family assistance plan—FAP—to be administered by HEW, would assist families with no adult member who is able to work, while the opportunities for families—OFF—to be administered by the Department of Labor, would assist families with a member who can work or is eligible for job training. This provision requires the Secretary of Labor to develop training, counseling and employment plans for all persons receiving benefits.

Administration of these two programs by the Federal Government is an important and positive step. However, it is unfortunate that H.R. 1, unlike last year's bill would not provide supplementary payments to welfare recipients who live in States now providing higher combined Federal-State payment than the proposed Federal payment of \$2,400.

It is my view that a matching provision of 30 percent should have been included in the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and in April I urged Chairman MILLS to include such a provision before the bill was reported. At that time I wrote:

If the \$2,400 base figure is used, Connecticut, for example, will have to supplement this grant with \$1,324, as the present average payment is \$3,724. As you are well aware from the testimony, Connecticut has suffered severe budget deficits as a result of the increased demand for welfare assistance. The situation is equally critical in a number of the northern States. . . .

If the 30% figure is adopted, Connecticut would receive a Federal matching supplement of about \$400 per family on the average. This will mean a total of \$10.3 million savings which would free funds for sorely needed education, recreation and related projects which have experienced cutbacks in recent years.

On a nationwide basis the \$2,400 figure reportedly under consideration by your Committee is a substantial step toward its goal for welfare reform. However, the cost of living in a number of the larger cities and states is such that a state supplement will be mandatory in order to insure even a minimum subsistence level. Unfortunately, these states are often the ones with extreme budgetary problems and dwindling tax bases.

It is therefore my hope that the Senate will include provisions in its bill to require that no welfare recipient will receive less under the new welfare program than he received previously. I hope that the Senate will also include a 30 percent matching provision to ease the welfare burden on the budgets of States whose welfare recipients already receive payments well above the \$2,400 figure.

Important social security provisions are also contained in H.R. 1, such as the increase in social security benefits for widows and dependent widowers, the special minimum benefits of up to \$150 for people who have worked under the program at low earnings for many years, and the increased benefits for workers who delay their retirement beyond age 65.

The 5-percent increase in social security benefits has my strong support; yet, I do not think this is an adequate raise, and am therefore cosponsor of legislation that would provide a considerably larger and realistic increase. Certainly, until such legislation is passed, the automatic increase provided by H.R. 1 for any year that the Consumer Price Index rises 3 percent or more will be very helpful.

I am deeply concerned about some of the medicare provisions in H.R. 1. True, this legislation would extend medicare to 1.5 million social security and railroad retirement fund recipients who were not previously eligible—and that is as it should be. But the provisions that medicare part B deductible would be raised from \$50 to \$60—meaning the patient would pay the first \$60 of his hospital bill instead of the first \$50—is indeed a step backward.

So are other provisions. For example, there would be a one-third cut in Federal payments for hospital care under medicare after 60 days, and the same cut for nursing home care. The bill also includes a one-third cut in Federal payments after 90 days for a patient in a mental hospital and a final cutoff after 275 additional days.

I understand that these provisions were included because a system of national health care, which would provide for the health needs of all our citizens, is under discussion. But I find this argument unconvincing.

Illness will not wait upon the actions of Congress. And as everyone knows, quick action is rarely a virtue of the Congress, even for matters as urgent as health care.

A single illness can wipe out the sav-

ings of a lifetime and rob a person of independence and dignity as he becomes a burden to loved ones. Medicare, which has been the saving grace for millions, now covers less than half the total medical bill of the average older American, leaving uncovered a health bill considerably larger than the total health bill for the average younger person.

It is my fervent hope that the Senate will correct the many deficiencies of the medicare section of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 could be substantially improved—and hopefully the Senate will make positive changes in the bill.

Still, H.R. 1 is landmark legislation. It sets a new course, a constructive beginning upon which to build in the future.

A BRAVE PEOPLE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all are aware of the gallant, persistent nature of the Baltic nationals of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The dauntless spirit of these nationals has shown no indications of relenting despite 30 years of Soviet domination.

In commemorating this 30th anniversary, the Star Ledger of New Jersey has provided an excellent portrayal of the Baltic plight.

I share in the dream of the Baltics for the freedom which is their right.

The article follows:

A BRAVE PEOPLE

For the Baltic people—nationals in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and Americans of Lithuanian descent—this month has a poignant sadness, a sense of an enduring tragedy. It's been 30 years since the Soviet Union invaded the Baltic states and seized the three independent republics, ignoring non-aggression pacts when it no longer suited its convenience.

These tiny nations, brave in spirit and independent in mind, had no alternative but to bow to the superior military might of their aggressive neighbor. The Kremlin moved behind ultimatums that dissolved the governments of the Balts, putting in their place regimes that were politically subservient to Russia.

There was, of course, the mockery of "free elections," the window-dressing that was supposed to provide a respectable facade, the face-saving device of having puppet parliaments that supinely requested admittance to the Soviet bloc.

The Balts are a proud people who have been subjected to the indignity of living in demeaning, demoralizing atmosphere of a police state. They have been repeatedly denied independence while the Kremlin has been trying to Sovietize the Baltic states with an infusion of Russian migration and a rigorous imposition of its language and culture on a still unwilling people.

To the eternal credit of the indomitable spirit of the Balts, there are still tangible vestiges of independence among the people, which the Kremlin no doubt finds extremely discomfiting. This is a measure of the unflagging will of a people who refuse to be crushed by a cruel exercise of power—three decades after an unconscionable conquest of a people who stubbornly, and courageously, resist the finality of complete submission.

THE EMMITSBURG CHRONICLE,
EMMITSBURG, MD.

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the Elder family of Emmitsburg, Md., has published the Emmitsburg Chronicle for almost 50 years, over a span of 3 generations. The newspaper now has a new publisher, Mr. Robert Wentworth. The Elder family can be proud of the excellent newspaper they have published since 1922. The Emmitsburg Chronicle of June 25, 1971, contained an editorial giving the history of the newspaper and the story of the Elder family connection with it. I would like to add my voice to those who have been grateful for this excellent paper over the years and say to Mrs. C. Arthur Elder and her son, Arthur S. Elder, congratulations on a job well done. The editorial follows:

THE EMMITSBURG CHRONICLE, EMMITSBURG, MD.

This is the last edition of the Chronicle under the Elder Banner. For fifty years and three generations, the Elder family has published this newspaper at the same location on South Seton Avenue.

Mr. Robert Wentworth is your new publisher. Mr. Wentworth, a Newport News, Virginia, newsman, is taking over the duties of owner and publisher of your favorite newspaper.

The Emmitsburg Chronicle, as we know it today, had a humble beginning. One hundred and thirty years ago, 1840, the Emmitsburg Banner was first published here. Five years later, in 1845, the paper took on a new name and a new ownership. Mr. C. Grate published the Emmitsburg Star. This publication continued for a few years. Just how long Mr. Grate continued to publish the Star is lost in history.

Mr. Samuel Motter, at the insistence of family and friends, published the first edition of the Emmitsburg Chronicle in 1879. Mr. Motter died March 21, 1889 and his widow, Mrs. C. Motter, took charge.

Mr. W. H. Troxell purchased the paper in 1899. Troxell continued publication until he sold out to Mr. Sterling Galt in 1906. Mr. Galt changed the name of the paper to the Weekly Chronicle, in 1909.

At the death of Mr. Galt, Mr. William Sugars bought the paper. Mr. Sugars sold out to a local combine of businessmen: Henry M. Warrenfeltz, J. Ward Kerrigan and Michael J. Thompson.

On January 16, 1922, this combine was dissolved and John D. Elder and Michael J. Thompson operated the paper on a partnership basis. During this ownership, the Chronicle was moved from East Main Street to its present location.

Mr. John D. Elder bought out Mr. Thompson in 1927, starting a fifty year, three generation ownership of the paper. This represents the longest uninterrupted ownership during the newspaper's colorful and sometimes stormy history. At John D. Elder's death, January 31, 1943, the paper suspended publication for five years. This was during World War II.

Resumption of publication was made under the ownership of Mr. C. Arthur Elder and Mr. Edward G. Stull, in 1948. C. Arthur Elder became sole owner and publisher in 1958. C. Arthur Elder died April 1, 1971. His widow, Mrs. Virginia Elder, and his son, Arthur Spalding Elder, have carried on to the present.

The Elder family has mixed emotions about handing over the reins of publication of the Chronicle. We will miss the frantic, never ending specter of the deadline, the constant search for the inevitable, "Who, What, When, Where and Why", of each news worthy item in each edition.

We hope we have served you well. We have tried.

We are also very sure that the high standards of John D. Elder, his son, C. Arthur Elder, and his grandson, Arthur Spalding Elder, will be continued under the able guidance of the new publisher, Bob Wentworth. The Chronicle will continue to be published at the old stand on South Seton Avenue.

Arthur Spalding Elder will continue to operate the Chronicle Press Inc. All your job printing needs will still be handled under the personal attention of Arthur S. Elder and his competent staff of Ernie Rosensteel and Tom Saylor.

If, we of the Chronicle staff, have but one thing of value to leave as a legacy it will be Integrity. When a lifetime of business transactions are simmered down to the basic essentials and stripped of all the tinsel, it becomes evident that without Integrity and Responsibility, there is no tomorrow.

We wish the new publisher well. We thank you all for your cooperation and help over the years.

So with a heavy heart we write "30" to our part in the production of the Emmitsburg Chronicle.

BLASTING THE BLAST

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, last month I testified in Anchorage before the Atomic Energy Commission, regarding the proposed nuclear testing on Amchitka Island next October. At that time, I raised several questions regarding the overall feasibility of this project.

Some of the questions that I have raised have been articulated by James E. Bylin in an article appearing in the June 24 issue of the Wall Street Journal. I believe this article expresses clearly and concisely some of the ideas and facts that point out why the decision to test nuclear weapons on Amchitka Island should be reconsidered.

The article follows:

BLASTING THE BLAST—AEC'S PLAN TO STAGE ATOM TEST IN ALASKA BRING SHARP DISSENT

CRITICS FEAR QUAKES, WAVES, HARM TO U.S.—SOVIET TIES; NO DANGER SEEN BY AGENCY

But is this test necessary?

(By James E. Bylin)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—It sounds like the governmental agency for all seasons.

Here in Alaska, it's transplanting sea otter, rescued from the edge of extinction, to build new herds in their old habitats. It maintains archeological digs that have shed new light on the arrival of man in North America. It helps in air and sea rescues. Forty-five percent of its work force are minority-group members.

But it also has a scheme that, many Alaskans and non-Alaskans fear, could produce a catalog of catastrophes, including earthquakes, tidal waves, radioactive poisoning and even a rupture in delicate U.S.—Soviet relations.

The agency is the Atomic Energy Commission, and it has embarked on what promises

to be one of its most controversial campaigns since the days of atmospheric nuclear testing a decade ago. This fall, probably in October, the AEC plans to detonate the biggest underground nuclear test in U.S. history on isolated Amchitka Island in Alaska's Aleutian Islands. Code-named Cannikin (the AEC says its code names have no meaning), it would be nearly five times larger than any underground blast ever undertaken by the U.S. The test would be a five megaton "event," to use an AEC term, equal to five million tons of TNT and 250 times larger than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945.

A REPLAY

The AEC says the test should be perfectly safe. But it is being questioned and criticized by Alaska officials as well as conservationists and scientists nationally. The opposition is spearheaded by Mike Gravel, a U.S. Senator from Alaska, who argues that the test should "be canceled and the island fully restored and that the AEC count Amchitka and Alaska out of any future plans for the detonation of atomic bombs." Meanwhile, Aleuts, the natives who inhabit the Aleutians (though not Amchitka) are threatening to go to court to block the test.

In a sense, the dispute is a replay. The AEC tested a nuclear device on Amchitka in October 1969 amid vociferous protests. This time, though, the stakes are much higher. That was a one-megaton explosion, about as large as any set off in the AEC's southern Nevada testing grounds, to determine whether the Amchitka site could safely handle bigger tests. The AEC's conclusion: it could.

At first glance, Amchitka would seem the ideal site for underground tests. The treeless, 42-mile-long island is utterly remote from large population centers. It is 1,400 miles west-southwest of Anchorage and 2,500 miles west-northwest of Seattle. Nearly 10,000 troops were stationed on the island during World War II, leaving behind a system of airstrips and roads. Today, rats are the only land mammals on Amchitka besides AEC personnel.

The island, however, happens to straddle one of the world's most active earthquake zones, raising the concern that the blast, which itself is expected to register 7.0 on the Richter seismic scale, could trigger a giant temblor and perhaps even a tidal wave. (Scientists prefer "seismic wave" or the Japanese term, tsunami, to the misnamed tidal wave.) And Alaskans have reason to worry about earthquakes. Much of the state was devastated by the Good Friday quake in 1964.

THE AEC'S POSITION

That quake, Sen. Gravel says, began with a shock of about 6.5 and triggered itself to a peak of 8.4. (The recent San Fernando Valley quake was 6.8.) Referring to Cannikin, Sen. Gravel says, "what type of energy can be released with that kind of trigger? No one knows. Would Cannikin's 7.0 Richter scale reading, combined with a 7.0 natural earthquake, remain a harmless 7.0 event? The odds shift markedly against such an eventuality occurring without some toll."

The AEC claims the chances it would set off a quake are remote, but it does acknowledge that "because the understanding of earthquake mechanisms is still developing and is not yet sufficient for exact calculations, the possibility of such an occurrence cannot be ruled out."

One AEC scientist says that earthquake country may be a "good place" for underground testing and that if an earthquake happened to be triggered it might actually be beneficial, in a manner of speaking. Exploding a bomb in a site like Amchitka, he says, would "represent much less a departure than in another place where quakes aren't common." And in the unlikelyhood a quake is triggered, it would undoubtedly have been "ready to go" anyway and its force could be

less than if mother nature hadn't been preempted, he reasons. Also, he claims, any quake would be localized, little different from what occurs frequently there.

RADIOACTIVITY IS FEARED

The 1964 Alaskan quake unleashed a massive seismic wave that smashed coastal areas throughout the Pacific Ocean basin; 27 blocks of downtown Crescent City in northern California were leveled by the wave, for instance. Cannikin's chances of duplicating this disaster are "negligible," according to the AEC. William G. Van Dorn, a Scripps Institute of Oceanography, seismologist working for the AEC, says that "no large tsunami has originated in recorded history" in the western Aleutians, where Amchitka is located. In 1965, Mr. Van Dorn says, a 7.5 magnitude quake only 20 miles from Amchitka "produced only a small, local tsunami." The key reason, he explains, appears to be that tsunamis tend to happen where quakes produce vertical ground motions. Unlike in the eastern Aleutians, the motions are horizontal in the western Aleutians, he adds.

For many critics, the earthquake-seismic wave questions are secondary. "These threats are real, but more real is the threat of radioactive contamination as the result of an accidental venting because these have happened with remarkable regularity," charges Earl J. Bell, a spokesman for the National Audubon Society, which opposes the test.

Since the signing of the limited test ban treaty in 1963, the AEC has exploded 230 underground devices, of which 17 "leaked radioactivity detectable offsite," the AEC admits. The one leak Cannikin opponents won't let the AEC forget occurred last December in Nevada, causing the AEC to suspend tests. Project Baneberry, a 20-kiloton device (equal to 20,000 tons of TNT) was detonated at a depth of 910 feet. Though the AEC thought it was fully familiar with the area's geology because it had conducted other tests nearby, the earth's surface suddenly cracked and radioactivity was spewed over several states. The AEC now blames unexpectedly high water content at the test depth for the accident. It exploded its first post-Baneberry device in Nevada June 16 and said the explosion didn't cause any radiation leakage. So, the AEC says, "we will be conducting other tests in the relatively near future." But it can't test in Nevada devices as big as that planned for Amchitka because of the effect on high-rise buildings in Las Vegas.

James E. Carothers, the AEC's assistant director for nuclear testing, claims that the bigger the test's yield, the safer it is as far as radioactivity is concerned. Two factors cause this phenomenon, according to Mr. Carothers: The bigger devices are buried deeper, thus placing more layers of rock between the device and the surface, and the bigger detonation tends to melt more of the rock about it, sealing off the cavity. Cannikin would be detonated at a depth of 5,875 feet.

Alaskans are particularly concerned over the possibility of another kind of radioactive contamination: seepage into the Bering Sea. The Aleutians are the crossroads for the spawning migrations of Pacific salmon. "Should contamination of these salmon occur, the economic disaster to one of Alaska's largest industries would be of very large magnitude," warns Wallace H. Noerenberg, commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. In 1970, Alaska fishermen hauled in \$60 million worth of salmon.

A DISAGREEMENT ON DILUTION

After Cannikin is detonated, the explosion-formed cavity is expected to collapse, creating a rubble-filled "chimney" to the surface; it should fill with water within 150 to 500 days. Leonard M. Gard, the AEC's supervisory geologist from the U.S. Geological Survey, says radioactive water shouldn't reach the surface of this sink. What is most likely to occur, Mr. Gard says, is for the radioactivity to be trapped underground, seeping out to the Ber-

ing Sea in about 1,000 years, at which time it would be harmless. The "very unlikely" alternative would be for the radioactive water to reach the Bering Sea in two or three years at about 1,200 times sea levels and continue to be discharged for 130 years, he says.

"In this unlikely event, the mixing with ocean waters in longshore currents would introduce an effective dilution factor," Mr. Gard says confidently.

But Jerold Lowenstein, a radiation expert at the University of California Medical Center in San Francisco, scoffs at the "magic of dilution" and says low levels of radioactivity can accumulate and be reconcentrated in the food cycle. Sen. Gravel adds, "In these days when the nation is deeply concerned about mercury poisoning and the market for seafood products has fallen off sharply, even the suspicion that radioactive water is leaking to the surface could devastate the market for all fishery species of the North Pacific."

Conservationists are especially enraged because the Aleutian Islands, including Amchitka, are a national wildlife refuge. But when he established the refuge in 1913, President Taft provided that Amchitka could be used for military purposes. Says the Audubon Society's Mr. Bell, "I think it is perfectly clear that coaling stations and the like were the kind of military purposes that President Taft considered commensurate with wildlife refuge status. It is obvious that he could not have conceivably imagined that this might include testing five-megaton nuclear weapons."

"NO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT"

Cannikin, the AEC claims, will cause "no significant environmental impact" on Amchitka. The island is home to the endangered sea otter, which the AEC has been helping transplant to other habitats in an effort to expand its ranks. Perhaps as many as 20 sea otters "could suffer measurable physiological effects" from the test, the AEC says, but the overall impact will be "negligible." The AEC adds that "a few fish of commercially important species may be killed by the shock."

As far as the Aleuts are concerned, the Aleutians should belong to them under a complex Alaskan native land claims settlement now pending before Congress. Illodor Philemonof, president of the Aleut League, which is threatening a lawsuit, says the Aleuts "were and are entitled to the protection of provisions of the Constitution. Property should not be taken without due process." The proposed explosion, he alleges, is another example of the white man subjecting Aleuts to "mistreatment and misfortune."

But the overriding issue in the controversy may be whether the test is actually necessary. Officially, the AEC hasn't disclosed the precise purpose of the \$160 million project except that "the test is considered of vital importance to national security." In testimony to a Senate committee in April, an AEC official admitted Cannikin will be to test the warhead for the Spartan antiballistic missile.

If that's the case, some scientists allege, then Cannikin is pointless. Jeremy J. Stone, director of the 2,000-member Federation of American Scientists, claims Cannikin was conceived by the AEC in 1966 under President Johnson to test the Spartan missile, an anti-Chinese missile defense system. However, Mr. Stone contends, the Nixon administration in early 1969 revised the ABM program to have the defense of Minuteman ICBM's against a Soviet threat as its primary purpose, with the defense of cities from a China attack as a supplemental program. "There now is ample reason to believe that a majority of the U.S. Senate will not support an anti-Chinese ABM," he says, adding that

the Spartan missile isn't necessary in the ICBM defense system.

"Basically," Mr. Stone argues, "Cannikin is a bureaucratic oversight—an experiment that has been waiting to be canceled."

The final green light for Cannikin must be flashed by President Nixon. The Anchorage Daily Times, quotes "reliable sources" in Washington as saying the administration may cancel Cannikin because of its "potential political risk" in the wake of the recent agreement with the Soviet Union at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks to negotiate limits on defensive ABM systems. (One AEC official grumbles that the Russians earlier this year set off a six-megaton test on an Arctic Island and "you didn't hear too much about that.")

Like its smaller Amchitka predecessor in 1969, Cannikin is generating much international ill will, especially in Canada and Japan, two fishing nations. Patrick Moore, a Canadian conservationist, points out that Japan, Canada and even the Soviet Union (which is 800 miles from Amchitka) are closer to the blast sites than is the contiguous U.S., and thus "exposed to a more serious threat." His suggestion: If the U.S. wants "to indulge" itself in the test, explode it in the geographic center of the U.S. in central Kansas.

THEY MOUTHED MORALITY

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to direct the attention of the House to today's news commentary section of the New York Times, where Charles Frankel has presented a very informative and clarifying analysis of Walter Rostow's view of "moralism" in policymaking for Vietnam:

THEY MOUTHED MORALITY

(By Charles Frankel)

Walt Rostow has stated the moral case for the war in Vietnam in these pages. No one who knows Mr. Rostow doubts his sincerity or depth of moral commitment. But the issue is not what it has been said to be—that those who made the decisions about the war were indifferent to moral considerations. The issue is the impersonal one as to the actual nature of these considerations, and the kind of logic that should be used in thinking about them.

It is odd for Mr. Rostow to call on George Kennan's animadversions against "moralism" to support the position he takes. His position is a study in moralism. Reading him, I have the same feeling again that I had when I discussed the war with some of its defenders in the Johnson Administration. It was the feeling of running into a blank wall, and turning around and running into another.

The first was a wall of fact to which I wasn't privy. ("If only you knew the facts that we know about Vietnam, you wouldn't hold the position you do." Well, now I know some of those facts, and they are quite unlovely.) But the other wall was and is the Great Wall of Moral Absolutes, a wall of principles to which one clings against the facts, against experience, against feeling.

Mr. Rostow begins, in effect, by telling us to keep our guard up against moral doubts. He sets up an impossible ideal—absolute pacifism—and confesses to a feeling of sadness that we can't attain it. But we can't; life is hard. "All national policy—like the human condition itself—is morally flawed."

The operative moral question about the war in Vietnam is not whether war in general is "ugly and sinful." It is about *this* war, its necessity, its purposes, whether these purposes could be accomplished, whether they were worth accomplishing given the cost in human suffering.

And what about this war? Mr. Rostow says that it meets one condition for being moral because the "national interests" we have pursued in Vietnam are parallel to those of the South Vietnamese, who, in 1961 and 1965, wanted to fight for an independent destiny. The South Vietnamese? Which ones? Which government? What about the South Vietnamese who are with the Vietcong?

Again, Mr. Rostow says that a war, if it is to be moral, must be conducted "so as to minimize damage to civilian lives." The argument, when offered in defense of the Vietnam war, is ghoulish. What is the relation of this abstract principle to mass transfers of populations, free-fire zones, the ghastly weapons we have used? Does the fact that all national policy is "morally flawed" relieve us from the responsibility of looking at facts?

The rest of Mr. Rostow's statement is similar. He says that our basic "power interests" in the world are morally legitimate because they are wholly "negative": We simply wish "to prevent the dominance of Europe and Asia by a single potentially hostile power." But what of the specific ways in which we have pursued this "negative" goal?

We cannot draw the lessons from Vietnam that some of its critics wish us to. The war is not a product of "the system." It is the product of the Cold War mentality, of the inordinate influence of the Pentagon and its satellites, and of policies that were adopted only by circumventing the system of consultation with the electorate and its representatives. But the way we got into the war, the way we have argued about it, tells us something about our national life.

It tells us that the habit is widespread of asserting airy moral principles without looking at their content and consequences. Highly intelligent men, products of the best education we have to offer, think that they have done their duty by morals when they mouth abstractions whose living meaning is left unexamined, and cling to lofty goals without ever asking whether the legitimacy of these goals is affected by what is done in their pursuit.

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 24, I joined Mr. REID of New York in sponsoring of H.R. 9330, a bill to provide for the creation of an American Council for Private International Communications, Inc., as a funding and management mechanism for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Last Saturday, the Washington Post published an editorial regarding RFE and RL. I bring to the attention of my colleagues this very informative piece:

THE ESSENTIAL BUSINESS OF RADIO FREE EUROPE

Radio Free Europe, which undertakes to tell East Europeans the news about themselves that their own controlled media withhold, is under harsh political attack for that

reason from governments of some of the East European countries it broadcasts to. It may face an even greater peril, however, from the confusion of efforts underway in Washington to end its covert financing by the C.I.A. and to finance and operate it on a new open basis. The situation has got to be taken into hand quickly, for as matters stand, funds will run out for RFE—and for Radio Liberty, which broadcasts to the Soviet Union—quite soon. The two stations are much too valuable to be lost in a summer haze.

East European governments resentful of RFE's broad appeal to their populations have long stewed and fulminated about it—along with pulling such dirty tricks as putting poison in the salt shakers of its Munich headquarters. They could do little more, until Willy Brandt opened his policy of reconciliation with the East. Then, sensing an opportunity for leverage, they said that his *Ostpolitik* and RFE are incompatible. In fact, they are not, but Germany was embarrassed. Once Mr. Nixon made clear his position that Americans troops and American radios in Germany are part of a package, however, Bonn diplomatically told the protesting East Europeans to cool down.

Some East European governments bored in harder when Senator Clifford Case stated publicly what almost everybody had known for years—that the C.I.A. finances RFE (and Radio Liberty). Poland, for instance, called upon the United States last month to put RFE off the air.

Senator Case's point was to get RFE out in the open and so he offered a bill to finance it by direct appropriations, through the State Department. The administration, correctly contending that much of RFE's audience appeal lies in its appearance of independence from the American government, countered with a bill to set up a publicly funded "private" corporation to run both RFE and RL (West Germany, for its own reasons, favors the latter approach.) In the meanwhile, there arose on Capitol Hill legitimate questions about the cost of the stations, their research functions, their relationship to other American propaganda and cultural programs, and their coordination with political efforts for detente. The administration did not allow enough time for Congress to cope adequately with these questions and, as a result, the stations are now hanging by the thread of a continuing resolution which provides funds only until August.

We do not have dogmatic views on the kind of organizational home the stations ought to have or on the size of their budgets or the scope of their non-broadcasting activities. We would like to make the emphatic point, however, that RFE and RL do an extremely important job and, in our judgment, do it well.

RFE still carries an image of irresponsibility dating from its indeed-irresponsible words of encouragement to Hungarian rebels in 1956. Together, RFE and RL have the reputation of being the voices of bitter emigres and primitive anti-Communists. The two stations, however, have considerably changed and they can no longer be fairly accused of the sins of their past. What they do now is to communicate directly with the people of East Europe who want to listen to them in order to learn what they cannot learn from their own captive press and radio. The stations do not incite to revolution or preach anti-Communism; they say what is going on in East Europe. It would be an unpardonable breach of faith with the stations' millions of listeners to deny them their choice of radio fare.

Detente, if it means anything, means widening the West's contacts with the East, not helping the East to seal off its people from the West. It means the exchange of people, goods, words and ideas. This is the essential business of RFE and RL. The Congress, in its rightminded determination to shake

the station free of the C.I.A. should not lose sight of the reason for letting them continue it.

BIERNE SPRAGINS HONORED AS PUBLIC CITIZEN

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Huntsville, Ala., Times honored Mr. Bierre Spragins, one of Alabama's most outstanding residents. I have known Mr. Spragins for more than 25 years, and I have never known a more dedicated public citizen.

The editorial remarks in the Huntsville Times cite the high points of his illustrious career of service to his community and its constant improvement. Beyond this record he is congenial and friendly. He is most gallant and chivalrous in all his departments. I am grateful that he has allowed me to be his friend through the years.

At this point I wish to include the comments of the editorial as a part of my remarks:

BIERNE SPRAGINS WAS THERE

Things have changed these past 50 years for Huntsville and its Rotary Club; but then some things are pretty much the same. For instance, when Rotary met this week, just as in 1920, Bierre Spragins was there.

The local club, for no special reason but for lots of good ones, therefore, paid tribute to its longtime member and former president (1932-33) for a life-time of effort in behalf of this community's development. We lend our applause.

Mr. Spragins is known generally as a banker. And that he is, having begun at the First National in 1919, soon after returning from World War I service in France. After an interlude operating the family's ice-and-coal company, he returned to First National Bank in 1933 as executive vice president and in 1935 succeeded his father, the late R. E. Spragins, who had served in that capacity since 1909.

But Mr. Spragins has served this community, to which his family came in 1820, in more ways than financial. For he has harbored a steadfast enthusiasm for its economic and cultural development. He was, for example, among the 18 men who organized the Huntsville Industrial Expansion Committee in 1944, and he served as its second president. He also served as president of the Chamber of Commerce in 1946.

In the words of one of his friends, "Bierre probably has had a hand in recruiting every new industry that has come to Huntsville in the past 25 years—except maybe the other banks."

Over the years, Mr. Spragins has garnered his share of accolades for his services. He received the C of C Distinguished Citizens Award in 1964, and in recognition of 21 years of service as chairman of two Army advisory committees, Huntsville's and the Third Army's, he received the Department of the Army's highest civilian award, the Outstanding Civilian Service Medal.

The recognition of his fellow Rotarians added sheen to the illustrious record.

Well, things may have been pretty much the same at Rotary, 1920 and 1971. Bierre Spragins was there.

But things surely are not the same in Huntsville, and in no small measure because Bierre Spragins was here.

BOOKBURNERS AND CULTURAL CENSORS AT WORK

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in nearby Montgomery County of Maryland the bookburners are back censoring and suppressing free speech in education.

The latest cultural work to be purged is "Little Black Sambo," printed in 1899 and enjoyed for generations by our youth with no qualms of conscience or psychological backlash.

The retort of the censor that the decision was not to be construed as book-burning clearly shows a guilt feeling and psychotic defensive reaction.

If all books in the library that might be offensive to someone were destroyed, there would be few books remaining in the library. Yet no reason was given to purge the book which degraded police officers as "pigs" nor was any book ridiculing whites suggested for suppression.

It appears that Montgomery County has a biased and prejudiced director of educational media and technology on its hands.

In the meantime, another federally funded organization, the Smithsonian Institution, has scoured the country to locate backwoods people, representative of American folklore to come to Washington at taxpayers' expense and give a demonstration of living culture in America.

Included in the conglomeration is said to be a black Ohio Colonial blues band comparable to a New Orleans blues band. Certainly by our Maryland standards of censorship, this could be regarded as "ridicule of black people"—specially if someone white told them so.

The material follows:

[From the Sunday Star, June 27, 1971]

SAMBO "DISMISSED" BY COUNTY SCHOOLS

(By Thomas Love)

"Little Black Sambo," the story of a boy with new clothes who outsmarts several tigers who want to eat him, has been ordered removed from Montgomery County schools.

Following a complaint by a mother of two elementary school children, a system official has ordered all copies of the book removed from school libraries, along with film strips and records telling the story.

"This decision is not to be construed as 'book burning,' but rather as book selection," Nancy C. Walker, director of the department of educational media and technology, said in a memo to all principals and librarians.

In May, Barbara Smith, of 11212 Skuykill Road, Rockville, whose two children attend Rockinghorse Elementary School, complained to the school administration that the book is a "ridicule of black people."

The black mother asked that the books be withdrawn from school libraries. After a month-long investigation, a committee of principals, librarians, teachers and a central office staff member recommended that her requests be granted.

"'Little Black Sambo' is derogatory. It's not good literature for children."

She said the book implies that "black people are preoccupied with 'fine' clothes, discriminate in their choice of food, gluttonous and live in or near jungle."

PUBLIC LIBRARIES NEXT

Now that she has prevailed with the school system, "the public libraries are my next target," she said.

Her whole campaign started when she saw a copy of the book in a county library. "It upset me," she said. "I didn't think they still had things like that in the libraries."

When she investigated, she found that while her children's school library did not have the book, it had a "Little Black Sambo" film strip. She then filed her complaint.

The book was written in 1899 by Helen Bannerman, an English woman living in India, for her two children.

It tells the story of Sambo, his mother Mumbo and his father Jumbo. The boy has a new outfit and goes into the jungle, where he meets several tigers who say they want to eat him.

He convinces each tiger to let him go in return for an article of his new clothes. The last tiger almost refuses the boy's shoes, because there are only two, until the animal is convinced that they would be attractive on his ears.

Finally, the tigers, each jealous of the other's apparel, chase each other around a tree until they melt into "tiger butter."

Sambo retrieves his clothes and takes the tiger butter home where he and his parents have a feast of hotcakes, smothered with the butter.

The seven-member school committee voted 6-1 to remove the book from the shelves of the libraries. The only dissenting vote came from one librarian who called the book fantasy, and said, "Humor is good for everyone."

Other members called it "inappropriate," and "not in keeping with good human relations," although one principal who wanted the book banned said it was "popular and in constant use."

CONCERN FOR SELF-CONCEPT

A kindergarten teacher on the committee said, "My concern is aroused at the suggestion that a poor self concept may be reinforced. Building a child's self-concept is something I struggle with every day and I cannot overemphasize its importance."

"Progress is sometimes so fragile that it can be reversed by a book and any positive relationship established by a teacher brought to an end. It is my opinion that 'Little Black Sambo' would not be a positive reinforcement for blacks or whites," she continued.

Last year, the school system banned "The Little Fellow" as racially offensive. The book is about a colt and its groom, a black who spoke in dialect and was caricatured in the illustrations.

However, both the Montgomery and Prince Georges County school systems refused to ban "Sylvester and the Magic Pebble," an animal book in which policemen are depicted as pigs, even though there were a number of complaints.

[From the Sunday Star, June 27, 1971]

SMITHSONIAN SLEUTH: COMBINING A NATION FOR ITS FOLKLORE
(By Jack Kneese)

The Smithsonian Institution's fifth annual Festival of American Folklife—to be held on the Mall Thursday through July 5—will owe much of its success to Ralph Rinzler's cultural sleuthwork.

Rinzler, the 34-year-old director of the festival, spends much of his time combing the backwoods of the nation for singers, musicians and craftsmen representative of American folklore.

The search almost cost him his life once as he walked along a mountain creek. But such perils were compensated for somewhat recently when he found a small blues band

in Columbus, Ohio, which is part of this year's festival.

As in past festivals, dancers, musicians and craftsmen will demonstrate the living culture of America. Ohio will be the featured state this year.

AMERICA'S CONTINUING FOLK HERITAGE

The festival, which attracted 700,000 persons last year and becomes more popular each year, is a conscious attempt by the Smithsonian's division of performing arts to focus national attention on the continuing American folk heritage.

As Rinzler said, it is more graphic and informative to see and hear living culture than to depend on a static exhibit.

This year, food processing demonstrations representative of Ohio tradition will include maple sugaring, making apple butter, and baking of Moravian love feast buns.

Another feature of this year's festival will be a musical presentation representing Ohio, including Ukrainian bandura players, a blues and a bluegrass band and mountain string bands.

Indians and their crafts from the northwestern coast of the U.S. will take part in the festival. A program displaying various aspects of American Indian life was begun at last year's festival. It continues through 1976.

Another focus this year will be the American working man as a member of organized labor. This, too, will be the first in a six-year program series on organized labor and the working man designed to culminate at the 1976 Bicentennial.

Demonstrations and performances will be held daily from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. Concerts will begin at 8 p.m.

A popular part of the festival will be the availability of foods—this year foods traditional to Ohio and some Indian food.

Rinzler and James R. Morris, director of the performing arts division, work with a full staff all year long to stage the festivals.

ELEVATOR OPERATOR SHOWED THE WAY

But Rinzler said that moment was compensated for by his experience this year in Columbus.

He said he casually asked an elevator operator if he knew of any musicians or bands in the area. This led to the discovery of a black blues band which Rinzler said is sensational—comparable to a New Orleans blues band.

The puzzling part of it to Rinzler is how the group had avoided the attention of music buffs.

This blues band—along with an Ohio mountain string band—will provide the public a chance to gauge Rinzler's discovery.

For Rinzler and Morris, there is little répit. Said Rinzler: "We're already working on next year's festival."

HOUSE RESOLUTION 319

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the language of House Resolution 319, which I introduced on March 17, 1971. I was hoping it might catch the attention of the administration:

H. RES. 319

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madam Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on September 17, 1970, that the policy of her government is "In case the United States Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, and the parties will engage at once in discussion on:

"—the question of ensuring safety for the total withdrawal from South Vietnam of United States troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp
"—the question of releasing captured military men."

Resolved, That the United States shall forthwith propose at the Paris peace talks that in return for the return of all American prisoners held in Indochina, the United States shall withdraw all its Armed Forces from Vietnam within sixty days following the signing of the agreement: *Provided*, That the agreement shall contain guarantee by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of safe conduct out of Vietnam for all American prisoners and all American Armed Forces simultaneously.

SAVE THE ARCTIC HEALTH RESEARCH CENTER

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the insensitivity of the Nixon administration to the necessity of full support for programs which have effectively met the vital social needs of the American people is vividly shown in the cutbacks in the appropriations for the Arctic Health Research Center. The \$347,000—25-percent—fund reduction for the College, Alaska, facility comes at a time when concern for the Nation's health has reached a peak. The cut, which will result in a decrease from 83 employees only 3 years ago to 47 positions next year, will seriously hamper the cause of medical research, not only in Alaska, but throughout the United States.

Gov. William E. Egan of Alaska has actively fought this devastating reduction of a program which has received widespread attention, nationally and internationally, for its success in combating cold weather problems. Because of the importance of health facilities to all Americans, the particular value of the Arctic Health Research Center, and the important work of Governor Egan in this area, I share this letter from the Governor which details the crisis nature of this situation:

JUNEAU, ALASKA,

June 11, 1971.

HON. NICK BEGICH,
Congressman for Alaska,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR NICK: The news that the reduction of staff of the Arctic Health Research Center at College, Alaska, has been delayed, pending further study, is welcome. I am glad that there was recognition of the consequences of such an abrupt and damaging action. Though the matter is now under study, I still want to express the deepest and most urgent concern of the state of Alaska about the planned staff reduction for the Arctic Health Research Center. This move will reduce the activities

and services of this outstanding organization which is so indispensable to Alaska and to other U.S. citizens in relation to preventive health care and medical education.

The Arctic Health Research Center is nationally and internationally known for its outstanding contributions in the area of arctic and sub-arctic health research, tuberculosis control, health education and long term studies of zoonotic diseases transmissible to man. Further, it is the only basic and applied research center of its type in the United States. The reduction from the 1968 authorized strength of 83 to the proposed 47 positions will extinguish essential health and biomedical programs on which the state of Alaska is dependent for critical health services. This will not only seriously cripple vital ongoing health research and medical education projects, but also jeopardize activities that have been responsible for the discovery of previously unrecognized diseases peculiar to northern climates. The loss of the scientific personnel, many of whom are world renowned in their respective fields, of supportive staff and ancillary facilities such as the library, animal colonies or virus laboratory will be tragic and damaging not only for Alaska, but for the United States as well.

The abrupt, planned cutback in positions will unavoidably and necessarily reduce the effectiveness of the Arctic Health Research Center as a vital link which is without question essential to the protection and health of all Alaskans. It should be pointed out that the population of Alaska includes Federal and military employees and dependents numbering 55,000, approximately 20 percent of the total State population. Furthermore, Alaska will be placed in the impossible position, without lead time for planning and appropriations, of having to produce equivalent laboratory and research staff, equipment, facilities and related services necessary for health protection amounting to a minimum of \$350,000 for only the most urgent of these functions. While this is a virtual impossibility in itself, so also is the problem of securing adequately trained and experienced research scientists with the information which has been gained by Arctic Health Research Center from investigatory work and direct services in Alaska during the past 20 years. The precipitous action as is already planned for the Arctic Health Research Center is contrary to the interests of Alaska, its citizens, and the Federal Government. The latter stands also to lose, in the long run, both from the impact upon the health of its citizens and funds for subsequent corrective and rehabilitative services and research.

At the present time, there are no less than 48 vital health studies of importance to Alaska being conducted at the Center. They represent studies and research in northern climates of both immediate and long-range significance to Alaska and the other states. It includes results of original research and accumulated knowledge of human studies affecting the health of individuals and population groups, of animal studies of importance to human beings, and the wise development of technical equipment, scientific educational materials, animal colonies and other expertise that cannot be measured in terms of dollars alone without equal consideration of human values.

I wish to provide just a few examples that will indicate the essential nature of this work.

1. Rabies. Rabies among the wildlife in Alaska is prevalent and poses a constant threat to all persons in not only the outlying villages, but to domestic pets and in turn man in our urban areas. At the present time, rabies has reached epidemic proportions in Southcentral Alaska and threatens to spread into Canada. The Arctic Health Research Center has conducted all of the investigative and surveillance studies on rabies in the arctic and sub-arctic regions and is defining

endemic areas and determining natural reservoirs of infection that maintain rabies virus between epidemic periods. They have also determined the cyclic pattern of wildlife rabies in Alaska and are assisting the State in predicting and planning control methods for epidemic periods. The Center has served as the rabies laboratory for the state of Alaska and has furnished the primary diagnostic facilities for the examination of suspected rabid animals. This has enabled physicians to promptly treat individuals exposed or bitten by rabid animals. This capability must be maintained in Alaska to avoid serious delays in the treatment of individuals. The state of Alaska, to avoid costly duplication of services did not equip laboratories for this work and to do so now would require an immediate outlay of \$50,000 per year.

2. The WAMI Program (Washington, Alaska, Montana, Idaho), University of Washington Medical School and University of Alaska. The Arctic Health Research Center is an essential component in the development of the WAMI Program which the Alaska State Legislature and I have wholeheartedly endorsed. This involves the training of Alaskans as physicians under an arrangement with the University of Washington Medical School and is a project to relieve the medical manpower shortage that exists in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. Alaskan students will receive their basic science training at the University of Alaska relying heavily upon the health scientists and facilities at Arctic Health Research Center. This program has already been set in motion with the entering students commencing in September, 1971. Cutback in staff at Arctic Health Research Center jeopardizes and weakens this entire program with its importance for Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. The need for physicians in Alaska is a desperate one. This program must not be compromised.

3. Trichinosis. Arctic Health Research Center established the fact of the existence and extent of animal trichinosis in Alaska where it has been discovered in bears and marine mammals. Human infections and fatalities were also unveiled. Previous to this research, the true extent and nature of the infection was not known. Many natives and other persons who have eaten raw or partially cooked bear meat have suffered from this disease with some reported fatalities. Only through the work of Arctic Health Research Center in this field has it been possible to learn enough about the natural history of the parasitic infection in the animal population in Alaska to begin to be able to control it, to educate the public relative to use and preparation of foods likely to contain trichina and to protect Alaska's population.

4. Hydatid Disease (Echinococcosis). The original research on both forms of this disease, prevalent in Alaska, was and continues to be carried out at the Arctic Health Research Center. Scientists at the Center have painstakingly worked out the life cycles in the animal hosts and described this disease which occurs in benign and malignant forms in man. The malignant form is fatal when it initially involves the liver, and later the cysts spread to other parts of the body, particularly to the brain. It is not curable by surgery in the terminal stage.

This disease was initially recognized on St. Lawrence Island through importation of dogs from infected areas in Alaska. The disease has now spread to the fox population of North Dakota and South Dakota and now presents a health hazard to man in these states. The complex life cycle of the parasite in different animal hosts has been worked out so that the onset and spread may be mapped and controlled. It was discovered to be confined to the area along the west coast of Alaska. The most important fact is that the disease is picked up during early childhood. If children are screened early, infected children can be detected and treated suc-

cessfully. If not found early, the disease is fatal. It has taken 15 years of study to come to the present point at which it will be possible to program the diagnosis and the detection of this disease and put controls into effect.

With sorrow I wish to point out that Florence Melegwotkuk, Gambell, Alaska, an Eskimo artist, particularly famous for her pen and ink sketches of Bering Sea scenes, died three weeks ago of the malignant form of hydatid disease. She was in her forties. Had we progressed more rapidly by this point in time her disease may have been detected at an earlier age when successful treatment would have been possible. Others may now be saved if the continuing work on this disease is not slowed or terminated. Early detection in childhood saves lives. Allowing the infection to progress until adulthood means serious complications and loss of life. Does it make sense to reduce services, such as these, at this stage when lives can be saved through early detection of this disease?

5. Virus Laboratory. Since the early days of the Arctic Health Research Center, the virus laboratory has been serving the needs of the people within the State. This has been a cooperative undertaking with the Department of Health and Welfare and other agencies. The State has not developed a duplicate viral laboratory since this would be inefficient, costly, and a wasteful undertaking. Consequently, Alaska continues to depend on the viral laboratory for assistance with human specimens. These include diagnostic work during epidemics of viral infections that occur frequently within the State.

In 1970 an epidemic of meningitis occurred in the Kotzebue area. Without a viral laboratory it would have been impossible or too slow to determine the cause of the meningitis and methods of control. With the help of the Arctic Health Research Center the diagnosis of ECHO virus aseptic meningitis was made and consequent controls instituted. The State relies upon Arctic Health Research Center for help in nearly all epidemiological problems. These services are indispensable to Alaska, to travelers in Alaska and to international epidemic surveillance activities, since Alaska is the first point of entry from the Orient and crossroads stop between East and West.

To replace this laboratory by the state of Alaska would require a minimum of \$300,000 for the first year.

6. Black flies and mosquitoes. This major problem in Alaska is one which also has implications, as do the above examples, for construction and maintenance workers on the pipeline and the development of resources within Alaska. Studies on black flies and mosquitoes have been taking place at Arctic Health Research Center over a period of years relative to identification of the specific insect vectors and studies on breeding habits and control techniques. Without this fundamental research it would be impossible to control this potential health hazard and would markedly depress the activities of man in the development and use of the interior of Alaska.

Nearly endless additional examples could be given that would simply strengthen the point I have already made, which is the devastating effect of a cutback of 14 to 16 positions in the Arctic Health Research Center in College, Alaska. Other examples include the detection and classification of anemia among the Eskimo population, basic nutrition studies which indicate the type of native foods which are of importance to the health and growth of children compared to imported, commercially prepared foods and genetic counseling and cytogenetic studies among the residents of Alaska. These constitute fundamental, unique and practical efforts of importance to the health of the Alaskan people.

At this time it is important to advance these many practical studies and research which will elevate the level of health of Alaskans and prevent illness, accidents and other costly, unnecessary disease. How shall we justify cutbacks under these conditions when the Federal Government itself is alarmed at the spiraling costs of medical and health care and is urging and encouraging states to stress prevention and preventive health practices? Arctic Health Research Center and the state of Alaska have been functioning as a team to complement one another's services and research and to discover and control diseases and other threats to human health. This is prevention and optimal cooperation in its finest sense. It must not be destroyed. It is too rare to find these days. Federal agencies and publications constantly proclaim the virtues of preventive health services as essential for economical, social and health reasons. Yet the action in cutting positions at Arctic Health Research Center is inconsistent and achieves exactly the opposite. There is nothing that I am aware of that can be more egregious and harmful to the people of the state of Alaska than to permit the cutback of these positions and the weakening of the Arctic Health Research Center upon which we all depend.

I urgently request your active support in restoring the staff to the previously authorized level and rescinding any plans to reduce the staff. I am ready to testify before any committee on the importance of these developments.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

NUCLEAR POWER IN MAINE—CITIZEN ACTION CALLED FOR

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in the past several days, I have inserted in the RECORD of our proceedings the first six of seven chapters of a pamphlet entitled "Nuclear Power—The Greatest Threat to Maine," which has been compiled by a Maine citizens' group known as Citizens for Safe Power. The chapters were devoted to the problems which operation of the proposed atomic plant in Maine could cause, the likely inability to solve or even minimize these problems, and several of the more reasonable available alternatives to nuclear power. The insertions appear on pages 21717, 21781, 22109, and 22549 of this journal.

Today, I include the seventh and final chapter of the pamphlet together with appropriate footnotes and the pamphlet's epilog. The chapter's title asks the question "What Then Can Citizens Do About Nuclear Plants in Maine?" Its paragraphs suggest a number of impressive answers:

WHAT THEN CAN CITIZENS DO ABOUT NUCLEAR PLANTS IN MAINE?

Regulation of the AEC has proved impossible from the onset. Due to the complexity of nuclear physics, the necessity of classified information, privileges of eminent domain, dispersal of responsibilities over a maze of divisions, offices, boards, panels, committees, and establishment of a complicated system of arbitrary overseers, the technology in-

volved and the agency necessary for its management have now become so vast that the AEC bureaucracy has grown second in size to the Pentagon and has become even greater than its formal structure indicates, now reaching down through all the major utilities and construction firms, hundreds of thousands of personnel all the way down to the field inspector and construction foreman. "We have circumnavigated the globe many times over, spreading the gospel about the peaceful atom" (66) states AEC Assistant General Manager, Howard B. Brown, Jr. Utilities have now become franchise outlets of the AEC, which designs and develops the product, conducts the construction and operation licensing, controls all inspections, and determines operation and production procedures.

The most realistic way for Maine citizens to do something about the AEC is to try to protect themselves from Maine Yankee and future nuclear plants in Maine. The key to any control is public awareness of the issues involved. Can you afford to let ignorance and apathy shape Maine's nuclear future? The urge to do nothing is great. Nuclear power advocate, Chet Holifield, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, believes that the public will "never" know enough about radiation "because it's too complicated" but "that doesn't mean that precautions aren't being taken by those who know, to protect the person who does not know." (67)

Mr. Harold A. Campbell, Head Selectman of Wiscasset for 21 years and employee of Stone and Webster, Builder of Maine Yankee, knows. According to the AEC's accounting of the Wiscasset hearing in 1968:

"Mr. Harold A. Campbell, Chairman, Board of Selectmen, Town of Wiscasset, who spoke on behalf of the Board and the citizens of the Town, informed this Board (Atomic Safety and Licensing Board) that the Applicant and its lead sponsor, Central Maine Power Company, have been solicitous of the Town's interests in the proposed plant, that the Town endorses the application, and that it relies upon the Commission [AEC] with respect to matters of safety." (68)

Wife of Maine Yankee's Engineer who will be monitoring the environment, Mrs. Valmar S. Thompson, is Secretary and sparkplug for the Westport Conservation Commission. She knows:

"I have absolutely no reservations about Maine Yankee. I'd be glad to have my children swim near the plant." (Feb. 1970, planning meeting for SRBCA)

After several attempts were made to get the Westport Conservation Commission to investigate the impact of Maine Yankee on Westport, the Commission began to beautify their dump. Westport lies directly downstream and downwind of Maine Yankee.

Galen L. Rose, Research Associate, Maine Department of Economic Development, knows:

"We feel that nuclear, electrical generating plants are advantageous to Maine's growth, and we will welcome them until some actual (as opposed to imagined) danger becomes apparent." (Jan. 27, 1971, letter)

John Cole, Editor of the Maine Times, knows:

"Maine Yankee has a \$100,000 staff with nothing to do but find any little fault in what you say, and drive it home until you hear nothing else. One slip and you're dead." (Feb., 1971, personal interview)

Marshall Burk, Executive Director of the Natural Resources Council, knows:

"They (Maine Yankee) have gone too far. I wouldn't touch them with a 10 foot pole." (Mar., 1970, personal interview)

These are the people who know, or do they? And thusly your representatives have spoken or remained silent for you, and the vital decisions are now being made accordingly.

Most people in Maine do not even know

what Maine Yankee is, partly because the public has no legal role in decision making for construction or operation of nuclear plants, and largely because Maine Yankee has maintained a very "low profile." At the intersection leading to Maine Yankee on Route 1, their two by two foot sign that reads "Maine Yankee"—the words "Atomic Power Plant" have been neatly covered with a strip of matching cardboard. When concern or interest does arise their Consultants, Engineers, Information Coordinator, and/or Public Relations Department control any public meetings that evolve by either actually arranging the meeting or smothering it with "expert testimony". Maine Yankee experts do have an advantage over the public. One nuclear power advocate recently explained that you can tell all lies to the public and they'll never know the difference. They can't go back and read the source material (The Advocates, 1971). Actually however, there is only a five to ten year lag between the scientists' findings and general public awareness. Unfortunately the AEC has had 23 billion tax dollars to censor and rebuke these findings. Most people in Maine, including the Deputy Attorney General, assume there is no law against withholding information requested by the public. Thus Maine Yankee ignores specific requests for information from the public while cultivating public ignorance and frustration. Actually there is a Freedom of Information Act which the Civil Liberties Union recently used to extract information on the environmental effects of the SST. However, there is no one, no State agency or organization, not even the smallest local group, doing anything but accepting passively all the partial and misleading information offered by Maine Yankee. No one is seeking other sources of information or publicly questioning Maine Yankee's design of operation. In this information void Maine Yankee, the AEC, and all other utilities have become dangerously glib.

What does the nuclear power industry say of Nobel Prize Winners Linus Pauling, Dr. Joshua Leberberg, winner of the Nobel Prize in Genetics; Drs. Gofman and Tamplin; Dr. Sternglass; Dr. Radford, Dr. Charles Huver; Dr. Benjamin Sonnenblick, Zoologist at Rutgers University; Dr. Eipper, Dr. James Crow; Dr. E. P. Radford, and the hundreds of other top scientists deeply concerned and trying to regulate questionable nuclear plant operations?

"the radical environmentalists . . . those who would roadblock the avenue to nuclear power need to make their own risk analysis of the consequences of zero growth (Ralph E. Lapp)." (69)

"we are pleased to host Maine Yankee . . . the advantages must be weighed against such disadvantages unless we choose to live again as cave men." (Galen L. Rose, Maine Department of Economic Development, Jan. 27, 1971, letter)

"I guess we can say that these mandatory hearings are at least a safeguard against these extremists anti-nuclear people holding a kook-out." (Representative Hosmer, 1967 Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.) (70)

However, the critics are not asking that the utilities stop producing electricity; they are only asking that it be produced safely and with minimal cost to our health and limited environment for the sake of mankind's future.

Most groups opposing nuclear plants simply ask for more stringent radioactive release rates and monitoring and perhaps cooling towers. In the face of the utilities' refusal to acknowledge any hazards and make the slightest concessions, concerned citizens are usually forced into court action to stop construction or defer operations. In a few cases plants were stopped by concerned citizens for other reasons such as in California where a group of citizens stopped a reactor from

being built 1,000 feet from the edge of the San Andreas Fault, one of the largest and most unpredictable earthquake zones on earth. Perils of the Peaceful Atom reports:

"The citizens called in Dr. Pierre Saint-Armand, a professional seismologist from the Naval Ordnance Test Station at China Lake, California. After studying the excavation he reported two crucial findings.

First, the reactor site lay in an area where great strain accumulates in the geological formations. Here exceptionally high earthquake intensities develop when the material finally breaks, producing the quake movement or "fling." He even suggested that a great earthquake could be expected within the lifetime of the reactor, a view which has since been confirmed by a number of authorities. In such an event the site would probably undergo some three or four meters permanent horizontal displacement.

"Second, Saint-Armand found that the reactor was being built, in effect, on sand. After describing the ways in which the foundation material of crushed rock and alluvium would shift or transmit shock waves, resulting in serious damage to the reactor, its cooling system and supporting structures, Saint-Armand concluded: 'A worse foundation situation would be difficult to envision' . . . The AEC decided to bring in a couple of members of the U.S. Geological Survey, who said (a) the rock in that area could have slipped in recent geologic time, but left no evidence of the shear; and (b) whatever had happened in the past had no bearing on what could be surmised to happen in the future . . . PG&E filed an amendment to its hazards report which proposed building a structure surrounded by a layer of compressible material, allowing for movements up to two feet without critical damage, 'even though the possibility of such movement occurring is not considered to be credible.' Seven months later, when the excavation turned up a secondary earthquake fault, the bodega head plans were dropped." (71)

In New York a group of Cornell University Scientists stopped the construction of an 830 megawatt boiling water reactor on Lake Cayuga. They pointed out:

"Waters of Cayuga Lake are currently used to supply drinking water for many private residences and the communities of Aurora, Cayuga, Hibiscus Harbor, Seneca Falls, Trumansburg and under extenuating drought conditions, Interlaken. Several other towns or villages obtain water from wells with possible ground water connections with the lake. Concentrations of strontium-90 which could exist in Cayuga Lake after several years of discharge at maximum permissible concentrations greatly exceed those recommended by the National Technical Advisory Subcommittee for Public Water Supplies and Agricultural Uses. (72)

"It is difficult to conceive of any appreciable benefits to the lake's present ecology from thermal pollution . . . heated water . . . will increase the settling-out of organic material . . . increase the rate of oxygen consumption . . . reduce total oxygen available for animal life . . . entrophication . . . reaches a point where the water was a dilute 'pea-soup' appearance . . . development of blue-green algae, many of which produce foul odors, tastes, and substances which may be toxic to fish, birds or mammals . . . small aquatic crustaceans . . . are the basic food source for young of fish . . . It is not likely that these forage organisms could survive the extremely rapid temperature rise in the cooling system." (73)

The Conservation Society of Southern Vermont has challenged the operation of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Plant. As reported in the Massachusetts Audubon Newsletter, February '71:

"It should be emphasized that at no time has the Conservation Society attempted to halt construction of the plant or prevent its

operation . . . The status of the case is as follows: Some months ago, Vermont Yankee applied to the Vermont Public Service Board for a permit to secure permanent financing. The PSB is bound to consider the general public good in issuing such a permit, and the Conservation Society went to great efforts to introduce evidence and expert testimony regarding the environmental impact of the plant. The PSB considered the evidence, but in issuing a partial financing permit failed to make environmental findings. The Conservation Society threatened to appeal the permit on the grounds that environmental findings were necessary . . . appeal would have delayed the financing. With this strategic lever the Conservation Society, now joined by the National Wildlife Federation, the Lake Champlain Committee and the Vermont Natural Resources Council, was able to force Vermont Yankee to agree by contract to abide by State radiation standards, regardless of AEC standards . . . the contract is unprecedented, and Vermont Yankee might void or circumvent it in court, thus leaving the AEC standards as the sole controls." (74)

It should be emphasized that all of these actions entail lengthy and expensive opposition from the utilities and only accomplish something through "due process" of the law.

The "allusory imaginings of radical environmentalists" are in fact the reasoned judgments of the most recognized scientists in America today. The utilities cannot plead for more time. The AEC has been warned and begged by the best minds in the world since the early 1940's to acknowledge and investigate the consequences of all man-made radiation exposures to populations. Likewise the utilities have been warned by scientists and state and federal agencies to acknowledge and investigate the consequences of their thermal effluents. Even at present, neither the utilities nor the AEC show signs of conducting meaningful investigations, regardless of well publicized researched grants, into areas that might challenge nuclear construction and promotion. Should the public give them 20 more years to rebuke qualified critics and polish up their own public records and press releases?

By their saying that no one can actually say what will happen for a specific plant in any specific situation until it has been operating, utilities are telling the public to stick its collective head in the guillotine and not protest until it knows for a fact that it has been cut off. Based on utility logic one can never avoid harm until it is done, and once damage is done the public must accept any outrage for services rendered, because utilities have the power to deny alternatives. Nuclear Physicist, Ralph Elapp explains:

"The whole thrust by a utility is to live up to its franchise of providing abundant, low cost and reliable power while at the same time earning a hefty profit for its stockholders." (75)

The way to do something about Maine Yankee and future nuclear plants in Maine is to seek information beyond the voices of people on CMP-Maine Yankee payrolls. The greatest service any organization could do for Maine now would be to arrange talks by Dr. Gofman, Dr. Eipper, Dr. Radford, or any of the other top scientists deeply disturbed about the consequences of operating Maine Yankee and much larger nuclear plants in Maine. There is a growing host of top scientists committed to informing the public and by simply paying their travel expenses any of them would speak before Maine people. Many citizens groups commonly present 10-15 top scientists from all over the U.S. to testify at AEC hearings. Wherever the public becomes informed nuclear plants are forced to install adequate safeguards or to defer construction or operation. Simply, begin by reading information on nuclear power plants. There are a growing number of recent paperbacks, recent senate hearings and scientific

reports found in college and university libraries, even a variety of magazine and newspaper articles. Check the references of any information you read to see whether resources are more interested in promoting nuclear plants or protecting the public's health and environment. When you are concerned enough contact anyone who has organized public support for environmental action in Maine, or people and groups that have tackled nuclear plants elsewhere (see appendix). If there are no groups in Maine interested in facing the dilemma and gaining experience from those other groups send what contributions you can to these out-of-state groups as one certain way to direct your concern to Maine Yankee.

In a taped interview a scientist from Brookhaven Laboratories, where AEC research on reactor safety is conducted, sums up the heart of most concern:

"Implicit in the question about the siting of plants in Maine is a value judgment, not a scientific judgment, and that is, whether it is acceptable that 5 people get cancer as a result of the construction of a plant but not acceptable that a hundred people do. That's value judgment that people have to make. . . . When a person says that a 0.1% increase in the death rate from cancer is negligible then he's implicitly assuming that he's not going to be one of the 0.1%. On the other hand all human activity has a risk of a kind.

"People become upset when the risk becomes apparently calculable. I would guess that the reason Maine has been chosen for the site of plants is the fact that the population density is low and the people of Peoria would say it is better to site these plants in a low population density area than a high one simply because of the fact that we're going to have a fewer number of people that suffer."

Maine people have not been allowed to make that value judgment . . . While AEC officials in Washington in collaboration with Maine Utilities have made the decision to make Maine residents the expendable guinea pigs for the rest of the nation. State government has absolutely no jurisdiction over this decision. Maine people can make their own value judgment count by civil suits or direct initiative referendum that could serve an injunction to force more stringent safeguards or deter operations until the public feels adequate safeguards are instituted. The court precedents for deferring operation of nuclear plants after construction is completed have been established elsewhere when the public became aware of the issues and acted. Concerned citizens nationwide refer to Maine Yankee when they successfully appeal for deferred construction or operation to "wait and see what happens elsewhere." Elsewhere is going to be Maine. In 1968 the Northeast Regional Advisory Committee to the FPC reported that Maine, with her cold water inlets and low population density "offers special advantages for the location of thermal [nuclear fission] power plants . . . Attempts will likely be made to generate large blocks of electrical energy along the Maine coast for export out of state to serve the megalopolitan areas to the south." The report made one estimate of 20-30 nuclear plants in Maine by 2020 (Sleeper, 1971). Such '68 estimates are presently running nationwide about 65% below actual applications to construct. (Committee on Resources and Man, 1969). In 1970 Ken Travis, Environmental Engineer for Maine Yankee stated that some 80 nuclear plants are now proposed for New England and Maine would be the ideal site.

Perhaps individuals, particularly people downwind of Maine Yankee should sue because the involuntary jeopardy and expendability inflicted on their lives by the hazards created by Maine Yankee is unconstitutional. The strength of the suit would lie in a substantial and growing body of scientific evidence that cancer and leukemia as well as ex-

tensive environmental damage has resulted from normal operations of other nuclear plants and that the AEC cannot disprove such claims. The Federal Radiation Council reports:

"It is not prudent therefore to assume that there is a level of radiation exposure below which there is absolute certainty that no effect may occur . . . every use of radiation involves the possibility of some biological risk either to the individual or his descendant." (76)

Dr. Dean E. Abrahamson continues in a plea before the AEC's Atomic Safety and Licensing Board 1968:

"The evaluation of whether or not to accept this risk is not, however, a scientific question, but one involving social and political decisions based on an evaluation of the risks and the costs to eliminate or reduce the risks. Yet, we are being asked to assume a risk, which involves also our descendants, with neither a clear definition of the risk nor a statement of the costs to avoid the risk. In this instance, the only apparent gain is lower electrical costs, and even this cost has not been stated." (77)

At issue is the basis for an environmental bill of rights legislation and the impending national crisis in which the various vast and complex technologies of our Country are singling out individuals and minorities to involuntarily pay the price for the benefits distributed throughout an often separate majority.

Perhaps if Maine Yankee is allowed to operate it should be forced to pay, as a part of the cost of profit making, for all necessary devices and programs to adequately contain heated effluents and radioactivity and for the necessary monitoring to guarantee 100% effectiveness of this containment for the safety of area residents. At present the public will pay for the shareholders' profits in increased consumer rates, in State and Federal taxes for up to 70% of the "research and development" of Maine Yankee's reactor construction. There have been massive cut backs this year on reactor safety research, the bulk of the research dollar goes to making a reactor run that is already committed or even fabricated for a particular plant, for the bulk of insurance costs and initial fuel costs, for State monitoring and study programs, and for present planned and projected damage to the public's health and environment, plus all AEC promotion and administration of all nuclear plants. At present Maine Yankee will be activated next December on the unregulated, irrational basis of waiting to see, after the reactor runs a few years, if any harm is detected. Of course, under present plans and responsibilities monitoring of possible radioactivity exposures to residents from all known sources will not be undertaken, and comparison background data has not been collected that would establish whether operation of Maine Yankee caused other environmental damage.

Under the direction of a private testing laboratory citizens should implement a comprehensive and independent program for continuous 24-hour monitoring of air and water and all possibly affected foods, domestic and wild for specific isotopes within a 15 to 20 mile radius of Maine Yankee.

Perhaps a case for a closed "dry cooling tower" system should be made on the basis that there is every indication that present discharge practices will eliminate the last of a once one million dollar harvest of shellfish and marine worms in Montsweag Bay. According to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration there are mechanical draft cooling towers in operation that could control Maine Yankee thermal pollution and release only dry air, not the clouds of salt mist Maine Yankee threatens. They would cost the average consumer 75c to \$1.50 a year and assure no harm to the environment from thermal pollution. Plants can also be forced

to ship all their radioactive waste to reprocessing plants or install closed systems rather than dumping them into the local air and waters. These safeguards could be imposed on Maine Yankee by an informed public.

There is now a standing offer from a group of citizens of 25,000 dollars for anyone who initiates court action to stop or control Maine Yankee, and almost unlimited funds once the merits of a specific case are well established. The Western Sierra Club has a corps of lawyers willing to advise and one Boston member-lawyer, whose specialty is nuclear plants, is anxious to avail free services to any citizen group ready to organize concern about Maine Yankee.

Scientists from 15 countries have made a world-wide appeal for any specific data on radiation exposure to humans. This group (U.N. Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation) has been closely studying civilian radiation exposures for the last 15 years and now feels peaceful uses of atomic energy such as nuclear generating plants and their affiliated re-processing plants and miscellaneous radiation discharges have outstripped bomb tests as a threat to world health through radiation. They will make their concern a major point of the World Conference in Stockholm in 1972 (Brewer, 1970). It would seem reasonable for Maine people to demand at least a few months postponement of the activation of Maine Yankee's reactor until the findings of the '72 Stockholm World Conference on radiation hazards are made public and time given for evaluation of these findings.

At the very least citizens should have a record for the incidence rates for cancer, leukemia, emphysema and fetal mutations and mortalities within a hundred mile radius of Maine Yankee. Such records will give some indication of the consequences of the Plant's radiation, particularly 15 and 20 years from now.

Maine people have got to get started now and not be sidetracked, intimidated, or discouraged by Maine Yankee's assaults or State agencies and organizations that drag their feet. Right now, the coastal Maine resident from Kittery to Lubec who thinks Wiscasset's reactor is a local problem that is none of his concern, is just begging for a reactor in his own backyard—aside from misbelieving that Wiscasset's radioactivity won't reach him. Individuals must begin to inform themselves, take initiatives, and write to editors at local papers and their representatives expressing their sentiments. As L. E. Minnick, Vice-President of the Yankee Atomic Electric Company succinctly points out:

"You say that the AEC 'has grabbed 84% of the Federal Energy-Research dollar for the past 20 years.' A far more accurate statement would have been that 'the people of the United States, through their duly elected representatives in Congress and under both Democratic and Republican Administrations, have allocated 84% of the Federal Energy-Research dollar to the AEC' . . ." (78)

You should demand that tax appropriations be cut from the AEC's nuclear generating plant construction and operation subsidies, and restrict funds to breeder research and research of safe radioactive disposal methods. Thus the AEC would be relieved of its runaway promotional role and left to be strictly the research regulatory agency it should be. The remaining appropriations should be diverted to current research of other developing alternatives for power generation.

Citizens should support the proposal of Senator Mike Gravel to establish an Energy Commission that could decide what generating methods should be employed and where the research dollar should go among alternatives, and what pollution devices must be installed—not just promote nuclear power as the Atomic Energy Commission now does.

It is frightening to see how thoroughly Maine industry has diverted public attention away from the big issues to talking in circles about detergents and re-cycling trash, and even to the point where almost anyone will now defend criticism of nuclear power with an automatic "well where are we going to get the power?" A group of the states most qualified lawyers have found legal justification to defer operation of Maine Yankee but refuse to initiate action because present public apathy and ignorance would seriously jeopardize their case at the public hearing required. The issue of oil coming to Maine has been a very effective cover for the enormous strides made in rigging Maine for fantastic nuclear power generation in the very near future—without a murmur from the public. Nothing meaningful has been decided or accomplished locally on the oil issue which largely depended on the Alaska pipeline recently approved by the Department of the Interior. The pipeline decision was based strictly on economics completely ignoring the arguments of ecologists and conservationists. Considering the Machias Port hearings, one recalls many lengthy, self-serving shows, a few very earnest attempts to accomplish something, and a net result of greater distraction from the inconspicuous, ever-busy Maine Yankee construction. Most of the principles so earnestly defending Maine from all before the NBC TV cameras, were fully aware and informed of what was going on in Wiscasset. These same people have yet to say anything about Maine Yankee. The hearings now being conducted to actually site individual refineries are restricted to a very small sector of the public, and decisions are privately prearranged in Augusta or at local law firms.

The public is very likely to be caught in the very near future in a trade-off between a federally sponsored Dickey Lincoln type or tidal generating project and another nuclear power plant, the logical next location being another Wiscasset situation such as Cousins Island off Falmouth Foreside or near the former reactor site proposed in the Arcadia area. The public will simply lose either way in this unwarranted industry induced power spiral unless the public can organize to effectively say what it wants. Maine people must inform themselves because, aside from possible massive algae blooms and occasional fish kills that will be noticed by residents near Montsweag Bay, there will be no obvious change or effects from the operation of Maine Yankee. Radiation is undetectable to the human senses. The AEC and the utilities are confident that the Maine public will endure in quiet ignorance the tragic burden of greatly increased but scattered incidences of genetic damage and cancer. It is frightening that the public has yet to say a word about Maine Yankee because the public offers the only force that can do something to control or stop Maine Yankee. The State's politicians, agencies, and organizations are simply watching out for the public's reactions.

If you are concerned, write a letter, send it to your representatives in Augusta and Washington but be sure to send a copy also to the distributors of this pamphlet. They will publicize your desires and if there evolves a general consensus among enough Maine voters, a direct initiative referendum would be insured that would force compliance with your desires.

Until next December the choice is yours—whether you want to extend yourself beyond your immediate personal affairs and do something to inform and protect yourself from Maine Yankee and much larger future plants, or bury yourself deeper into personal affairs, accepting the imposed additional incidence of disease and death and environmental destruction under the ever present potential of total destruction. Once Maine Yankee is activated, contamination is irreversible and the

precedents are set for similar operations all along the coast.

EPILOG

Discussion of the threats to our environment and health from nuclear power plants cannot be termed accurate at any level, because of the unknowns and controversy that presently exist in the minds of our top scientists and because state and federal regulatory agencies are not making specific data available to the public. It is fundamentally wrong for concerned citizens to take the time of industry personnel. Our public health and environmental agencies should have, readily available, all the information the public seeks, and the services the public needs to protect its health and environment that lie beyond industry's private property. If the general public does not make its agencies and representatives effectively serve public interests, then the small citizen groups that are trying to avert the continuing sacrifice of the public's environment and health are forced to futile confrontation with state government and industry. Unfortunately the general public only reacts as a matter of expediency by initiating stop-gap measures after environmental and health harm has been done. Unfortunately, industry acts foremost to earn a profit.

When Paul Erlich, Ralph Nader, and segments of the public argue that our survival depends on "good old Mother Earth", they fail to recognize that maintenance of the natural biosphere is increasingly less feasible or as profitable as is controlled destruction of the natural biosphere. The less the public can depend on the natural biosphere the more they must depend on technology. The giant industries that have grown from man's need for private transportation and communications systems will be miniscule compared to the new complex of industries that is beginning to produce substitutes for the natural biosphere that supports man's survival—for a price.

As a friend concluded, the basic issue in conservation is aesthetics. The nuclear industry explains that I am that part of the "lay culture" that wants to hinder the national economy to preserve a natural earth, while our technocrats are building a brave new world where those that pay the price will ultimately orbit in titillating space stations around a dead and poisonous earth-warehouse of raw materials.

As Roy Gallant, science writer, and I entered the mammoth dome at Maine Yankee, Don Laubenstein, Maine Yankee's information coordinator, turned and said, "We are going to create infinite power and save mankind." Both Mr. Laubenstein and Plant Supervisor, Mr. John Randazza then argued that man can consume and produce *ad infinitum* by means of conversion and substitution. They argued that only technology can solve critical problems because man will never stem his population growth or change his values in time. Can the general public think about and act upon its future now? Our choice of life styles is becoming considerably less as we continue each day to mind our own business and increase consumption per family.

REFERENCES

66. Shepherd, p. 21.
67. Jacobs, p. 56.
68. U.S.A.E.C. Docket No. 50-309, License to Construct, p. 5.
69. Lapp, Ralph E., "The Four Big Fears About Nuclear Power," The New York Times Magazine (February 7) 1971, p. 24.
70. Curtis and Hogan, Perils of the Peaceful Atom, p. 225.
71. Curtis and Hogan, Perils of the Peaceful Atom, pp. 71-72.
72. Carlson, Jr., Clarence A. and Associates, Radioactivity and a Proposed Power Plant on

Cayuga Lake, Citizens Committee to Save Cayuga Lake, Ithaca (1968), pp. 10-11.

73. Eipper, A. W., and Associates, Thermal Pollution of Cayuga Lake, Citizens Committee to Save Cayuga Lake, Ithaca (1968), pp. 6-7.

74. McClintock, Atty. Morris K., "Vermont Nuclear Power Precedent," Massachusetts Audubon Newsletter, Vol. 10 (February, 1971), p. 7.

75. Lapp, p. 23.

76. Statement by Dr. Dean E. Abrahamson reprinted in Nuclear Power and Public Concern, 1970, p. 45.

77. Ibid.

78. Minnick, L. E., Vice-President, Yankee Atomic Electric Company, Westboro, Massachusetts, in a letter to The Editors of Look magazine, December 15, 1970, p. 2.

O HAPPY "BUST DAY"

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to have this fine article by a constituent of mine, Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, inserted in the RECORD:

[From the Tulsa Tribune, May 22, 1971]

O HAPPY "BUST DAY"

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Something called the National Bust Day Committee, headquartered in Allendale, Mich., has issued a call to all pot smokers to celebrate National Bust Day on June 5 by a massive clogging of the courts.

The idea, according to a release sent out to college newspapers, is for 10 million pot-heads (that's the Bust Day Committee's figure) to supply themselves with enough marijuana to be in clear violation of the law, and then to hurry down to police stations, display the weed, and demand jury trials.

Thus, according to the Bust Day strategists the courts will become hopelessly snarled and enforcement of all anti-grass laws will collapse.

This is undoubtedly the best idea since the miniskirt. For June 5 could be the day when America begins to get cleaned up. All that it will take will be a few simple preparations.

First, just before June 5 arrives the courts should appoint small delegations of leading citizens with reputations for impeccable truth-telling to sit around the police stations on Bust Day in order to corroborate police reports on who showed up with what. These citizens could back up the prosecution against any defendants who later might get cold feet and try to deny everything.

Special juries could run through the cases at high speed. After all, what kind of a defense can you put on for the character who waves contraband at a cop?

Any defendant who insisted on taking the stand in his own behalf could be asked the simple question, "Why did you go to the police station?" This would give him the option of throwing his own case or committing perjury.

As soon as the jails were filled, camps could be set up in public parks with tents and camp kitchens supplied by the national guard. Escapes should be no problem, since even old hands at pot-smoking could quickly grasp the fact that escape after conviction ceases to be a hilarious bash and becomes a serious matter.

Prisoners could then be divided into two

groups—those willing to work and those unwilling.

Those unwilling would be fed army surplus K and C rations. K rations taste like goldfish food and C rations like dog food. They are both healthy—a scientific blend of vitamins and minerals and GI's under combat conditions have lived on them a long time.

Such rations have been in storage by civil defense agencies for years and ought to be eaten up, anyway. People who would lie around the camps wouldn't need much—about 1,200 calories a day.

Those who would choose to work would be fed regular army chow, which isn't bad and costs about \$2 a day. So that court and jail funds would not be embarrassed, luncheon clubs, patriotic organizations and civic groups could call for Sponsor-a-Pot-Head funds to which many millions of citizens would contribute willingly.

One of the first jobs for the workers would be to get out to the scenes of rock festivals called to protest the ruination of the ecology and clean up the ruination of the ecology.

Then they could be hauled around to streams and watercourses where they could pick up old tires and accumulated trash. With all that manpower it would be feasible to hoist abandoned autos onto flatbeds and get them to junkyards for the benefit of county funds. Then the tidying-up of streets, alleys, highway rights-of-way and recreation areas could begin.

If, as the Bust Committee hopes, ten million pot smokers choose to get busted, let's say five million would lie around retching over K and C rations and five million would get hungry and busy. In 30 days that would produce 150,000,000 mandays for the benefit of environment and ecology. America would shine!

At the end of 30 days governors could pardon everybody. This would eliminate a lot of paper work.

In a year or two, when the country begins to get messed up again, another Bust Day could be organized, possibly at the instigation of F.B.I. agents dressed like hippies.

FORCED BUSING ENDANGERS SCHOOL ATHLETICS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recent Federal court decisions ordering massive forced busing of southern schoolchildren to create artificial racial balances is having a tragic impact on many youngsters and their school programs. School life means more than classroom instruction—it means learning about citizenship through clubs, bands, and sports, and the cementing of lasting friendships.

All of this is now in jeopardy because the court decided to deny the right of children to attend their neighborhood school because of their color.

To correct this tragic wrong, I have introduced a proposed constitutional amendment, House Joint Resolution 600, guaranteeing that the right of students to attend the public school nearest their home shall not be denied or abridged because of race, color, national origin, religion, or sex.

The potentially devastating impact of forced busing on the school athletic program in my home district, and on the

athletes themselves, was examined by Bob Chick, sports editor of the St. Petersburg Independent.

This thoughtful column gives insight into yet another problem caused by forced busing, and is offered here for the consideration of our fellow Congressmen:

ROTATING BUSING COULD HURT ATHLETICS

(By Bob Chick)

Though the athletic program will not be the overriding factor in the busing of high school students, it might still be appropriate to examine this area.

It has been suggested, but not yet adopted, a rotating district be established whereby a student would be bused one of his three years in high school.

Such a setup could endanger athletics as they are today.

First, put yourself in the position of the coach.

Joe Bullneck has played junior varsity football for you at such-an-such a school as a sophomore. Midway through the season you elevated him to the varsity and now as a junior he's sharing the load at fullback.

It's the fourth quarter. The coach looks to his bench and sees Bullneck along with Johnny Lightning. One player has to go in.

So the coach thinks.

Lightning will return next year. Bullneck will not be back. He'll be bused to your cross-town rival for his senior year.

Who is sent in? Not Bullneck. He won't be around and, rightfully, the coach is looking out for his own interest.

What happens to the boy, too, who spends his sophomore year at school Y, is bused to school X his junior year and then returns to school Y as a senior. Chances are it would be his first year at school Y on the varsity and if there are two boys with equal talent, a coach will undoubtedly go with the player with the most eligibility left.

Under those circumstances, adjustments to different systems of coaching could ruin a boy's high school career. A coach at one school might emphasize defense, whereby another system might be based on an offensive structure.

And how about competitiveness?

What about a player for school X in a head-to-head meeting with school Y. He might know the following year he'll be going to school Y. Will this take some of the edge away? Can you maintain desire under such a set of circumstances?

And when would such busing zones be announced?

So that indiscriminate moving from one zone to another would be eliminated, would the school board wait until the latest possible moment to announce the zones for the following school year?

If so, it could further damage the athletic picture.

Coach Y might have two quarterbacks he has worked extensively with during spring practice. Come fall and both his players have been bused and the coach is left without the key position to his entire team. One stroke of the busing zone could wipe-out, for example, an entire offensive line.

And how do you key a boy up about transferring from a school that went 9-1 to one school with little tradition and a 2-8 season? What would be the thoughts of such an athlete knowing if he stayed at school X, the club might have had an opportunity to play in the state playoff?

Any athlete playing for two schools in three years might find it difficult, too, to pick up an athletic scholarship. His talent could be wasted at one school because the coach knows the boy won't be back the next year. Gone, then, could be college scholarship assistance of as much as \$12,000-\$15,000 for a full four-year ride.

The borderline athlete might not go out for sports, knowing he lives 10-12 miles away, the bus taking him home leaves right after school and if he stayed out for the team he might not be able to make the arrangements to get home every night.

Football, involving 1,000 Pinellas County athletes, would not be the only sport in serious trouble with a rotating busing arrangement. An entire basketball starting five could be moved out during a single season. A baseball coach could lose his top pitcher and a track coach watch his relay team shattered.

Athletic programs are important to schools. Justly, the athlete should be weighed for what he is worth before any final decision is reached.

THE NEED FOR A VA HOSPITAL IN EASTERN CONNECTICUT—H.R. 8693

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, which I submitted this morning as testimony to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The need for new medical facilities in Connecticut is urgent. The Congress, and the Veterans' Administration, must act quickly to prevent a worsening situation from becoming a crisis. The material follows:

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT H. STEELE

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of submitting testimony to this Subcommittee in support of H.R. 8693, a bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in the county of New London, State of Connecticut.

I am fully aware that this Subcommittee has heard testimony from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs regarding the necessity of cutting the fiscal 1972 budget to bring it in line with the President's budget request. I am also aware of the unquestioned necessity of continuing to provide quality medical services to those who have served their country in time of crisis.

I urge this Subcommittee to provide new funding for the Veterans Administration to construct badly needed hospital facilities. And I specifically request this Subcommittee and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to review the need for a new facility to serve the veterans of eastern Connecticut, western Rhode Island, and Fishers Island, New York.

H.R. 8693 would authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to construct a three hundred fifty bed hospital in New London County, Connecticut. Veterans' hospital facilities in Connecticut and Rhode Island are currently inadequate to meet the growing demand for quality medical care. Increasing numbers of instances in which veterans have been unreasonably delayed in being admitted for treatment or denied emergency care are on record.

Moreover, veterans from this area have to travel fifty miles or more for treatment and medical care, and at considerable personal expense. Outpatients spend significant amounts of time travelling back and forth, thus reducing their employment attractiveness and job security. Long term patients must bear the loneliness of having their families too distant to make frequent visits; or an entire family's life-style must change

to accommodate the inconvenience, expense, and hardship.

There are approximately eighty thousand veterans in the counties of New London, Middlesex, Tolland, and Windham, all of which are in my District. Additionally, there are several tens of thousands of veterans in western Rhode Island which would be served by such a facility.

The need for construction of a new hospital in Connecticut is evident from the public statements of support collected from local governments. Resolutions of support from the City of New London, the City of Norwich, and the Towns of Waterford and Groton are included in my supporting materials for your review.

On May 20, 1971, Mrs. Thelma Scarano of Groton, Connecticut informed the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that she would donate ten to fifteen acres of her property to the Veterans Administration, if they would build a VA hospital on it.

In June 7, 1971, representatives of local chapters and posts of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Amvets, and World War I Veterans presented petitions signed by 8,000 of my constituents in support of the construction of a new VA facility in New London County. The petitions state that "as residents of eastern Connecticut [we] request the erection of a sorely needed veterans hospital in our area. With the mass return of discharged men and women from our armed forces in increasingly large numbers in the past six years and the advancing ailments of our older veterans there is a great need of this hospital as of today. We urgently press this request of the Veterans Administration."

For the eighty thousand veterans of eastern Connecticut, for the thousands of western Rhode Island, and for the eight thousand persons concerned enough to lend their names to the effort to obtain a badly needed and long overdue medical facility for the veterans of this area, I ask that this Subcommittee give careful consideration to the need of a new hospital in eastern Connecticut.

Thank you.

PROCLAMATION, CITY OF NORWICH, CONN.

Whereas, many thousands of veterans in the Norwich Area are in dire need of a Veterans Hospital, and

Whereas, the nearest Veterans Hospital is over sixty miles away from the City of Norwich,

Therefore, we, the City of Norwich, do endorse and favor having a Veterans Hospital located in the eastern Connecticut area.

THOMAS H. HISSOM,
City Manager.

Attest:

JOHN J. RYAN,
President of Council.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Town of Waterford, Connecticut, as well as the surrounding communities, has a large veteran population, and these veterans may find themselves in need of hospital services, and

Whereas, the distance to the present Veterans Hospitals is at least fifty miles and admittance to these facilities requires a considerable waiting period, and

Whereas, the difficulty in visitors making trips to these facilities is considerable, be it

Resolved, that the Waterford Representative Town Meeting supports the construction of a Veterans Hospital in the greater New London Area. The RTM urgently requests that this Hospital be constructed as quickly as funds can be appropriated by the Federal Government.

FRANCIS J. PAVETTA,
Town Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW LONDON ENDORSING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A VETERANS HOSPITAL IN THE NEW LONDON AREA

Whereas, there are three Veterans' Hospitals in the State of Connecticut and said hospitals are over an hours travel time from the New London area; and

Whereas, Veterans and patients in these hospitals, which are over-crowded, are frequently disappointed because visitors are unable to travel these distances; and

Whereas, there are over sixty-six thousand Veterans in the New London area and this number will grow with the younger men coming home from Viet Nam; and

Whereas, there are long waiting periods to get into existing facilities in the state as well as local hospitals,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the City of New London, as follows:

We hereby support the construction of a Veterans Hospital within a ten (10) mile radius of the Gold Star Memorial Bridge which spans the Thames River;

That this hospital be created as quickly as funds can be appropriated by the Federal Government for this needed program in order to facilitate the medical needs of the Veterans of southeastern Connecticut.

Adopted by the Council of the City of New London at its meeting held on Tuesday, December 8th, 1970.

Attest:

GRACE M. PODESZWA,
City Clerk.

Dated at New London, Connecticut, this 9th day of December, 1970.

RESOLUTION

Requesting the President of the United States and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to construct a veterans' hospital in southeastern Connecticut

Whereas, there is an urgent need for hospital facilities for veterans throughout the Southeastern Connecticut, Western Rhode Island and Fishers Island, New York, areas, and

Whereas, the number of veterans in said areas has increased substantially over the past several years, without any increase in hospital and medical facilities to said veterans, and

Whereas, there are extreme conditions of overcrowding and inadequate or reduced hospital and medical facilities throughout said areas, and

Whereas, the veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict and the Vietnam conflict, deserve and are entitled to accessible and adequate hospital care and medical services, of which they are presently being deprived, be it

Resolved, that the Town Council of the Town of Groton urgently requests the President of the United States to approve, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide for the construction of a new veterans' hospital with all necessary facilities, adequate to serve the hospital, medical and surgical needs of those who have served their country in time of war and conflict, such facilities to be located convenient and readily accessible to the veterans residing in the Southeastern Connecticut, Western Rhode Island and Fishers Island, New York, areas, and be it further

Resolved, that the Town Manager is hereby requested and directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, and to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

This is to certify that at a meeting of the Town Council of the Town of Groton held January 4, 1971, the above resolution was adopted.

Attest:

SALLY M. SAWYER,
Town Clerk.

HENRY TAYLOR ON GREECE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following four columns were written by the well known columnist Mr. Henry J. Taylor during a recent visit to Greece.

Mr. Taylor is no newcomer to the Greek scene, having been in that nation during all three attempts by the Communists to seize control of the last Balkan State remaining outside of the Soviet Bloc. He points out that although Greece bravely resisted the Nazi invasion during World War II, almost defeating Nazi forces five or six times stronger than her own, that—

In all those horrible years of Nazi invasion and occupation Greece's casualties did not equal the incredible 250,000 Greek men, women and children killed during those two Red attempts to take over Greece (following World War II).

Mr. Taylor goes briefly into the strategic importance of Greece as an ally to the United States and the deteriorating condition of the U.S. 6th Fleet.

The following articles, released by United Features Syndicate Inc., on June 16, 18, 21, and 23, are recommended reading.

The article follows:

HENRY TAYLOR ON GREECE—I

(By Henry J. Taylor)

ATHENS, GREECE.—Premier George Papadopoulos conducted a two-hour discussion with this writer in his office here. Only our interpreter was present. I submitted no questions in advance. And the prime minister agreed that all he said, from start to finish, was on the record.

First, he mentioned his so-called "government of colonels." There are only three colonels in it. Greece has a civilian government by any reasonable definition, even though it resulted from the military take-over of April 21, 1967. This fact accounts for the great gap so noticeable here between public opinion (and support of the government) inside Greece and the impression abroad.

The government is pro-U.S.A., pro-NATO, pro-free world and anti-Communist. Premier Papadopoulos described the struggle to keep it that way.

The result is an "underdog" situation in the Balkans and the eastern Mediterranean so vital in the American interest that this struggle literally becomes ours, too.

The prime minister turned to the map in defining Greece's problem. His country's entire 700-mile northern frontier borders on Communist countries. Greece is the only Balkan nation not behind the Iron Curtain. It is flanked by two NATO countries now showing increased instability and demoralization—Italy and Turkey. A stable Greece is a strategic imperative in the American interest.

This works two ways. What is our meat is the Communists' poison. Accordingly, anything that can be done to discredit the government here is a major objective in Moscow. The prize for success is enormous, the tools for the objective are worldwide, and the campaign goes on day and night.

"We feel it everywhere," said the prime minister. "But surely this should be no surprise in the United States or throughout the free world."

Mr. Papadopoulos is a soft-spoken man, instinctively courteous, and when I asked why such a transparent attack was not better understood abroad he pointed to the incomparable strength of the worldwide machinery available to those who would benefit from the Greek government's collapse.

This systematized attack includes creating discouragement within the government itself. It centers on a point on which the government appears vulnerable. At the time of the 1967 takeover the government declared itself a "provisional government" and few here doubt that this was its honest intention. But the admittedly irresponsible behavior of young King Constantine in making totally unrealistic personal demands, the traditional impact of Greek political factionalism and the immense dimensions of the essential economic rehabilitation has battered that intention.

The preparation of the new Constitution was overwhelmingly approved in a national referendum vote. But the timing of the termination of the provisional government—by announcing an election date as a result of outside pressures—encounters large questions of foreign and internal confidence in which the timing is not as consequential as the realities.

"Admittedly, the delay can be construed as self-serving," Prime Minister Papadopoulos stated on his own initiative, "but I wish every member of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives would come here and judge our intentions. In fact, anyone is entitled to that judgment. All that we ask is that they come to Greece, travel throughout Greece and judge for themselves.

"Our task," he continued, "is to avoid the outside discouragements and pursue, instead, the aspirations of the Greek people themselves by every possible encouragement to them—their security, their liberty, their industry, their patriotism and their honest pride in this country.

"The Greek is a man of many parts. He loves liberty—sometimes in our history even to the point of governmental anarchy—and we know it is ridiculous to envision that a government could survive here for long by authoritarian means.

"The Greek is also, by nature, suspicious and does not give his confidence easily. He has suffered greatly and he is no fool. We can succeed, in his eyes and our own, only as we struggle in his behalf as fellow-Greeks whose aspirations are identical."

All that honorable men anywhere can do is struggle for the good of their country, and struggle even harder as the external forces of destruction grow greater. There is bravery here—and ability—totally justifying the helping hand of the United States.

HENRY TAYLOR ON GREECE—II

(By Henry J. Taylor)

PLATAEA, GREECE.—Almost 2,500 years ago the young soldiers from this Greek city ranged the left flank of their Athenian allies and stared across the Plain of Marathon. Through the early morning haze they saw an enormous mass of Medes and Persians.

Persian King Darius I led this army and he threatened to engulf Greece and, with that, conquer the remainder of the known Western world. And, had this Persian succeeded on this plain 26 miles northeast of Athens, Western civilization never would have developed as it did.

But the warriors of Plataea and Athens defeated the Persians here and gave Greece time enough to consolidate its states into the resemblance of a united nation that could defeat the Persians at sea in the battle of Salamis when they stormed Athens itself.

The story of Greece is a story of 25 centuries of bloodshed and this has continued into the lives of nearly all who live here today.

Greece was an anti-Nazi country that did not collapse. She fought heroically against, and almost defeated, Nazi forces five or six times stronger than her own. In fact, Greece was the only Western ally to sustain a successful land campaign against the German-Italian axis on the European continent for the first four years of the war. In our own country let that not be forgotten.

The British deserted the Greeks in their final hours of crisis and there were hundreds of British soldiers left stranded here when the British withdrew to the island of Crete, yet not one British soldier was betrayed to the occupying Nazis. The Greeks hid them, fed them, and cared for every one—and all of this at the risk of their own lives.

This country lived under that Nazi invasion and occupation longer than any of our NATO allies. In fact, of the 15 NATO nations only eight were ever occupied by the Nazi forces. Then came two Communist take-over attacks, both of which I witnessed here. And in all those horrible years of Nazi invasion and occupation Greece's casualties did not equal the incredible 250,000 Greek men, women and children killed during those two Red attempts to take over Greece.

Every mile of this lovely land's 300-mile northern frontier borders on a Communist country. West to East, these are: Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria—all Red and all ready. Greece dangles like a plum under them—today the only Balkan nation outside the Iron Curtain.

The third Red attempt was made in 1967 and I was here then, too. I moved that April the entire distance along the three Red borders in the north. The conveniently mountainous terrain made (and still makes) guerrilla infiltration as ideal as from Red North Vietnam into South Vietnam. It was apparent that someone had to act, or Greece was on the verge of being another South Vietnam or a Castro Cuba.

On April 21 Col. George Papadopoulos and an officer group overthrew the shaky government of Premier Panayiotis Canelloponos. On December 14 young King Constantine II fled to Rome, along with Premier Constantine V. Kollias, whom the King had preferred in April after the coup, which resulted in today's government misnamed cryptically abroad the "government of the colonels".

The alternative to this government could well be a Red government—a fact many propagandists in our country and elsewhere make it their business to ignore.

Yet this is the essence of the American interest—or should be. By the present government America's interest, not the interest of the U.S.S.R., is served. Greece is our country's NATO partner. It fully supports NATO and our foreign policies as a whole. The Red attackers who were stopped by "the colonels" publicly swore to withdraw Greece from NATO, and they remain to this day as anti-American as the Red leaders in Hanoi.

The Soviet clearly threatens the free world in the Mediterranean. It is a countering of this threat which is indispensable in the American interest. We need an ally, not an enemy, in Greece. The relation of this government to the security of the United States is the basis on which Greece should be judged. And the internal situation here is the subject of another article.

HENRY TAYLOR ON GREECE—III

(By Henry J. Taylor)

CORFU, Greece.—Our U.S. 6th Fleet is here and I have come to this Greek island to be with it. Its visiting range is tragically limited. Greece, in fact, is the only country in the entire eastern Mediterranean where our 6th Fleet can congenially call.

It cannot go to neighboring Turkey, long a solid anchor of NATO in the eastern Mediterranean, without provoking street riots, protest bombings and crippling internal strikers. That represents a complete reversal of our defense capability in this explosive part of the world.

Moreover, west of Turkey and except for Israel, Tunisia and Morocco, the entire southern rim of the Mediterranean is hostile to us. Syrian, Egyptian and Libyan harbors are available to the immensely expanded Soviet Mediterranean fleet. Algerian President Houari Boumedienne's denials notwithstanding, our Office of Naval Intelligence finds that he has offered the Soviets the use of the former immense French Mers-el-Kebir naval and air base near Algiers. This established the U.S.S.R. within 260 miles of Gibraltar, prepared to block the Gibraltar Strait and confront, or deny, the access of Western navies to the Mediterranean.

The U.S. 6th Fleet today consists of about 50 vessels, including helicopter carrier, two aircraft carriers and 200 aircraft. Its personnel numbers 25,000, plus only a combat-ready battalion landing team of a scant 3,000 Marines.

Its ships are badly aging. The fleet's commanders do not see how they can compensate for time's natural disintegration. Typical of our Navy as a whole, an alarming proportion of the 6th Fleet was built during the 1939-45 war period and is nearly 30 years old.

It faces a nearly-new Soviet fleet. Typical of the Red navy as a whole, only one per cent of the Soviet vessels in these waters is 20 years old.

Nor is that all. Our 6th Fleet is short of manpower, including sufficient technicians; short of planes; short of other combat equipment; short of ammunition reserves, vital electronic parts, and spare parts as a whole; and it has insufficient logistic backup.

In a hypothetical showdown between the Soviet Mediterranean fleet and our 6th Fleet in which the Russians would fire first, I find not one American officer of flag rank who is willing to give me clear assurance of the outcome.

As for Greece, its naval force is largely assigned to submarine operations in its NATO responsibility. But the submarines are antiquated American and British vessels, and, even though the Greeks have been great sailors from time immemorial, our Navy men take a dim view of the Greek effectiveness in this role for that reason.

Domestically, this NATO member country is not too worried about enemy Tito in neighboring Yugoslavia. Actually, and surprisingly, the eye of the Greek army is on Bulgaria. And when President Nixon authorized the resumption of military aid to Greece in spite of criticism of the "government of colonels"—so much of it totally unjust—the Soviet's buildup of Bulgarian forces was an undisclosed but important factor.

Bulgaria's infantry is now highly mobile and new tank formations are constantly entering service. Also, the Bulgarian air force is receiving the best fighter and bomber planes being used by the Soviet Union itself and joint maneuvers with the Soviet air force are a regular thing.

The morale of the Greek army is high. But the number of its "divisions"—that elastic term of military measurement so often quoted in deception and self-deception—is largely meaningless. For their equipment has been sparse and thus the defense capability was proven to President Nixon to be very limited. On the air side the same applied, even though we assisted in the training of Greek airmen, and they are excellent flyers.

Moreover, a hodgepodge of foreign equipment has so contaminated the effectiveness of Greece's armed forces as a whole that the hodgepodge nearly defies logistic support and combat refurbishing.

Admittedly, before President Nixon stepped in and authorized the resumption of military aid, Greece's entire armed forces could not have restrained an attack by the Bulgarian forces alone—just the Bulgarian forces—for more than two or three days. Militarily, this lovely land was ripe for the plucking. Absorbing the contrived criticism promoted outside Greece, President Nixon could not reveal the whole story.

HENRY TAYLOR ON GREECE—IV

(By Henry J. Taylor)

DELPHI, Greece.—I have spent long periods in this lovely land, returned many times, and have always liked and admired the people, their colorfulness, their history, their bravery. This ageless place—Delphi—is in Greece's hinterland and in the hinterland the people are poor. But it is here, close to the soil, that you find the true Greek.

Most Greek peasants still measure time by such ancient ruins as are here and in donkey-hours of travel. The adjective Spartan is suitable. Nearly all have known in their lives that inner feeling when a man defies his own limits. But among Greece's peasants the word for a friendly American translates as "guest," and you encounter at once the peasants' simple delight in doing anyone a service.

What they want is close around them. Their families, their land, their livestock—and the security of these—mean everything. They couldn't care less about the Athens government's ideology or anything having to do with Athens so long as they feel safe. They went no trouble out of Athens, and surely no bloodshed, and they abhor those Greek emigres who sound like trouble, blast the government and shout at them from afar, "Let's you and him fight."

Criticism abroad of today's "government of the colonels" ignores the priority of this national feeling for order is now the order of the day in this strife-weary country. This has great popular appeal—as it might in our own country—and makes up for a great deal more than we may think.

Moreover, emigres, such as movie star Melina Mercouri, who shout from abroad that it is unsafe to visit Greece are bitterly resented as hurting their homeland. They're quite openly called liars, besides. Foreign spenders visiting Greece are like Zeus descending on Danae in a shower of gold. They are this country's largest single source of income.

Through June of this year tourists will exceed 560,000—up 24 percent from 1969. Their 1971 spending will nudge \$160 million. Mercouri-like damage to this tourism bonanza ruffles Greek feathers like a fox in a henhouse.

In simple truth, there is not a section of this country that could conceivably be safer for the ordinary visitor. You find that this safety extends from the most-crowded districts in the cities—like Athens' old Plaka section pressing on the Acropolis or the Salonika waterfront—to even the remote, ancient troglodyte houses built in the hinterland's cliffsides during the Turkish occupation and many of which are still occupied.

As one result, able, experienced and highly impressive Minister of Coordination Nicholas Makarezos tells me he finds it significant that for the first time in postwar Greek history more than a million Greeks now have savings accounts—a 400,000 increase in the past four years—and that these represent more than half the nation's entire bank deposits. Minister Makarezos regards this as individual votes of confidence by the people in the country's stability.

A Balkans-poor country—and a scattered country about the size of Alabama but with 166 inhabited islands—Greece is lifting itself now by its bootstraps. Only one-fourth of the total area is arable. Only bauxite is present in abundance and new, costly hydro-

electric developments have had to take the place of coal.

Under Secretary George Georgalas tells me that, in spite of all this, in 1967 Greece's gross national product increased 4.8 per cent, in 1968 it increased 5.5 per cent, and in 1969 another 8.5 per cent. In 1970 the increase exceeded 10 per cent and this year's increase is expected to exceed even that. Workers' incomes have risen 10 per cent per annum. Meanwhile, the average industrial share on the Athens Stock Exchange has climbed 140 per cent since 1968.

Actually, the economic advance here now exceeds that of any country reporting its status, even Japan, and, astoundingly enough, in the past four years Greece has shown the least rise in prices of any country in the entire world reporting same.

One key to its success is Minister Makarezos' assurance to foreign investors that their investments will not be confiscated. This contrasts with the nearby southern rim of the Mediterranean where confiscation is rampant in Syria, Egypt, Libya, etc. The current American losses alone through confiscation or shotgun marriages with governments are running into the billions of dollars, and with no end in sight.

"Greece in view! O, joy!" sang Byron—and so sing the tourists and the investors alike.

RODEO STOCK PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, cruelty to animals is always offensive. Cruelty justified in the name of entertainment is even more offensive.

While the Congress has been responsive to some extent in bringing a halt to the inhumane treatment of animals—by passage of the Horse Protection Act of 1970, Public Law 91-540, for example—it has not yet attempted to bring a halt to inhumane treatment inflicted upon rodeo animals.

Horses, steers, and calves are an integral component of rodeos, which last year attracted some 40 million Americans to their shows. The unhappy aspect of these productions is that often the animals are subjected to cruelly painful abuses. Devices such as electric prods and flank straps are used to induce horses to buck by means of the inflicting of pain. Steer busting and calf roping are contests which likewise inflict pain and injury on the animals.

To end this cruelty, I have introduced the Rodeo Stock Protection Act of 1971, H.R. 9027, reintroduced as H.R. 9389. This legislation makes it unlawful to transport in interstate commerce any animal which is used or intended to be used for the purpose of steer busting, calf roping, steer wrestling, or which is subjected to the various pain inflicting devices such as flank straps. In addition, the Rodeo Stock Protection Act of 1971 makes unlawful the buying or transporting in interstate commerce of these devices, when the buyer or transporter has reasonable cause to believe they will be

used in the course of a public performance, such as a rodeo.

I want to make clear that not all rodeos are guilty of the abuses which I have recounted. But many are. For the animals used in those rodeos, protection is needed. This is not to say that the cowboys who participate in rodeos do not also suffer injuries. That they do is clear. But I believe the crucial distinction is this—the men and women who perform in rodeos do so of their own volition, and for monetary gain. On the other hand, the animals who suffer in calf roping contests and the animals on whom are inflicted flank straps have not chosen this fate.

Three recent articles point up very well the issues involved in considering the Rodeo Stock Protection Act of 1971. The June 28 issue of Newsweek magazine includes an article entitled "Ride 'Em Cowboy—Gently." In this article, the author quotes naturalist Roger Caras, who states:

This Roman arena syndrome should no longer be tolerated. I am not out to destroy the rodeo. I believe it is legitimate Americana. But there are parts of it that are unconscionable.

I share Mr. Caras' sentiments. My aim is not to end rodeos, but only to assure that the animals used in them are not subjected to inhumane treatment.

In the June 17 issue of the Village Voice, M. Stuart Madden writes of rodeos, also, in an article entitled "Ambushing the Rodeos: How the West Was Won." Mr. Madden points out, in the course of his article, the abuse inflicted by the bucking strap:

Most of the roping and bucking stock in the modern rodeo is thoroughly domesticated and pathetically confused. A bronc bucks in a frenzy because of the pain of the bucking strap and the shock of the prod, and the animal soon learns that it must throw its rider to escape the pain. Immediately after the ride a clown or chase cowboy will gentle the bucking strap and lead the stock away.

In addition, Bob Addie, in his June 18 column in the Washington Post, discussed the rodeo stock issue, and particularly the response of the Rodeo Cowboys Association to the legislation which I have introduced.

At this point, I am including these three articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From Newsweek Magazine, June 28, 1971]

RIDE 'EM COWBOY—GENTLY

It was once the spirited pastime of working cowhands who drove great herds of beef to marketplaces in the north. Lusty, ragtag affairs, "ridin' and ropin' contests" were little more than colorful tests of manhood, and the simple lure of the sport was best summed up in an old cowhands' maxim: "Never a cowboy who couldn't be thrown, never a bronc that couldn't be rode." From such modest frontier origins, the rodeo has grown into a vast network of highly profitable shows staged everywhere from dusty hamlets to big-city arenas. Last year alone, some 40 million Americans turned out to see 3,000 rodeos.

But now, in an age of ever-proliferating causes, the rodeo is under vehement attack from naturalists and humane societies for alleged cruelty and inhuman treatment of its animals. Not surprisingly, cowboys regard the

charges as unjust and the critics as prissy Eastern dudes. And last week, in a counter-attack, officials of the Rodeo Cowboys Association hired a public-relations firm, and then flew into New York themselves to stage a benefit performance to set the city slickers straight. "I've never heard any complaints out West," says RCA secretary-treasurer Dave Stout. "It's all coming from the East. The folks around these parts deserve to hear the truth."

Naturalist Roger Caras disagrees violently. "It's high time these people are exposed," he told NEWSWEEK's Peter Bonventre. "This Roman arena syndrome should no longer be tolerated. I'm not out to destroy the rodeo. I believe it's legitimate Americana. But there are parts of it that are unconscionable." The author of fourteen books on pets and wildlife, Caras takes the rodeos to task for a whole gamut of alleged cruelties from steer busting to abuses of the bucking horse.

Steer busting in fact has already been outlawed in 47 states. In this "contest," a rider lassos a steer by the horns and lets the rope run taut along the steer's right flank. Then, the rider gallops off at an angle to the left in hopes of catching the steer's hind legs and tripping it. But actually, the maneuver doesn't simply trip the steer; it hurls the animal high into the air. After crashing to the ground, the steer is dragged at full gallop around the arena until "stunned," and then the rider dismounts and ties its legs. As a result steers regularly have their horns broken, their ears ripped and their eyes gouged. This event was held only nine times last year in RCA-sanctioned rodeos, but RCA president Dale Smith hardly helps his cause when he admits, "It's like a pro football game. If those boys were playing touch, who would come?"

Abuses: Caras and his supporters claim that even worse abuses are inflicted on rodeo horses. They say that the majority of rodeo horses are actually saddle-broken animals that have been on the circuit for twenty years or more and must be driven to buck—usually by kicking or using electric prods, spurs and, particularly, the flank strap. The RCA vehemently denies that any of its cowboys kicks horses and insists the electric prod is never used in connection with an actual event, but rather as the most humane method to move recalcitrant livestock.

"That is categorically an untruth," responds Caras. "I have seen prods in the hands of gamemen and I have seen horses kicked. They use those prods to get the horse to come out of the chute like a bat out of hell."

The most controversial rodeo device of all is the flank strap, a fleece-lined belt that is tied about the horse between the rib cage and the hind legs. Beyond a doubt, this area of the animal is highly sensitive, and the anti-rodeo forces regard the strap as nothing less than "an instrument of torture." For its part, the RCA maintains the flank strap is simply a painless aid to "help" the horse buck more vigorously. "Would you like someone tying a string around your testicles?" says Caras. "That strap is painful. Technically, once the horse has thrown his rider he should stop bucking. In the rodeo, you will notice he doesn't; that's because he wants to get rid of the strap."

Dr. Donald Delahanty, a prominent Cornell University professor of veterinary surgery, retorts that the strap is secured over the intestines, not the genitals, and insists that "the flank strap is an annoyance. It cannot cause any physical harm. Pain is not an issue; it has been made an issue." Delahanty believes that the horse's response to the strap may eventually become Pavlovian in nature. "A horse can learn to respond to simple tricks rather quickly," he notes. "Just as a race horse responds to a starting bell, a bucking

horse knows he has to perform when he's got the belt on."

Code: To its credit, the RCA has willingly cooperated with the American Humane Association, and both groups have worked out a uniform nationwide code of nineteen rules that govern the handling of rodeo livestock (among them, that there shall be a veterinarian on the premises and that all injured animals be removed immediately from a show). But while AHA officials regularly inspect RCA-sanctioned rodeos, it is impossible to police all of them. The RCA participated in 547 rodeos last year—which was only one-sixth of the total number held throughout the country. The remaining five-sixths were conducted by other professional outfits, high-school and college teams and a large number of unsupervised amateur performers.

The richest and most glamorous group in the rodeo world, the RCA is making a concerted effort to insure the respectability of the sport. If it can't, others will try to impose controls from the outside.

"We are putting the rodeo on notice," says Caras. "It is no longer facing little old ladies in tennis shoes. It is up against people who are concerned about their self-image. We will be looking over their shoulders from now on."

[From the Village Voice, June 17, 1971]

AMBUSHING THE RODEOS: HOW THE WEST WAS WON

(By M. Stuart Madden)

"If you ever had the blues, you know just how I feel,

Puts you on the wander, makes you want to squeal.

When you take the blues, can't figure what to do,

Jus' find yourself a rodeo and ride the whole world through."

Enjoying a history as colorful and elaborate as that of any sport in the world, American rodeo is no longer the provincial pastime of the Old West. In the last five years the rodeo has become an unbridled coast-to-coast attraction, and is likely to be an annual event in areas anywhere from Daytona to the Cow Palace. "Keep the children happy, keep the ladies happy," barks a balloon man at one of last year's 3000 rodeos, "Be a Rodeo Daddy for a Day!" Sunburst and spangled jalopies, clowns and stock shows have made some modern rodeos into barnyard extravaganzas, while even the smallest shows can bring out entire broods for rodeo fun like "Jackpot Roping," an event for every member of the family. For everyone the rodeo's promise is no less than that of a day to bask in the myth of roughhewn Old West history.

To meet the demand, the Rodeo Cowboys Association, formed in a 1936 cowboys strike at Madison Square Garden, is now joined by the newer and for the most part younger independent Rodeo Association. Between the two professional cowboys leagues, RCA- and IRA-sponsored rodeos last year commanded the paid attendance of 25 million fans, half again as much as college football.

This month rodeo sportsmen are fit to be tied over the spring offensive of the Humane Society of the United States. Under its new president John Hoyt, the HSUS is challenging stock breeders, rodeo sponsors, and some 5000 professional cowboys to "tell it like it is in rodeo advertising." In brief petition to the Federal Trade Commission the HSUS has asked the government to investigate "alleged deceptive acts and practices" by the rodeo industry. The HSUS says America's most glorified native entertainment is rigged, and that the bucking broncos and Brahmas are no more "wild and unbroken" than the gunslingers in a Disneyland de-guello are genuine outlaws or apt to bleed

real blood. Specifically the group maintains that the bulls, calves, and horses in the rodeo's roping and bucking events perform only after the cowboys' use of painful bucking straps and electric prods with the homey nickname of "hot-shots."

This is not the first legal ambush the rodeo has sustained. In an on-going fight with the Ohio state legislature, the rodeo as it is now produced is banned from that state. Ohio law now forbids the use of bucking straps, electric prods, or other inhumane devices for the maneuvering of rodeo stock. Rodeo men have taken to calling past and current attacks the "destruction of a wholesome sport by people who don't know which end of a horse you hang a bridle on," and the RCA has now hired the services of the New York public relations firm Ruder and Finn. According to the Rodeo Sports News the advertising group charged primarily "to combat anti-rodeo groups more than to promote the sport." For the year, the sport's face-lifting may cost the RCA \$68,000.

Today's "Rootin' Tootin' Wild West Rodeo" had its origins, of course, in the necessary range work of the expanding West, with its mythic cattle drives, the taming of wild horses, and the fashioning of nature for (white) man's use. M. S. Robertson's lengthy history of the sport scatters tinted daguerotypes of early California round-ups among photos contemporary rodeos to reinforce the connection between the modern entertainment and the original ranch skills, making rodeo "a traditional native American sport, a product of our heritage."

Cowboys, on the other hand, will tell you the need for such work went out with the turn of the century. The ranges for the most part fenced and whatever romance there was in range work left unrequited, the cultural slack was soon picked up by traveling Wild West shows. The ragtag troupes like Bill Pickett's, with his frontier bands and singing cowgirls, re-affirmed the dying arts of range and rope work and introduced new stunts, some of which were never a part of stock work to begin with. By way of example, steer wrestling, in which the cowboy leaps from his horse, buries his knees in the steer's chest, and slams its horns to the ground, was never a range-developed skill. Any cowboy who broke a steer like this would find himself busted from a job. Equally artificial is the history of "Bull-dogging," invented by Bill Pickett himself. In "Bull-dogging" the cowboy sinks his teeth in the steer's lower hip or nostrils to insure a clean take-down.

It's not unnatural that what was once Western fact turned to fancy. The present 20th century order of life is now confirmed, however sorrowfully, along with its industry and institutional tyranny. In the face of this the cowboy myth serves up the memory of unending Western ranges and the continental adventure at a time before it dropped in America's lap like an over-ripe fruit. The rodeo, as this Western myth's modern liturgy, tells those who listen that a man can still buy his own whiskey, rope his own cattle, and even mete out the people's justice with two-fisted certainty.

No description here intends to belittle the danger faced by a rodeo cowboy, who in pursuing a very modest wage may be gored or trampled if his grip is hasty, but who will likely be out of the money if he errs on the side of prudence. Rodeo judges will tell you they grade the cowboys on "style and economy of movement, like a springboard diver," but the competing cowboy knows he works against time. Depending upon the roping or tying event, a contestant may have less than 20 seconds to win a potential 20 points in categories from "spurring and general control" in the chase to knot tying after the tackle. If a cowboy can stun an animal in the fall, then binding the unconscious steer's legs

is no problem. For the steer with its horns pegged to the ground or the calf with its neck snapped, though, the 15-second show is barbarous and final. Dead or wounded stock are ordinarily sledged from the arena while the rodeo clowns may re-assemble the barrel boundaries and the announcer assures. "Don't worry folks, it's just had the wind knocked out of it."

Rodeo fans shouldn't look to learn this and other trade secrets from the advertising and hustle when the rodeo hits town. The rodeo is presented to the public as the "last frontier," the electrifying drama of man over beast "brought to you straight from the Old West where men were men" and women worth their oats behaved like men too. As rodeo advance men recently hyped a local show for a Miami columnist, "You take a few wild bulls, and some mean horses, a number of steers, several calves, and then throw in a couple hundred cowboys to rope and ride these critters and you have America's most exciting and challenging sport, the rodeo."

To the rodeo's public presentations of self, the HSUS might reply that the only electrifying drama in a bronc's spasms to shake its rider comes from the electric prod in its flank as it explodes from the chute. In truth there are next to no wild horses left in this country. Even if for the sake of hypothesis all the remaining mustangs were in America's rodeos, ranch hands everywhere aver that the worst way imaginable to accustom a horse to the saddle would be to torment and terrify it. Most of the roping and bucking stock in the modern rodeo is thoroughly domesticated and pathetically confused. A bronc bucks in a frenzy because of the pain of the bucking strap and the shock of the prod, and the animal soon learns that it must throw its rider to escape the pain. Immediately after the ride a clown or chase cowboy will gentle the bucking strap and lead the stock away. Without the bucking strap the stock stills quickly, and the ruse is there played out for everyone to see. By this time, however, the crowds have fixed their attention on the fallen cowboy or the next "wild" ride.

Bull bucking events also need this deliberate coaxing to turn a one-ton Brahma into an unnatural terror, even though these bulls are never ridden, even for sport, on any but the "dude" ranches. To impute a native rivalry between Western man and the Brahma bull is to forget that these same bulls lounge peaceably in the streets of India's cities, where they endure the bustle of motorists and the mischief of children with an ecclesiastic patience.

Most onlookers are unaware of the bucking strap's use on broncs and bulls alike. Rodeo backer Robertson says the strap "is no more annoying than a girdle is to girls," but this is clever nonsense. The iguinal and flank areas of bulls and broncs serve to protect the reproductive organs and are extremely sensitive. Moreover, as former HSUS president Mel Morse writes in his book "Ordeal of the Animals," "There may be barbed wire under the bucking strap, or sharp tacks or heavy needles placed there to guarantee that the bull will buck. Most spectators . . . are probably unaware that the bull, before he was driven into the chute, was beaten, whipped, and goaded. The combination of fear and pain turns the bull into an exciting performer, and the wilder he reacts, the higher the fee his devoted owner can demand at the next show."

Robert M. Miller, DVM, calls this malarkey, and told the Western Horseman, one of the sport's trade magazines, that "rodeo serves as a mental and physical outlet for energy, which if not properly channeled could easily lead to less desirable activities . . . Let's not be maudlin about this. Fear for a calf or a bull is not necessarily a bad thing. In fact, fear can even be stimulating or challenging,

although a gentle old dowager might find that concept a bit incomprehensible."

Miller quotes liberally from Genesis to affirm man's just domination "over the cattle and over everything that moves upon the earth." The veterinarian goes on to remind critics that the rodeo animal's work hours cannot be beat, for the stock only bucks for several minutes a week. "If I were a horse," Miller says, "I'd want to be a rodeo bucking horse."

In spite of Miller's claims, even the rodeo men who rail bitterly over the Buckeye legislature and the HSUS admit the systematic stock manhandling and shocking in the rodeo. In justification they say the broncs and bulls are "Mexican," and perforce unpredictable or "sour." Others agree with Miller that the rodeo animal is downright lucky not to be pulling a plow, or in the case of the older animals, shipped off to the renderers.

The HSUS attorneys do not expect any radical auto-critique or self-suggested revisions by the RCA and IRA as all three groups await a decision from the federal agency. In the meantime the HSUS is running a series of anti-rodeo advertisements in national magazines, one of which under the headline, "Is This the Way the West Was Won?" shows a photograph from a recent rodeo. The cowboy and the bronc are still in the chute, and behind the rider are the judges who measure the quality of the critical first few bucks. To the horse's other side are two cowboys entrusted to assure just that quality. One is putting his full weight into tightening a strap around the bronc's underbelly, another is jabbing the horse with a cattle prod. The humane group says it hopes the paying public, given a candid explanation of the fraud and cruelty within the rodeo, will no longer support the sport. Furthermore, recognizing the intimacy and confidence Americans place in television, the HSUS has urged the Federal Communications Commission to enjoin televised rodeos, with two nation-wide and several regionally telecasted round-ups last year, until producers explain to their audiences the posturing of the events.

In response, the RCA has made the informal but taunting invitation for HSUS president Hoyt to "ride one of our broncs," without accountermments, "if he thinks they're so tame." It was a sentiment shared by Arthur Godfrey, recently rehabilitated as an ecological saint, who rasped on nationwide radio, "John Hoyt doesn't even know if horses roost in trees." It can be seen that the rodeo, counting its constituency if not its members, has an expansive cultural pool from which to draw allies to its defense. But until Ruder and Finn can turn on a high power public rebuttal, it would seem the rodeo reaction is stalled at the level of Biblical incantations and a theory of Mexican bile.

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1971]

RODEO BUCKS BACK: BOB ADDIE

Followers of the late show occasionally run into a rodeo movie where "Tex" rides "Black Fury," the bucking bronc, and gets to keep the horse while losing the girl. Rodeos have been with us for some time as a reminder of our heritage and the old West, and they're just as popular in the East as in cowboy country.

Outside of movies, few people ever think about rodeos or the people and animals in them. But a rodeo stock protection bill was introduced in the House last week by Rep. William F. Ryan (D-N.Y.) charging that "while the rodeos are enjoyable entertainment, they are based on intentionally inflicted cruelty upon the animals used."

That brought a more furious buck from the Rodeo Cowboys Association than any bronco ever gave its saddled members. Along with Ryan's charge, the Humane Society of

the United States petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to prohibit the broadcasting for rodeos.

The Humane Society wanted the FCC to obtain "full disclosures of any and all methods or devices used to cause the rodeo animals to buck, act wildly or otherwise appear to be 'wild,' 'unbroken' or 'dangerous.'" The FCC decided not to issue a complaint against the rodeo promoters.

There may be some purists who object to calling rodeo a "sport" or the cowboys "athletes." But then, a rodeo is as much of a sport as a horse race or an auto race. It takes skill, stamina and nerve to take part in a rodeo and at last count there weren't many old cowboys competing.

Ryan's bill brought a detailed rebuttal from the Rodeo Cowboys Association which is to rodeo what the NCAA is to intercollegiate sports or the PGA is to golf. And, along the way, some interesting facts were uncovered.

For instance, the RCA supervised 547 rodeos in the United States and Canada last year. There is even a World Series of rodeo in December. This year it will be in Oklahoma City and tickets are no easier to get than for the baseball version.

Rodeo cowboys, like Little Leaguers, start young. From junior rodeos the youngsters go on to national high school competition and then to college—that's right, college rodeos. There is a National Intercollegiate Rodeo Association which, surprisingly, has 88 member schools.

It's a tough racket for a cowboy. He has to pay his travel expenses plus rodeo entry fees. He gets no "appearance" money or guarantees. He draws down only what he can win in a performance. A highly skilled cowboy, if he is lucky enough to escape injury, will average around \$40,000 a year. But it isn't like a golfer who can make that much winning a couple of tournaments. The rodeo cowboy has to hit the circuit for 12 months a year, with perhaps time out for the Christmas holidays, to make that kind of money.

Most cowboys are little guys, weighing around 150 pounds. They pit that 150 pounds against a 2,000-pound bull, and it does get a little tougher than even football.

Bucking horses are hard to find. Usually, they are animals that have refused to become gentle. They will accept care, such as watering and feeding, but they won't allow anybody to ride them.

The RCA says it is not unusual for horses to be bucking when they are 20 years old, equivalent to an 80-year-old human being. The bulls don't last as long but there are many still performing in rodeos from 10 to 13 years of age.

Humans, on the other hand, don't last as long. It's a rare cowboy who has been performing in rodeos for 10 or more years.

In his speech before the House last week, Ryan touched on some of the "cruel practices" employed in some rodeos such as an electric prod in a sensitive area, to make the horse jump out of the chute, and a flank strap pulled tightly around the horse's groin. Not true, says the RCA which explains that the prod is used only on the shoulder or hip and is more humane than a whip. As for the strap, the rodeo group says this covers the underbelly of the horse and is not harmful.

The RCA points out that not even Congress could be as stringent in its control of rodeos. The group adds that every cowboy must carry with him the official rule book listing 19 rules to insure humane treatment of livestock.

"Which way would you vote if you were a horse?" asks the RCA academically. "Would you like to buck approximately two minutes a month in the rodeo arena and receive feed, shelter and medical care all year long until you come to a natural end or would you rather meet an early end in a dog food can?"

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an overview of the existing situation in the field of pharmacology was aptly presented by Dr. L. C. Weaver, dean of the College of Pharmacy, of the University of Minnesota, at the recently completed Minneapolis health hearings.

Among other things, Dean Weaver effectively presents a case for continued stability in Federal health manpower programs. The failure of the Federal Government to maintain a sufficient level of support to promote the growth of these programs to meet our growing needs would have a disastrous impact on our future.

Dean Weaver points out that those in the field of pharmacy are a well-trained but underutilized group of people. His remarks follow:

PRESENTATION: HEALTH POLICY ISSUES

(By Dr. L. C. Weaver, Dean, College of Pharmacy, University of Minnesota, February 27, 1971)

PHARMACY MANPOWER

The 73 accredited schools of pharmacy in the Continental United States and the one in Puerto Rico are responsible for the nation's supply of pharmacy manpower. Currently, there are 128,842 pharmacists in practice in the United States and its territories (Minnesota, 2,269). The supply in relation to the population decreased gradually for nearly two decades, but it has been increasing for the past two years and now stands at 63.2 per 100,000 of population.

The educational program requires a minimum of five years beyond high school. Two schools require six years (four years following two years of preprofessional work) and several schools also offer the long program on an optional basis (Minnesota in 1971).

The 73 schools in the Continental United States have an enrollment of 15,326 students (Minnesota, 252) in the last three years, and 22 percent are women. During 1969-70, there were 4,716 graduates (Minnesota, 75), a number less than that required to replace those who leave the practicing pharmacist population annually.

About 83 percent of the pharmacist population of 128,843 is practicing in the 52,500 community pharmacies and about 8.5 percent is practicing in the hospitals throughout the country. The remaining 8.5 percent is employed in the control, research, or product development laboratories of the manufacturing plants; as medical service representatives to the physicians; in our schools; in government; and in the Armed Forces.

In hospital pharmacy where about 11,000 pharmacists are employed, the demand is greater than the supply. Of the approximately 7,000 hospitals, only 67 percent had a pharmacy with a registered pharmacist in 1967.

In addition to the demands of the hospitals, the profession is attempting to meet the pharmaceutical needs of the many nursing homes and extended care facilities. Through training courses offered by the schools and pharmaceutical associations, community pharmacists are being instructed in order that they can serve as consultants to these facilities and to small hospitals. About 1,000 community pharmacists have received such instruction in the last years.

Thus, the continually greater demand for pharmaceutical services of our increasing population necessitates an increased output of pharmacists. In 1969, 1.24 billion prescriptions were filled—about 71 million more than in 1968. Therefore, the annual increase in the number of prescriptions alone is demanding that the community pharmacist and the hospital pharmacist devote more and more of their time to strictly professional services. In fact, it has been estimated that by 1978 community pharmacies will be called on to fill 3.1 billion prescriptions annually and that, because of the shortage of pharmacists, there will be a "prescription gap" of between 400 million and 1 billion, i.e., this number of prescriptions would go unfilled under the present system of pharmaceutical service.¹

The Office of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Administration recently completed an informal, technical analysis of the probable impact of third-party programs on retail pharmacy by 1975. This study shows that, on the basis of the current system of the delivery of pharmaceutical services and with 50 percent of the population on third-party programs, the nation is likely to be faced with a critical shortage of pharmacy manpower by the middle of the decade.

In retail pharmacy (community pharmacy) the analysis shows that there will be an apparent gap (shortage) by 1975 of from 3,500 to 18,400 pharmacists and in hospital pharmacy a shortage of from 1,000 to 3,000 pharmacists. For all of the areas of employment the predicted shortage ranges from about 6,000 to 71,000 or more.

The increasing number of women enrolling in pharmacy soon will have an impact on our manpower needs, since the number of years they are active in the profession is much less than that for men. Women now constitute 22 percent of the students enrolled in the last three classes of schools of pharmacy, whereas 11 years ago they made up but 10 percent of these classes. Also, the rate of increase in the percentage of women students is accelerating; the increase from 15 to 20 percent occurred during the three year period 1967-1970, whereas the increase from 10 to 15 percent required seven years.

THE ROLE OF THE PHARMACIST

Through the years the pharmacist has traditionally served as the distributor of drugs. The schools of pharmacy provided programs which made their graduates experts on drugs.

In recent years, however, it has been realized that to play a more meaningful role in the increasing need for health services, the pharmacist must be not only an expert on drugs, i.e., drug oriented, but also he must be knowledgeable with the disease state, i.e., he must be patient oriented as well.

The University of Minnesota College of Pharmacy recognized this need early and initiated experimental clinical pharmacy programs during 1967. These programs have been expanded as rapidly as faculty resources would permit. We have used affiliated institutions such as hospitals, nursing homes, mental hospitals, group practice clinics, community pharmacies and other health education facilities to give our students a patient orientation. Minnesota is recognized as a pioneer in exploring these new avenues for the preparation of a more useful pharmacist.

Thus, the patient-oriented pharmacy graduates, because of these new clinical experiences, can serve an even more important role than is now being served in the physician-patient-pharmacist relationship. This role, including health education, preventive medicine, and a triage (screening) function of patients, can serve to supplement and

complement the role of the physician in both the rural and the urban areas. Projects to test these potential roles for the pharmacist will be initiated as soon as proper planning can be completed.

The group practice concept, perhaps through Health Maintenance Organization now being advocated, would permit the utilization of the pharmacist's potential to the maximum. He could serve an important role in advising patients on the use of non-prescription drugs, in referring to physicians those who need attention, in advising patients regarding the proper use of prescription drugs, and in health education and preventive medicine.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Schools of pharmacy along with schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, and podiatry are eligible to participate in all programs of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act (Public Law 88-129 and amended by Public Laws 89-290 and 90-490). The programs provide for construction funds, scholarships and loans, and for institutional and special project grants.

Construction. As of June 30, 1970, there was a backlog of approved but unfunded applications for construction grants totaling \$465.4 million, of which \$9.2 was for schools of pharmacy. The total amount of unfunded grants for pharmacy, veterinary medicine, optometry and podiatry was \$85.4, with the remainder of the \$465.4 million for schools of medicine, dentistry and osteopathy.

It is understood that for the present funding cycle some \$7 to \$8 million of funds have been frozen which should be available for the construction of schools of pharmacy, veterinary medicine, optometry and podiatry. Your assistance is respectfully requested in freeing these funds for the use intended.

The University of Minnesota College of Pharmacy is in the process of preparing a federal grant application for a new facility in the health sciences complex. We believe that the eventual development of a health team has the best chance in an environment where faculty and students prepare themselves together to serve the patient. We see no solution to funding without federal assistance. This latter continues to be inadequate. Something must be done to make more construction funds available to all health units, particularly those that have not been financed in the past.

Scholarships and Loans. The need for financial assistance to students of the health professions is well established. Without adequate assistance, the objective of the legislation cannot be achieved.

While the proposed budget for loans for FY 1972 is \$22.027 million, about 12 percent less than that provided by Congress in 1971, the *Appendix to the Budget for FY 1972* shows that the estimated number of loans to students of pharmacy, veterinary medicine, optometry and podiatry will be 4,159 compared to an estimated 7,560 in 1971. This is a 45 percent decrease for students of these four schools while the number of loans to medical and dental students in 1972 is essentially the same as in 1971.

Again, it is respectfully requested that you assist in maintaining the loan program at least at the 1971 level for schools of pharmacy, veterinary medicine, optometry and podiatry.

The number of *scholarships* to be awarded to schools of pharmacy, veterinary medicine, optometry and podiatry in FY 1972, according to the President's budget, will not suffer the marked reduction to be experienced in the loan program. The number to be awarded in 1972 is the same as in 1971, 6,325. For medicine, osteopathy and dentistry, a total of 11,930 are to be available in 1972, the same as in 1971. We are grateful.

Institutional and Special Project Grants. Institutional grants are made to schools on a formula basis in order to strengthen their base of financial support, thus increasing their enrollments and the number of graduates and to improve the quality of their programs.

Schools of pharmacy received about \$10.2 million under this program in FY 1970, the first year of eligibility. An amount about equal to this is anticipated in 1971.

Some of the deficiencies in the programs of colleges of pharmacy could have been corrected years ago and, perhaps, the pharmacists would be providing a more meaningful contribution to health care today, had federal funds been available as they have been for dentistry and medicine. If pharmacy is to accomplish the important health roles envisioned by many, this federal aid must be continued at an effective level. We solicit your continued assistance.

Special project grants are awarded on a competitive basis for the development of new programs, to increase enrollments, to increase the faculties, to improve curriculums, to develop training programs for auxiliary health personnel, and to assist schools in serious financial straits.

Schools of pharmacy became eligible for these grants in FY 1970 for the first time. However, because of the need to continue grants awarded in previous years and the need for funds to assist schools of medicine and dentistry in dire financial straits, only two schools of pharmacy received grants although about 65 schools made application for grants totaling nearly \$10 million.

The President's budget for 1972 holds no greater hope for an increase in the number of grants to schools of pharmacy unless Congress increases markedly the appropriations for this program category.

I was a part of the pharmacy review committee concerned with these applications for 1971 and 1972. You can be assured that there were many worthwhile proposals and several which would have had a favorable effect toward improving health care. We are desirous of initiating a new professional Doctor of Pharmacy program which will prepare a pharmacist to serve in the capacity of "applied clinical pharmacology." The resources to initiate this important program are not yet available.

Need for Stability of Health Manpower Program. The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act has provided the health professions with most essential financial assistance, albeit limited in some categories.

However, it must be stressed that there is a distinct need for stability in the program. While the level of funding is, of course, important, the schools must be assured of a program for a sufficient period to enable them to plan wisely over a period of years. The best possible use of funds can be made, and hence the greatest improvement in the quality of the educational programs will result, only if there is a stable program. For example, the attraction and retention of additional well qualified staff members can be achieved only through such stabilization. In many instances, the parent institution would be unable to provide the necessary "backup" in the event federal funds are not available.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING

It would appear that Public Law 91-515 strengthens the health planning authorities of Public Law 89-749. In Minnesota we see the development of an effective Comprehensive Health Planning organization. All of the 314(b) areawide agencies will be active before the end of the year. It is imperative that resources be made available to test the full potential of this "Partnership in Health" approach. It is important that you stay informed of the progress of Comprehensive Health Planning in Minnesota in order that you can assist in all ways available to you.

¹Rodowskas, Jr., C. A., *Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association*, NS10, 196 (1970).

ECONOMY PRESENTS SERIOUS PROBLEMS TO LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the troubles of our economy present serious problems to both labor and management representatives at collective bargaining tables. And the Nixon administration is complicating these problems with its present economic policies.

I agree with AFL-CIO president George Meany that collective bargaining—with the accompanying right to strike—is essential to the functioning of a free economy and society. With steel negotiations going on and other important ones coming up, this subject is an interesting and timely one. For that reason I was particularly interested when Mr. Meany presented his views on collective bargaining and its relationship to our economy to the Collective Bargaining Forum in New York recently. I include his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY BEFORE THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FORUM LUNCHEON MEETING AT AUTOMATION HOUSE, 49 EAST 68TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y.

These are interesting times for students and practitioners of collective bargaining. Besides all the usual factors that have to be considered in labor-management relations, we have some unusual and even mischievous influences to take into account.

So today I would like to talk to you briefly about the backdrop and the context in which negotiations are taking place these days.

First, we have severe dislocations in the economy at large. We have the almost unique problem of simultaneous inflation and recession. We have high unemployment and low production, and yet prices continue to climb.

Management of many companies, other than banks, are dissatisfied because profits are not rocketing upward as they did before this Administration took over. Workers are dissatisfied because their earnings are lagging behind the cost of living and lagging badly. The way their purchasing power is being squeezed, they urgently need higher wages just to break even.

So both labor and management negotiators have their work cut out for them to reach just, fair and workable settlements in an economic climate that can only be described as difficult.

These problems are being compounded by the unusual amount of doctrinaire advice unions and managements are receiving about what decisions they should reach at the bargaining table. Not much of this advice is useful or constructive. Some of it adds up to dangerous interference with the machinery of collective bargaining.

A great deal of this misguided advice stems from a complete misunderstanding of what collective bargaining is.

Those critics who keep telling us, in the face of all the evidence, that collective bargaining won't work, look on the bargaining table as an arena of conflict from which victory emerges for one side and defeat for the other.

But those closest to collective bargaining,

who understand how it works, know that problems are not created at the bargaining table. That's where they're solved.

And when the bargainers don't find an immediate settlement—when there is a strike—that too is part of the collective bargaining process. A strike isn't a tragedy; it doesn't signal the collapse of collective bargaining, no matter how often ill-informed editorialists profoundly declare the process dead.

I don't like strikes. As a matter of fact, I've never met a union leader who preferred a strike to a settlement.

But I do like the right to strike. That right is essential to freedom; in fact, it is the hallmark of a free society. And, as President Eisenhower said, "There are some things worse, much worse, than strikes. One of them is loss of freedom."

And even when there is a strike, the ultimate agreement is at the collective bargaining table.

Something like 97% or 98% of collective bargaining negotiations are settled without a strike. This is a good record. We should do better. I hope we will do better. But we must not tamper with the right to strike—that's too basic to a free society.

So we think quite highly of the collective bargaining process and quite scornfully of those who routinely write its obituary.

And we view with real hostility those who would try to destroy collective bargaining between employer and employee no matter what weapon they use—government intervention in favor of one side; naked union-busting or the favorite solution of some academic theorists—compulsory arbitration.

We know collective bargaining is not a perfect instrument. It couldn't be for it is the creation of imperfect men.

But it does work. And, in my book, that's the test of democratic devices. It is a responsible method for resolving the conflicts that naturally arise between investors who want the highest possible return on the money they invest, and workers who want the highest possible return on the labor they invest.

Obviously successful collective bargaining agreements can't be concluded except by the free consent of the people who have to live with them. Such agreements have to produce specific solutions to specific problems. They have to be drawn by the people who know what the problems are, and what resources can be found and what compromises can be reached to resolve them.

Of course, the parties can agree to let an impartial umpire decide disputed issues. That method, voluntary arbitration, has a respected—and I think—growing role in labor-management relations. But once again it is the element of free choice—the free decision of both parties to arbitrate—that is the essential ingredient.

I said we had hostile reactions to those who, in the name of political expediency or because they fear the free decision of free men, would disrupt this sensitive instrument of decision. Let me list a few for you.

First is the Council of Economic Advisers—those busybodies who helped create today's economic mess and who now seek to inject themselves into the basic steel negotiations before the parties have begun to talk.

I say this not simply because the Administration is attempting to stack the cards in management's favor, but because it is wrong for the Administration to interfere on behalf of either side.

For the President's advisers to attempt to dictate terms is a violation of the rights and responsibilities of both sides and it is harmful to both sides.

If the government dictates what wages workers will receive, it is simultaneously dictating what wages management must pay. And from there it isn't much of a step to dictating how many workers management shall employ, and how much it shall produce

and what and what prices it shall charge and what profit it may make.

A free society cannot afford government efforts to undermine and short-circuit the collective bargaining process no matter how momentarily appetizing it may appear to the favored party.

And then there is Dr. Arthur Burns, the economic tinkerer whose "game plan" brought about the Nixon recession.

He wants to do away with collective bargaining altogether and substitute compulsory arbitration in key industries.

He wants the government to establish an "income policy"—that is, a wage ceiling—on the earnings of workers.

Dr. Burns blames America's collective bargaining system and the high wage economy for all of the nation's economic ills. He argues that workers should have a smaller share in the nation's economic pie, and it seems he is doing what he can to make it smaller.

This architect of President Nixon's tight-money policy, this inventor of the Nixon "game plan", this man who sent interest rates to their highest level in a hundred years, this academic economist whose economic theories deprived 2½ million Americans of their livelihood and put the national economy in a nosedive, isn't satisfied.

Dr. Burns wants compulsory arbitration and he wants it to restrain wages. He makes no secret of it.

I suppose there will be short-sighted men in management, and some instant-solution-seekers among the commentators, who like this idea. While it would undoubtedly hold down wages, it would also undermine the nation's consumer purchasing power, the life-blood of our economy.

Coupled with court injunctions, it could—for a brief time—even stop a strike. But, of course, that kind of labor peace, the peace of tyranny, wouldn't last—for, as history has proven time and again, slaves revolt. Workers denied their freedom, denied their just share of the wealth they help create, just won't work—no matter what the law or how stringent the injunction.

And, let me remind you, a free, just and democratic society rests on the conviction that no man can be free unless all men are free. To accept and condone and profit by the destruction of other men's freedom is to insure the destruction of one's own freedom.

Personally, I am convinced that management generally, which values its own freedom, will reject compulsory arbitration just as firmly as workers do.

Let's talk for a moment about an incomes policy, although I have in mind one that is vastly different from the Burns' concept. I think this nation is long overdue in establishing a concrete scale of economic justice. We need a humane floor that will prevent suffering and guarantee at least a modest but adequate standard of living to all Americans.

If the nation needs an incomes policy ceiling—and only the President can make that decision—it must apply to every form of income, without loopholes, exceptions or evasions.

Nothing else is acceptable.

We have said many times that, if any such controls are found necessary, and if they are applied fairly, justly and across the board, American workers will cooperate.

But Dr. Burns never talks about ceilings on bank profits, interest rates, dividends, rents, expense accounts, hospital charges, doctors' fees, insurance rates and stock options.

He talks about wages. His incomes policy would be designed to prevent workers from negotiating the wage increases they need for a decent standard of living.

As for setting floors on incomes, Dr. Burns wants to go the other way. He opposes a \$2

minimum wage. He says it would be inflationary for every full-time worker to have as much as \$80 a week, or \$4,000 a year, to live on. He goes farther than that. He wants to wipe out the existing \$1.60-an-hour minimum wage for anybody who isn't 21 years old.

Well, setting ethics aside, Dr. Burns' proposals in this area, as well as others, are destructive from a business point of view. They can only destroy still more purchasing power and undermine the high-wage, mass-market economy even more dangerously.

President Nixon has set the very ambitious goal of increasing the Gross National Product to one trillion, 65 billion dollars this year.

That goal can't be reached by following Dr. Burns' prescriptions or by issuing more optimistic press releases. It can only be reached by making good on promises to stimulate economic activity, and by vastly increasing mass purchasing power.

Workers are going to do their part to help President Nixon reach his "1065" goal through expanded purchasing power. They are going to keep pressing for more jobs, and they are going to keep pressing for the wage levels that mean increased buying power. They will do all they can to expand activity in the marketplace.

Some will say that this is inflationary. They ignore the fact that the effect of wage increases on inflation has been fantastically exaggerated and distorted.

Without going into exhaustive detail, I would like to say a few words about the position of workers in one industry—one I know well for it is my own industry—construction.

Dr. Burns favorite target is the construction worker. He says they are overpaid, and that they receive a disproportionately large share of the nation's economic product. He blames high wages for all the troubles of the construction industry—for high rents and high mortgage payments, as well as for the nation's abject failure to meet its peoples' needs for housing.

To get the construction industry on its feet, Dr. Burns prescribes lower wages for construction workers.

It is a fact that union wage settlements in the construction industry last year brought increases that averaged 11.9 percent. Dr. Burns says that is inflationary. But he says nothing about the 34% increase in mortgage rates in the months between January 1968 and mid-1970 or the 66¢ rise since 1965. Soaring interest rates aren't inflationary to him.

When the banker makes more, that's ok in the Burns book but when the worker makes more, the good doctor charges "inflation."

I've yet to hear him comment on the report of the National Association of Home Builders that the cost of labor, as a percentage of the price of a new home, was cut almost in half over the 20-year period from 1949 to 1969. It dropped from 33 percent of the purchase price to 18 percent. But the price of land doubled, and so did the builder's financing charges. Again, Dr. Burns doesn't have much to say about the costs that doubled. He assails only the one that was cut in half. And he wants it cut further.

Finally, let's consider the construction worker's income. Union members who worked on construction jobs in cities of more than 100,000 population last year earned \$6.18 an hour, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But they didn't work the standard 2,000 hours—50, 40-hour weeks. They worked an average of 1,400 hours, and they earned an average of \$8,600.

Now if you remember that the BLS also says that the head of an average urban family of four needs an income of \$11,000 a year to support his family "modestly but adequately," you will discover that the average urban union construction worker falls more

than 25 percent short of earning what the government says he needs for a family of four.

In January of this year, the average big-city construction wage was \$6.39 an hour. If the average worker puts in the same number of hours as last year, he will have less than \$9,999 to meet his obligations, pay his taxes and care for his family. For him, that "modest but adequate" living standard is still only a dream and a goal.

And this is the princely income that so offends Dr. Burns.

Now last year, when construction wages rose 11.9 percent, bank profits were going up much more steeply. At J. P. Morgan it was 21.9 percent; 19.2 percent at the First National Bank of Dallas; 16.1 percent for Chase Manhattan; 15.2 percent for Bankers Trust. Interest inflation did that.

Workers are not competing in that race. Workers are not interested so much in money as in the things they need money to buy. They are pressing for wage increases not because it gives them pleasure to see large numbers on their paychecks, but because they want to be able to pay their bills and care for their families decently.

Labor believes that every American family has a right to live at a "modest but adequate" living standard, and, to us, the collective bargaining table is where we can achieve that goal.

We believe we can achieve it fairly and honestly and, we hope, without strikes. But if it takes strikes to achieve economic justice, we won't hesitate to withhold our labor.

That's the frame of mind in which we approach the collective bargaining table in the negotiations of 1971.

We want our fair share of the economic pie and we will not be intimidated, frightened or stopped. And we won't relinquish the right to bargain collectively any more than we will surrender the right to strike.

VINCENT MONZEL

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, recently our North Carolina congressional family lost one of its most valued members when Vincent Monzel passed away. Vince was not a native Tar Heel but he had spent many years serving the people of our State and his interest in North Carolina and her people was genuine. He leaves us with warm memories of him as a man and deep respect for his loyalty and effectiveness as a congressional aide. Our distinguished colleague, Mr. JAMES BROYHILL, delivered an appropriate and moving tribute to Vince last Friday which I wish to insert in the RECORD.

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.

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 . . . 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.

NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY: A CLEAR ANSWER

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the national health security program which I have introduced was recently discussed by Andrew J. Blemler, AFL-CIO legislative director, in an article in the American Federationist. In that article, he pointed out that national health security is the only program which would both provide quality medical care for all Americans and control costs.

The rhetoric used to describe many of the other plans, plus their lower price tags, may have shadowed the facts. The facts are that health security would provide more benefits to all people, with cost controls and efficiency incentives to prevent continued inflation of medical costs. In the long run the total cost of health care, the cost paid by the American people, would be less under national health security.

I think this article makes clear the strengths of health security, and reveals the weaknesses of the other programs. Therefore, I am including it in the RECORD at this point:

NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY: A CLEAR ANSWER

(By Andrew J. Blemler)

When you get past the 50-cent words, the mountains of statistics and the emotionalism, any national health insurance program worth its salt must meet these two objectives:

Provide quality medical care for all Americans as a matter of right.

Control the soaring costs of medical care.

If a proposal doesn't meet these goals, it's a mockery of the term "national health insurance."

Cost control and providing medical care as a right—this is what the national health insurance fight is all about.

National Health Security meets these twin goals—and it is the only program before Congress that does.

President Nixon, the insurance companies and the American Medical Association all have a big financial stake in preserving as much of the status quo as possible.

The health care system is working quite well for these groups. But that doesn't mean it is working well for the American people—in fact, it isn't working at all well for the American people.

Medical care costs—even for routine care—are a very real threat to the financial stability of virtually every family in America. The runaway escalation of health care costs keeps many families from seeking proper health care.

The chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Rep. Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.), pointed out the reason health costs are so out of line: cost plus reimbursement.

Very simply, "cost plus reimbursement" means that every hospital is paid on the basis of its costs, plus something more.

Doctors have a similarly inefficient sys-

tem—fee-for-service. The doctor gets a certain amount for every office visit or treatment. The doctor sets that "certain amount" and also determines the number of services.

And when you add up the totals, the dollar figures are overwhelming.

Mills told a group of Westinghouse executives what the total health cost to the American people for 1969 was more than \$60 billion. He also pointed out that this was a five fold increase over the 1949 figure of \$12 billion. The Social Security Administration estimates that health expenditures may double by 1975—to \$120 billion. By 1980, health care expenditures are projected to cost a minimum of \$156 billion and possibly as much as \$189 billion. And despite the fact you're paying a lot more, you aren't going to be getting better health care.

The case for National Health Security must be based on the facts. And the facts are that Health Security is the only proposal that provides real cost controls and, at the same time, meets the goal of providing quality health care for all Americans as a matter of right.

This goal is not to be confused by rhetoric or the traps set by the opposition's scare tactics.

"Socialized medicine" is the cry from some corners. Yet every single health care proposal before the Congress is based on using federal funds. Even the American Medical Association's proposal—"medicredit"—would use federal monies, although that is about all it has in common with Health Security.

However, National Health Security does not propose that the federal government hire the doctors, own the hospitals or manage the health care resources and their distribution.

Health Security is a national system—just as Social Security is a national system. Health Security is a system of financing and paying for comprehensive health care for all Americans. But it is still a voluntary system—doctors will be free to join community health service organizations or remain in solo, fee-for-service practice; patients will be free to go to either type of doctor, but with the cost covered by National Health Security.

It should be pointed out to the purveyors of fear that true "socialized medicine" now exists in the United States and has existed for many years. The government owns and operates health care facilities—the Veterans Administration hospitals, the U.S. Public Health Service hospitals and the medical facilities for armed forces personnel and their dependents.

Under National Health Security, we propose that all health care be budgeted for a year and that Congress act as the watchdog. Control must be placed in a responsible body. We think the best repositories for this control are the people's elected representatives.

The VA and PHS hospitals are now operated under the careful scrutiny of the Congress. And that system has worked to control costs. For example, VA hospital per diem costs in fiscal year 1970 were \$49.22 for general hospital care. Public Health Service hospitals estimate their daily rate at approximately \$60. Both of these figures are well below the national average of \$80 a day for care in a hospital.

So, national budgeting and congressional control do help keep costs down.

If we are to properly use our experience to develop a national health insurance system, then we must also examine the failures of the present system.

The private health insurance industry is one of these failures. Its record in coverage, benefits, service, cost control and quality control is pathetic.

Insurance companies have taken a "public-be-damned" attitude about cost and quality controls. Hospital and doctor bills are almost always paid without question. When medical costs go up, insurance pre-

miums go up, because the insurance companies are also paid on a "cost-plus" basis. And when insurance premiums go up, our problems in obtaining good contracts for our members also escalate.

The "plus" for insurance companies last year amounted to more than \$2 billion. Of the \$14 billion insurance companies collected in premiums, they used \$2 billion for advertising, executive salaries, commissions, overhead and profits. We think that \$2 billion should go for health care. No corporation should make a profit out of health care.

Insurance companies have resisted quality controls. They don't want to know how many operations are unnecessary, because that might force them to lower insurance premiums.

Look at the future of the insurance companies—premiums are expected to double in five years, while the amount of the patient's health bill that will be covered will increase only slightly.

The Wall Street Journal reported recently that insurance companies have figured out a new way to control costs—they are planning to increase the cancellation of policies of subscribers who make too many claims. In other words, if you get real sick, you're financially dead.

The private insurance industry has its staunch supporters. It even has its own bill. As a matter of fact, President Nixon's proposal is a financial bailout amounting to billions of dollars for private, profit-making insurance companies.

The facts do not justify giving private insurance companies a huge windfall of federal money to continue doing an inadequate job of protecting Americans.

President Nixon says we should stick with the insurance companies. He wants workers to pay part of the premiums and a large share of their health costs because that's the only way we're going to get what he calls "cost consciousness" about medical care.

Workers have been conscious of the cost of medical care for years. But up until now, they haven't been able to do a thing about it.

Workers now pay—out of their own pockets—the deductibles and partial payments and the things that inadequate insurance doesn't cover. President Nixon says this will be the cost control under his system. It isn't working now; it isn't ever going to work and that's why we need National Health Security. Deductibles, co-insurance, co-payments—the fancy words that mean you pay out of your pocket—do not work. In fact, they often drive up medical costs.

It is far cheaper and less dangerous to treat an illness as soon as possible. If the insurance company only pays for treatment in a hospital, then people are more likely to be treated in the hospital—even when that treatment can be performed as well in a doctor's office at less cost.

Patients really have very little to do with medical costs except pay them. It is the doctor, not the patient, who decides which patients need to be treated and where and for what fee. It is the doctor who decides who should enter the hospital and for what and for how long. It is the doctor who prescribes what drugs the patient should purchase and whether the price will be \$5 for a brand name product or \$1 for a chemically equivalent generic drug.

If we want to control medical costs, we must begin with the doctor—not the patient.

A national financing mechanism—fair and equitable contributions by employers, employees, the self-employed and the federal government—will provide the money. Then we set up a comprehensive benefit structure, covering all physicians' and surgeons' services and all hospital services. And all of those bills will be paid directly by National Health Security on a fair, equitable basis in accordance with established schedules. Quality con-

trols will protect the consumer and prevent unnecessary surgery and hospitalization.

People will be encouraged to take physical examinations because they will not be charged for them. Illnesses will be detected and treated early. Patients won't have to go into the hospital for treatments that can be performed just as well in a doctor's office.

Preventive medicine and early diagnosis and treatment are the basic principles of prepaid group practice. Prepaid group practice works—and works well. It is less costly to the patient; more efficient for the doctors; better in terms of health because unnecessary surgery is eliminated. The patient is treated as a whole human being—not an arm at one doctor, the chest some place else and the eyes at still another.

National Health Security will provide sufficient funds to increase the number of prepaid group practice plans and expand existing ones to serve more people. Prepaid group practice plans operate on a budget—figuring the total health care needs of their patients and living within that budget.

Health Security will operate in a similar manner. An annual budget would set the limit of medical care costs. If charges are more than budgeted amounts, then payments will be pro-rated. At no time will health care be denied anyone. Health Security would live within its budget. No other proposal now before Congress has cost controls.

The opponents of National Health Security—seeing that they cannot match the benefits and the cost and quality controls—have decided to use scare techniques, such as calling National Health Security "womb to tomb" health care. They try to make National Health Security sound evil and bad and un-American.

The "big" scare is the next step of the opponents of National Health Security. "Look at how much it is going to cost the federal government. Bad. Bad," they say.

Some of the other proposals may cost less in terms of federal dollars, but what they don't tell you is that their health plans are going to do much less.

It doesn't matter whether the money comes straight out of our pockets or out of our tax dollars—health care is still going to cost money.

What happens when we all put our money together into a national system like National Health Security is that we can begin to control costs. We'll have the financial leverage to reform the health care delivery system.

And without cost controls and needed reforms in how health care is delivered, the cost of medical care is going to continue to soar and bring financial ruin to American families.

When the Nixon Administration says its proposal will only cost the federal government \$2.8 billion more—ask them how much it is going to cost the individual.

Under the Nixon plan, an individual would have to pay part of the premium cost—between 25 and 35 percent; the first two days of hospital care; 25 percent of everything after that; plus a deductible of \$100 a person for other medical expenses. And still not everything is covered.

The difference between the Nixon program and National Health Security is that our costs are not in the open. The Nixon plan hides its true cost.

Health Security will cost about \$57 billion in 1974. That is about 70 percent of the total personal health care expenditures of the country. It will cost each worker 1 percent of his income up to \$15,000—or a maximum of \$150 a year. Workers are now paying 0.8 percent of the first \$7,800 for Medicare tax. This tax would be eliminated. The differences are 1 percent of everything above \$7,800 and medical care now, not just at age 65.

In short, National Health Security would provide a dollar's worth of health care for each dollar we spend.

A national health insurance bill is going to be passed by Congress. Whether that bill just protects vested interests—or really controls costs and provides medical care for all Americans—is dependent on how well we make our case for National Health Security.

HOW NATIONAL HEALTH SECURITY WORKS

To meet its basic purpose of making a broad range of quality health services available to all residents of the United States, National Health Security will bring about major improvements in the organization and delivery of health care so as to increase its availability, control cost, safeguard quality and increase manpower and facilities.

Under National Health Security, the following benefits would be paid in full for all Americans:

All necessary physician services—primary medical services, furnished by general practitioners or other primary physicians and specialized services, including surgery if furnished by a specialist on referral.

All necessary hospital services, hospital-affiliated skilled nursing home care, approved outpatient services and home health care without limit. Included are pathology, radiology and all other necessary services. Other skilled nursing home care will be covered up to 120 days.

Active psychiatric treatment to any outpatient, including preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic and rehabilitative treatment. No limitations would be imposed as long as the psychiatric care is furnished by a comprehensive health service organization, hospital or other approved mental health facility. Otherwise, consultations would be limited to 20 a year and coverage would include 45 days of inpatient care and 60 days in a day care clinic.

Dental benefits, initially limited to those under 15. Benefits include cleanings, fillings, diagnostic and therapeutic services (except cosmetic orthodontic work). Everyone, regardless of age, will be covered for rehabilitation following injury, disability or disease. Eligibility for all benefits will increase until everyone is covered. Persons covered initially are entitled to benefits for life.

All medicines provided to inpatients and outpatients by a hospital and to persons enrolled in comprehensive group practice plans. Otherwise, drug coverage is limited to chronic conditions requiring long and costly drug therapy.

Approved therapeutic equipment, including eyeglasses and prosthetic devices.

There will be no cut-off point in dollars, numbers of days or age, except as noted. There will be no exclusion of coverage for pre-existing conditions; no limitations on physical examinations and other preventive medical services; no co-insurance; no deductibles; no waiting periods.

Health Security will make all payments directly to the providers of health care. No bills will be sent to the patient.

The money to pay benefits will be guaranteed through the Health Security Trust Fund, similar to the Social Security Trust Fund. Money will be raised from these sources: 50 percent from federal general tax revenues; 36 percent from a tax (3.5 percent) on employers' payrolls; 12 percent from a tax (1 percent) on wages and unearned income up to \$15,000 a year; 2 percent from a tax (2.5 percent) on income of the self-employed up to \$15,000 a year. Employers may pay all or part of the workers' contribution if agreed to in bargaining.

Under this system, Health Security will pay more than \$3 billion in health care expenditures now paid by state and local governments, through Medicaid, public assistance programs, city and county hospitals and

medical programs. State and local governments also will be exempt from paying the employers' tax. This is a saving of \$3.2 billion.

It will also require prior budgeting for the costs of personal health services, providing overall control.

The Health Security Board will budget funds to regions of the country. Each region will determine its needs and priorities.

For example, New England might allocate more for hospital services, while the Rocky Mountain area might use more for emergency transportation for rural areas.

Hospitals, skilled nursing homes and other institutions will develop and operate on budgets, which will be reviewed and approved at the regional level.

Funds allocated for payment to individual providers, such as physicians, dentists and optometrists, will be distributed to local areas within the region on a per capita basis. The budgeted amount will be divided between the different providers according to the number of consumers who elect to receive care from those providers.

For example: In a city of 100,000 people, 25,000 may enroll in comprehensive health service organizations. If the amount budgeted for physician services in that area is \$65 per person, Health Security will pay these organizations \$1,625,000 (\$65 × 25,000) for physicians' services. The other 75,000 individuals elect to receive physician services from fee-for-service practitioners. Health Security will create a fund of \$4,875,000 (\$65 × 75,000) to pay all fee-for-service bills submitted in accordance with a fee schedule set by the board.

Comprehensive group practice organizations and professional foundations which accept responsibility for providing or securing all covered services for a defined population will receive the total amount budgeted for all services. Thus they will share in any savings achieved by reducing costs.

SENATOR MCGOVERN TESTIFIES ON BEHALF OF A NEW CHINA POLICY

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1971, the Honorable GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in support of more mature relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

He asked for adoption of Senate Resolution 82, which he sponsors, proposing that our Nation support a United Nations General Assembly resolution acknowledging that the People's Republic is the sole representative of China in the General Assembly, the Security Council, and all other organs of the United Nations.

Senator MCGOVERN's resolution further proposes that the United States seek negotiations toward the establishment of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic. It also calls for travel, trade, and cultural initiatives such as those which have recently been implemented.

Because of the significance of Senator MCGOVERN's remarks, I feel that my colleagues should have the opportunity of seeing his testimony in full.

Senator MCGOVERN's testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR GEORGE S. MCGOVERN

Mr. Chairman, let me first commend you and the Committee for undertaking this examination of United States policy toward China.

These are timely hearings. I say that not so much because we are forced to a reassessment of our position because of the prospect of a defeat at the United Nations this fall, but because you are initiating precisely the kind of action that is required if we are to redeem the sacrifices of years of brutal war in Indochina.

That war has been the fruition of the twenty year old doctrine that we can and should seek the military encirclement and containment of the People's Republic of China. It has always been described in those terms.

Yet even in that sense it has been a thumping failure. Instead of reducing Chinese influence in Asia, we have seen since last year, for the first time in history, the forging of a formal coalition among nationalist revolutionaries in Indochina and the People's Republic. Rather than retard it, the war has clearly expanded Chinese influence in the region.

We have misread the threat and we have been entirely wrong in assessing the probable results of our involvement. The war constitutes a disaster beyond rescue.

If it leads to a more enlightened American policy toward Asia, and I think that process has already begun, then we will have gained something of great value from our losses. If they help stimulate a new American posture toward China, then the Committee's deliberations can do more in this respect than almost anything else we might try—certainly far more than any tragic effort to justify blood already spilled by spilling more.

The resolution I recommend for your consideration, Senate Resolution 82, addresses three interrelated aspects of our policy toward the People's Republic of China.

It calls for travel, trade and cultural initiatives which have already been implemented to a great extent by the Nixon Administration, and I heartily commend those moves. I regard as especially significant the decision to drop the shipping restrictions on agricultural commodities which have closed off to American producers large agricultural markets not only in China but in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe as well. I fought those restrictions when they were imposed in 1963 and 1964, and I regard their removal as a vitally important step both in our own self-interest and in the interest of further accommodation.

Through such actions we have, in the span of a few months, become vastly more capable of addressing the most serious issues impeding normalized relations with the People's Republic, the question of United Nations membership and the question of diplomatic recognition. The Administration should be given the strongest possible mandate to proceed to those issues, and the strongest possible encouragement to approach them forthrightly.

My resolution further proposes first that the United States support a United Nations General Assembly resolution, "... acknowledging the fact that the People's Republic of China is the sole representative of China in the General Assembly, the Security Council, and all other organs of the United Nations."

Second, I propose that the United States should, "... seek negotiations toward the establishment of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, and should announce that the United States is prepared, through such negotiations, to recognize the People's Republic as the sole legitimate government of China, leaving the future status of Taiwan to a peaceful reso-

lution by the people on both sides of the Taiwan straits."

Before discussing these actions more specifically, let me suggest that if we are at last ready to adjust our policy, then we ought to think carefully about our objectives.

I believe we have been in fundamental error since 1949, and I am deeply troubled by the spectacle of the world's most powerful Nation clinging, at exorbitant cost, to an absurd and unrealistic position.

I state quite frankly that I offer Senate Resolution 82 in the belief that it is in the best interests of the United States for the People's Republic of China to sit in the United Nations, and for us to establish normal diplomatic contact with Peking. These are developments to be welcomed and expedited, not because they will lead to speedy resolution of our profound differences of interest and outlook with the People's Republic, but they will allow us to consider and respond to those issues less hampered by the ignorance, misapprehension and fear which have been the inevitable results of our isolation.

I earnestly hope, therefore, we will not miss the opportunities afforded by the recent softening in attitudes on both sides, by yielding to the temptation of new artificial formulas—including those demanding some form of "dual representation" in the United Nations—in order to make the ascent from error less disquieting. While creating new legal and logical nightmares to replace the old, and while inviting the wrath of both Peking and Taipei, such solutions can only delay the inevitable and perpetuate needless hostility.

The price of improved relations is quite clear. We must recognize the 1949 outcome of the Chinese civil war, and we must end our involvement in its remnants.

While I believe there is real hope for accommodation on some issues, this is one point on which we can expect no compromise. The Chinese have been unmistakably explicit, as exemplified by Premier Chou En-lai's statement in an interview with journalist Edgar Snow last year:

"Taiwan is China's internal matter and the Chinese people alone have the right to liberate it. United States armed aggression there is another question, an international question, and we are ready to negotiate on that. The door is open. But it depends on whether the United States is serious in dealing with the Taiwan question."

Our role on Taiwan is at once the most critical issue from the standpoint of the Chinese and the most painful and difficult for the United States. It raises perplexing legal, military, and moral questions for us to resolve.

Because they are apt to be decisive, I want to devote the remainder of my testimony to those questions.

If we address them without hysteria, I believe we can meet them with almost complete confidence in the outcome.

ORIGINS OF UNITED STATES-TAIWAN TIES

The Nationalist Government on Taiwan claims our allegiance as the legitimate government of all of China.

Yet there no longer seems to be much dispute over the identity of the government of China. It is quite that the Communists govern the 750 million Chinese people. They have done so for a generation, and it is impossible to give credence to perennial reports of their imminent collapse. The growing unification of American attitudes on this point is perhaps best illustrated by President Nixon's recent use of the proper term, "Peoples' Republic of China," in his references to the government in Peking.

It is also clear that this state of affairs does not exit because of any failure on the part of the United States. Remaining feel-

ings to that effect can only be traced to self-deception with respect to the Chiang Kai-shek regime and to the political aberrations of the McCarthy era.

Former Secretary of State Acheson has written in his memoirs that after World War II:

"Chiang controlled the greatest military power in Chinese history, supported and given economic backing by the United States. Four years later his armies and his support both within country and outside it had melted away. He was a refugee on a small island off the coast. . . . To attribute this to inadequate foreign support . . . was to miscalculate entirely what had been going on in China and the nature of the forces involved. The most inexhaustible patience of the Chinese had ended. They had not overthrown the Government. There was nothing to overthrow. They had simply ignored it. The Communists were not the creators of this situation, this revolutionary spirit, but had mounted it and ridden it to victory and power."

Chiang Kai-shek dealt from a position of political weakness and military ineptitude at the end of the war and those were conditions of his own making. He nonetheless spurned the attempts of the United States, through General George C. Marshall, to mediate between warring Chinese factions toward a coalition government, to salvage something from a deteriorating situation.

Most accounts suggest that when the fighting resumed in 1947, Communist forces were welcomed, by a population thoroughly disenchanted with Chiang's government, as they moved to capture control of the country. Whole armies surrendered without significant resistance. The civil war of 1947 to 1949 was a rout for the Kuomintang, notwithstanding the enormous amounts of military assistance supplied by the United States for the war effort against Japan, only to be hoarded by Chiang for use against the Communists. Chiang and 2 million followers were forced to flee from the Mainland to Taiwan.

The answer to the question "Who lost China?" could not be more obvious.

In fact we did comprehend that answer from October of 1949 until late June of 1950. President Truman declared in January of 1950 that the United States regarded Formosa as Chinese territory without qualification and that—

"The United States has no predatory designs on Formosa or any other Chinese territory. The United States has no desire to obtain special rights or privileges or to establish military bases on Formosa at this time, nor does it have any intention of using its armed forces to interfere in the present situation. The United States will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China . . . similarly, the United States government will not provide military aid or advice to the Chinese forces on Formosa."

A few days later Secretary of State Acheson, amplifying the President's statement, defined the American defense perimeter in Asia to exclude both Korea and Taiwan.

Events in the several months following President Truman's 1950 statement provide a chilling lesson on the speed with which international postures of wisdom and prudence can be abandoned, and almost entirely as a consequence of domestic political considerations.

President Truman's position was roundly condemned by Chiang's friends in the United States. It promised to emerge as the dominant political issue in the 1950 Congressional elections.

We have no way of knowing whether President Truman would have held firm despite the pressure. The Korean war intervened. We saw the attack of North Korea against the South in mid-1950 as the first in

a series of moves by the new Chinese government to build an empire in East Asia, just as the Soviet Union had done in Eastern and Central Europe. The 7th Fleet was quickly dispatched to patrol the waters between Taiwan and the Mainland, in effect preventing what was then the inevitable perfection of the Communists' rise to power.

The United States made a 180 degree turn in the space of a few months, moving from a firm policy of nonintervention in January to one which interposed American warships directly between the Communists and the beaten Kuomintang forces.

If it was not clear at the time it is clear now that China did not initiate the Korea war; that the attack was instead encouraged by the Soviet Union. It is also clear that when China did intervene it was in response to the threat of American forces, having achieved their initial limited objective of driving the North Koreans back across the 38th parallel, racing toward the Yalu river amidst discussion in this country of an invasion of Chinese territory.

Nevertheless the Korean war ended with the United States inextricably caught up in the civil conflict in China.

RESOLUTION OF TAIWAN'S STATUS

My resolution proposes that the future status of Taiwan be left to a "peaceful resolution by the people on both sides of the Taiwan straits." If this is a legitimate position, then it must initially be squared with the ambiguity with respect to Taiwan's present status.

The United States first developed a formal position on Taiwan through the Cairo Declaration in December of 1943, in which President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and President Chiang Kai-shek agreed that, "All territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

This allied statement of intent was confirmed in the Potsdam Declaration of July, 1945, with Premier Stalin of Russia joining Roosevelt and Churchill in pledging that the terms of the Cairo Declaration would be fulfilled.

Acting in behalf of the signatories to those declarations, President Chiang Kai-shek accepted the Japanese surrender of Taiwan in 1948, although reoccupation had already occurred in 1945 and 1946. In the general and special peace treaties of 1951 and 1952, Japan renounced all claim to Formosa and the Pescadores.

In a step inspiring all of what ambiguity exists about Taiwan's status today, however, Japan did not name a beneficiary to receive what she gave up.

United States questions on this point were raised most recently, in April of this year, by State Department spokesman Charles W. Bray, who suggested that sovereignty over Taiwan and the Pescadores remains an open question subject to international settlement. Speaking through Foreign Minister Chow Shu-kai, the Nationalist government reacted with some vehemence to that suggestion, citing the Cairo and Potsdam declarations as clearly affirming that Taiwan and the Pescadores have been restored to China. From Peking, the New China News Agency offered comment that was virtually identical in substance, that: "there is only one China on earth and Taiwan is an inalienable part of Chinese territory."

From these statements it appears that the legal dilemma is not as complex as it might seem. The Chiang government makes no claim to Taiwan that is independent of his claim to sovereignty over all of China. Indeed it would be impossible to sustain such a claim, unless we were to locate a novel doctrine holding that international agreements such as those declared at Potsdam and Cairo flow to individuals rather than to countries,

or to governments in a personal capacity instead of to governments acting for the people they govern at the time.

Thus we can, if we are willing, regard the obligations accepted at Potsdam and Cairo as fulfilled by the Republic of China's acceptance of Japan's surrender of Taiwan in 1948. The subsequent civil war leaves the final resolution of the issue to the two civil war protagonists, as provided by my resolution.

But whether or not we grasp this legal interpretation, I submit that we are forced in any event to accept the same result in a practical sense. In the first instance, the United States is powerless to create an alternative solution unilaterally, without the participation of the United Kingdom, the Republic of China and the Soviet Union, the other participants in the Cairo and Potsdam declarations. Beyond that, I'm sure none of us can envision a way to establish Taiwan as something other than disputed territory in China's civil war without the cooperation of the government which now maintains physical control of the island, that is, the Chiang government.

There are compelling arguments in favor of self-determination for the 12 million native Taiwanese, for the vast majority on the island who feel, as far as we know, no direct ties with the mainland. Pleas for the application of American influence toward that end have special weight in light of the nature of the government which has existed on that island with United States support since 1949.

Those who describe Chiang's government as a bastion of freedom and liberty in Asia perpetrate a hoax of monstrous proportions.

The Chinese Nationalist "liberators" who took control of Taiwan in 1946 soon proved to be more oppressive than the Japanese. The native population demonstrated in protest against their exploitation in February 1947, but their protest was brutally crushed. In the 1945 to 1949 period an estimated 20,000 were executed, with at least half that number attributed to reprisals for the February incident. Indigenous leadership was either eliminated or driven abroad.

Since his arrival on the island in 1949, Chiang has maintained martial law on the premise that he remains at war with Peking. Strikes, petitioning and demonstrations are forbidden under penalty of death. Constitutional guarantees have been suspended, and political crimes are outside due process of law. Although no major underground "Formosans for Independence" exists on the island, the number of political prisoners is estimated in the thousands.

Chiang brought with him from the Mainland a 3,000 seat national assembly, in which 32, or about 3 percent, of the 1400 seats presently occupied, are held by natives of the island, as a result of the 1949 elections covering a small number of seats. No other assembly elections have been held since 1949. When it appeared in 1960 that a quorum could not be mustered because of attrition in the membership due to deaths and defections, the government conveniently lowered the quorum requirement from one-third to one-fourth of the membership. The assembly, in turn, dutifully reelects Chiang each six years.

In truth we perpetuate tyranny on Taiwan. It mocks the terms to talk of liberty and democracy in connection with that government. And I am therefore in total sympathy with those who seek self-determination, perhaps through a plebiscite, for the population of Taiwan.

But I despair of finding a means for the United States to enforce that kind of solution.

We can, however, at least move to a position nearer neutrality on this issue.

At present the United States is actively hostile to the Taiwanese independence movement. Our support of Chiang's regime guar-

antees that the Taiwanese must suffer under his rule, or that of his successors, indefinitely.

Adjustment of those guarantees will at least broaden the realm of possibilities. In the past the People's Republic has repeatedly indicated a readiness to hold direct discussions with authorities on Taiwan and to entertain proposals for making Taiwan an autonomous region.

While we can do no more than speculate on the ultimate outcome, therefore, I believe that by refusing further involvement in a civil conflict, we can significantly improve the outlook for the native population on Taiwan. Certainly that step will encourage the direct negotiations which the Nationalists have repeatedly refused.

THE DEFENSE OF TAIWAN

The most troublesome remaining issue is our obligation to defend Taiwan, as provided by the 1954 Mutual Defense Treaty.

"Regard an armed attack directed against Taiwan and the Pescadores as a danger to its own peace and safety and would act to meet the danger—such action to be in accordance with our own constitutional processes."

The treaty is supplemented by a series of antecedent and subsequent Executive agreements.

In addition the Congress has, through the Joint Congressional Resolution to Defend Formosa of 1955, empowered the President to, "take such measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

Let me say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that I wholly endorse the proposal offered by Senators Church and Mathias to repeal that resolution. We have been assured by successive Administrations that it will not be treated as Congressional authority for military action in any event. If we are at all concerned about Congressional powers over war and peace, then certainly we ought to scrap this open-ended and virtually limitless authorization for war in Asia.

On the treaty itself it must, of course, be noted that the commitment itself raises a troublesome paradox. We are obliged to regard such treaties as binding until they are canceled, a process requiring, in the case of our defense treaty with Taiwan, a year's notice by either party. At the same time it is hardly open to dispute that intervention in civil war violates both international law and our own concepts of sovereignty.

But resolution of that issues is a question for negotiation in any case, as has been recognized by Peking.

But what we must do now is reexamine the status of our obligation to defend Taiwan.

We are under no commitment to station forces on Taiwan or the Pescadores.

We are not committed to defend the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

We are not committed to defend Taiwan in the event of Nationalist actions taken without prior U.S. agreement.

And we are not, of course, committed, to take or refrain from taking any position concerning recognition of the People's Republic of China, the China seat in the United Nations, or the ultimate status of Taiwan.

I believe our commitments under the treaty of 1954 have been fully met, to the point where it is now possible to both reduce the size and adjust the nature of our involvement.

During the course of our alliance with Taipei we have supplied directly some \$2.5 billion in military assistance, along with vast additional sums made available through other means. Chiang's defenses are formidable indeed.

Peking, meanwhile, has neither in being nor in production the offensive capability, either in amphibious landing capacity, air-drop or bombers, to mount an effective at-

tack against defenses as solid as those on Taiwan.

With or without direct American involvement, therefore, the prospect of a Communist attack on Taiwan is exceedingly remote. I would say it is virtually nonexistent.

Under such circumstances it is clear that we can, without fear of the consequences, fully remove our forces from Taiwan and from the Taiwan strait and terminate our military assistance to the Nationalist Government. We can do so without abrogating our defense commitment to Taiwan, since the 1954 agreement can in no way be construed to demand further action than that required to deter attack.

Hence the door is open to end in very real terms our involvement in China's civil war. I believe we should move speedily to do so, thus clearly placing the burden of achieving a solution where it must eventually reside in any case—in the hands of negotiators representing Peking and Taipei.

TOWARD A NEW LEVEL OF UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

I believe the considerations I have outlined offer a clear path toward more mature relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China. It is a path we take without abrogating any obligations, moral or legal, to the Nationalist Government, and without withdrawing anything that government has a legitimate right to expect of the United States.

As my resolution proposes, the People's Republic of China should assume the China seats in the United Nations, and that decision should not await resolution of the Status of Taiwan by the parties involved.

We should meanwhile end our diplomatic challenge to the legitimacy of Peking's authority on the Mainland, by announcing our willingness to establish diplomatic relations with that government as the sole government of China and to withdraw such recognition from the Taiwan regime.

And, particularly since they are no longer required in any case, we should remove the very real symbols of our physical intervention in China's internal affairs, by withdrawing all U.S. forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait and by ending further military assistance to the Taiwan government.

In pursuing these steps we must avoid both unrealistic expectations and exaggerated fears.

They will not cause the People's Republic to abandon her aspirations for influence in Asia and her ambition to serve as an inspiration for wars of national liberation.

But neither will they lend her assistance or encouragement in those efforts.

These steps will not halt China's nuclear weapons development programs and their concomitant additions to China's considerable military and diplomatic power.

But neither will they accelerate those programs. And they will certainly improve the prospect for Chinese adherence to international limitations on these ominous devices.

The initiatives I recommend will not of themselves end the hostility that a generation of Chinese feels for the United States, nor speedily end Chinese views on the probability of conflict between our two systems.

But neither will they make China more dangerous. They are instead the one way in which we can begin to break down the animosity so carefully constructed over twenty years, and to move toward a more realistic Chinese understanding of the United States.

The United States and China do have serious differences. They will persist.

But our substantive disputes do not supply an argument for continued attempts to isolate and exclude China. Instead they offer still more reason for establishing the sort of international relations which ought to exist between mature societies.

The road ahead is a difficult one regardless of the course we choose.

But it is also a road of opportunity, if we can bring ourselves to heed the lesson taught by a Chinese scholar to an American in 1895:

"Our politics must be infinite, reaching to both ends of time and leading a thousand million men from their fathers to their sons, in lines neither broken nor tangled. You who know so many things do not know the most ancient and powerful, and you rage with desire for what is immediate and you destroy your fathers and sons together . . . You can see that we are not to be despised; we invented gunpowder—but for shooting off fireworks in the evening."

PEOPLE'S HOME RULE BILL INTRODUCED

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a home rule bill on behalf of the people of the District of Columbia. Early in May, my staff and I drafted a tentative home rule proposal that was submitted to the people of the city in a series of eight public hearings held in each of the wards. The main feature of that tentative proposal was an elected mayor-city council form of government. The Council was to be composed of 15 members, eight elected from wards and seven at large. The Mayor and the City Council were to serve 4-year terms. Under the tentative proposal, the District government would be given broad legislative authority, including the power to set taxes. In addition, provision was made for an automatic Federal payment, pegged at 32 percent of city revenues in 1972 and going up to 40 percent in 1976.

The public hearings in each of the city's eight wards produced valuable discussion of the tentative proposal. Not only was the analysis of the tentative measure sharp and incisive but many alternatives and highly innovative suggestions were put forward, many of which have been incorporated into the home rule bill I am introducing today. My staff and I carefully reviewed the record of these hearings, and we closely considered the many suggestions and comments that were advanced.

Before discussing the bill in detail, several important points should be made clear. First, while the bill reflects the best thinking of those District citizens who testified at the hearings, and also the soundest technical advice available, this bill is not perfect. No legislation is. There no doubt will be many refinements, improvements, and changes as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Second, in many cases, difficult decisions had to be made between reasonable alternatives on such questions, for example, as the size of the City Council and whether service on the Council should be full or part time. Because one choice was made does not mean that other options were not reasonable and sensible. All alternatives were considered, but in order to frame the legisla-

tive proposal decisions had to be made, and in many cases the judgments were very close.

The home rule bill I shall introduce today, like the tentative measure, proposes an elected mayor—city council form of government with broad legislative authority, including the power to levy taxes. The City Council would be composed of 11 members, eight elected from wards and three elected at large. The provision for an automatic Federal payment going up to 40 percent of city revenues in 1976 was retained. In addition, three totally innovative proposals have been added to the bill. First, in response to the rightful claim of the young to have a greater share in government, a youth advisory council would be formed. Second, in order to investigate the possibilities of bringing greater decisionmaking down to the neighborhood level, a District of Columbia Government Decentralization Commission would be established. Finally, a new ingredient to the Federal payment formula is added by the creation of procedures to compensate the District government for expenses incurred in connection with assemblages, marches, and other demonstrations in the District which relate solely to the Federal Government.

With this introduction, I shall now discuss the bill in some detail.

THE CITY COUNCIL AND MAYOR

The City Council would be composed of 11 members, three elected at large and eight elected from each of eight wards. Council members will serve 3-year terms, and the chairman and vice chairman will be elected from among the Council members—section 301. The chairman of the Council will receive an annual salary of \$25,000, the vice chairman \$24,000, and the remaining members \$22,500—section 303(b). These levels are set in the bill so that those initially running for the Council may have some notion of what the salary is likely to be. Once elected, the Council is free to decrease or increase its compensation in line with whether its members view the job as full-time or part-time. Presumably, the level of compensation will be subject to change based on the experience of the Council over a period of time.

The District government is given the legislative power with respect to "any subject as to which Congress could exercise its authority as the legislature for the District, including the imposition of appropriate taxes and fees"—section 325 (a). The Council is given the authority to pass acts with respect to the municipal courts—section 325(d). Judicial appointments will be made by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the Council—section 325(e). In this connection, one new feature of this legislation is that each judge must be a resident of the District and continue his residency as long as he is a judge—section 325(f). Finally, the express reservation of congressional authority that was contained in section 325 of the tentative proposal has been deleted. While this deletion probably does not alter Congress' constitutional authority over the District, many witnesses at the hearing sensibly argued

that this section invited congressional intervention in local affairs.

The office of the Mayor created under the bill possesses the chief executive functions of the District Government. The Mayor will serve a 4-year term, and will be elected in odd numbered years—section 401(a). The Mayor will receive \$40,000 annual salary, although this amount may be increased or decreased by the Council, but any decrease will only apply to future terms of the Mayor—section 401(c). The Mayor possesses the full executive power and has the authority to appoint his department heads—section 402. The bill would also create the office of city administrator to assist the Mayor. The city administrator will be appointed and removed by the Mayor. The city administrator performs those duties that are assigned to him by the Mayor—section 403.

BUDGETARY FUNCTIONS

The District government would be given complete authority to set its budget—title V. The Mayor and City Council would be limited with respect to the budget of the Board of Education, however. The District government would only be free to set the maximum level of Board of Education expenditures, but it would have no authority to dictate line budget expenditures for the Board—section 707. Further, the District government would have the authority to finance its capital program through the sale of municipal bonds, as do most other municipal governments—title VI. The bonds would not be tax exempt, but the Federal Government would subsidize the added interest rate cost to the District government of issuing bonds with no tax-exempt status. In addition, the Federal Government would pick up the entire capital cost necessary to build adequate facilities for the District's institutions of higher education—section 611.

THE ANNUAL AUTOMATIC FEDERAL PAYMENT

The Federal Government would pay to the District government an automatic annual Federal payment "in recognition of the unique character of the District as the Nation's Capital City." The Federal payment would be set at the following levels: For fiscal year 1972, an amount equal to 32 percent of District revenues; for fiscal year 1973, 34 percent; for fiscal year 1974, 36 percent; for fiscal year 1975, 38 percent; for fiscal year 1976, 40 percent—section 731. In addition, as a new feature, the District government would be reimbursed by the Federal Government for expenses in connection with national demonstrations; as we have seen, the recent antiwar demonstrations directed at the Federal Government have cost the people of this city almost \$4 million. These are costs that should properly be shouldered by the Federal Government and not by District residents.

ELECTIONS

Unlike earlier home rule proposals, this bill provides for election of the Mayor and the City Council on a partisan basis—title VIII. While there was some sentiment expressed at the hearings for nonpartisan elections, this was largely based on the fear that Federal employees could not participate in local elections if

the elections were held along party lines because of Hatch Act restrictions. This view has considerable merit, and it is clear that some statutory change is necessary. This was not proposed in the context of the home rule bill so that the discussion of the merits of the home rule would not be diverted by other possibly controversial questions. Within the next several months, I shall introduce legislation, independent of the home rule bill, that will allow Government employees to participate in local elections, whether partisan or not. The restrictions contained in the present Hatch Act protecting employees from coercion and political influence would be retained.

There was much testimony at the hearings in favor of party elections, and as was indicated, this approach was adopted. It seems clear that party elections set a much stronger framework for community political action. The creation of strong political parties heightens political awareness and thus creates greater and more broadly based citizen involvement. This occurred in connection with the Delegate race, and deserves to be further encouraged.

The bill would also restore the right to vote to ex-felons once they have been "pardoned of such offense or completed the sentence of imprisonment required for such offense." This point was mentioned at every public hearing and obviously has strong citizen support. It is clear that the time has come when we must cease treating ex-convicts as second class citizens and bring them into our society as full participants—section 801.

The mechanics of electing the Mayor and the City Council will be much the same as those that applied in the Delegate election. Nominees for City Council seats from the wards must collect 250 signatures from the ward in which the candidate is running. Candidates for at-large seats and the Mayor must collect 250 signatures in each ward of the District. The winners will be selected in party primary elections and in a general election. Local officials will be subject to recall—section 803.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DECENTRALIZATION COMMISSION

At the hearings on the tentative home rule proposal, a number of witnesses expressed a strong desire for some mechanism to bring government more effectively down to the neighborhood level. Obviously, this is a proposal that deserves much work and careful consideration. Consequently, the home rule bill would establish a Commission to "conduct a full and complete study of, and recommend to the Council a plan for, the establishment in the District of Columbia of neighborhood councils which shall have delegated to them those functions which can be administered on a neighborhood basis."—section 1102. The Commission would be composed of 12 members, eight appointed by the Mayor and four by the chairman of the Council—section 1103. Within 1 year, the Commission must submit its plan to the Council. The Council may approve the plan, approve it with revisions, or disapprove it. If the Council fails to take action within 60 days after the plan is

submitted, the neighborhood councils will be established in accordance with the plan—section 1106.

YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

It should be plain that youth are demanding and deserve a voice in determining the government policies affecting them. This was a major theme of much of the testimony at the neighborhood hearings. The home rule bill responds by creating a highly innovative youth advisory council. The youth council would have the duty of advising the City Council on legislation concerning youth, recommend legislation on matters affecting youth, and discuss, study and report to the Council generally on the problems affecting youth in the city—section 1122. The youth council would be composed of one member elected from each of the accredited public and parochial high schools in the District. The members would receive a stipend of \$1,500 a year for service on the youth council—section 1123. The youth council will be provided administrative support and services by the City Council—section 1124.

CHARTER REFERENDUM

Upon passage of the home rule bill by Congress, and approval by the President, the bill will be submitted to the people of the District for approval—section 1401. If the majority of the voters of the District accept the bill, it shall become law—section 1405.

THE WORKER IS NOT THE SCAPEGOAT

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1971

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of discussion about who's to blame for our current economic problems—the worker, profits, the money supply or the interest rate. The easiest and the current favorite scapegoat is organized labor.

A quick look at the economic history of the past few years shows this simplistic answer is unreasonable—many other costs, and many companies' and banks' profits, have increased more rapidly than labor costs. Furthermore, in real dollars the worker is falling behind. When he negotiates for a substantial increase in wages, he is only trying to keep his head above water. Those who blame him for inflation should remember—he is also among the first to suffer from soaring prices.

But the administration is not only trying to put the blame on the worker, it is making him the victim of its solution. Workers suffer from unemployment, from the administration's opposition to a meaningful increase in the minimum wage, and now from meddling in the collective bargaining process—meddling that looks suspiciously like it could become compulsory arbitration.

The most definitive description of what the current economic problems mean to American workers comes, of course, from the spokesman of organized labor in

America, George Meany. He recently presented his views on the economic situation and on the administration's attempts to deal with it at the Seventh Convention of the International Insurance Workers Union. Because I think his statement is both interesting and informative, I include it in the RECORD at this time:

AN ADDRESS BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY TO THE 7TH CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE WORKERS UNION AT MIAMI BEACH, FLA., ON MAY 27, 1971

Yes, I am a plumber. I don't know how humble I am but I always try to stress the importance of the plumbing business. I say plumbers in a good many cases are more important than lawyers. You can put millions of people in a great city and get along without lawyers but you couldn't put them in there without plumbers. So I must warn you never to underestimate the importance of a plumber. In fact, I know anyone who has ever got a bill from a plumber doesn't underestimate them.

I would like to congratulate the Insurance Workers on the tremendously good job being done by this organization in a very difficult field, and when I say it is a difficult field to organize, I say that because of experience over many years; and I think under Bill Gillen the organization is showing real progress in its effort to bring benefit of trade unionism to the insurance workers of this great country.

Now I could discuss with you this morning many problems of interest to us as trade unionists and as Americans. Of course, we can always talk about the war. We have demonstrations and, of course, we have the criticism of the President and all the pros and cons in Congress about the war, but there is one thing there seems to be agreement on, that we should try to get out of Vietnam, get our boys home and turn our attention to the very important business that we have at home. Of course, they talk about a definite cut-off date, and while I certainly hold no brief for President Nixon I think we have to be absolutely fair and realize that when he became President we had 540,000 in Vietnam. He said that he would wind the war down and turn it over to the South Vietnam team and get our boys back as fast as he could; and in a period of a little over two years he has brought a couple of hundred thousand home, and we are down now to 260,000. So I think that we can say that within a reasonably short time this problem will certainly be out of the way.

But we have many problems here at home, many problems I could talk to you about—environment, clean air, clean water. After a century of doing business as usual, polluting the streams, polluting the air, we now find that everybody is concerned about environment. In my book, they should be concerned because this is a real problem.

And, of course, we have the problem of the generation gap. We have Women's Lib and the drug problem, poverty problems, and all that. But as trade unionists we are interested in the No. 1 problem, that is, the economy and jobs, and our business is jobs, decent jobs and under decent conditions with adequate pay, so the worker can get a fair share of the wealth that is produced by this democratic society we have here in the United States.

Everything that we do legislatively, organizationally, politically, is directed toward jobs and securing an adequate share of the wealth produced by the workers we represent.

So when we look at the economy today we see a rather sad picture. We are in trouble economically, and I think we should take a look at it and see how we got to this position.

We have now 6.1 percent of our people, our

working force, unemployed, which adds up to five million people. Of course, these are statistics, basic figures, but in human terms, the loss of a job is a serious thing. More and more of the unemployed are running out of their unemployment insurance and are turning to welfare and to other means of getting by.

How did we get to this position? In January, 1969, when the present Administration took office in Washington we had come through 90 consecutive months of continued economic improvement measured by every measuring rod that we used to see how the economy was going. We had something like 2.7 percent of our people unemployed at that time, which was the lowest figure in many, many years. And, of course, we had inflation which is always part of our problem. So when the new Administration came in, they announced they were going to do something new, that they were going to lick this problem of inflation, they were going to cool off the economy, slow it down. They were going to tighten up on money. They were going to restrict credit, but they were going to do this without increasing unemployment. President Nixon in a letter to the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO in early February, 1969, put it in writing. He said he was going to cool off the economy, he was going to bring the prices down but he was going to do it without adding to unemployment.

Of course, economists as a general rule felt when you slow down, when you tighten up on money, prevent business expansion, the natural result is that you do add to unemployment, but President Nixon said this was not going to happen.

Well, what did happen. They cooled off the economy all right. They slowed it down, and in two years we lost 2,200,000 jobs. We have seen the interest rates in this country go to the highest level in over 100 years, putting a tremendous burden not on big business, not on big banks but putting it on the small business man and putting it, the burden, on the citizen who wanted to buy a home. It got to the situation where interest rates were 10 percent, actual rates and 10½.

Now what did we get from the Administration during this period? Did we get any concrete proposals to try to turn this situation around? Incidentally, the prices did not go down; they went up. This took a lot of doing, according to the experts but the Nixon Administration managed to do it. They managed to add to unemployment and bring prices up at the same time.

Now as I say, what did we get during this time? Did we get any concrete proposal for jobs to build up the purchasing power? No! We got rosy predictions of what was to happen. Things are just going to be all right. Even though inflation kept going up, don't pay any attention to figures, everything is going to be all right.

Well, we don't take that, we go by the record, and the record shows that the Administration's so-called economic "game plan" which was inaugurated in January, 1969, is an absolute and complete failure. This "game plan" was the brainchild of Dr. Burns, who was a great economist, and he was the one that was in charge.

Now do we get from him any apology for the failure? Oh, no! He doesn't talk about his "game plan" any more but he talks about the trade union movement and about the workers. In other words, he is looking for a whipping boy. He is looking for someone upon whom to place the blame and he cracks down on wages, high wages are responsible for the inflation which we are going through.

So he comes up with some proposals: Compulsory arbitration for people in the important and vital industries; repeal of protective laws that have been put on the statute books for many years to protect workers who are engaged in employment, financed by federal funds, laws that have for their purpose the

idea that public money, the people's money should never be spent in a way to depress wages, to bring wages down.

He is against the minimum wage law. He is against increasing the minimum wage. But for business he feels that they should get another tax incentive of some kind. Now he points to the construction industry, trying to fix the blame there. And do you know that the one item in the cost of housing that has gone up the least in the last 20 years, according to official government figures and our figures, has been the cost of construction labor.

In 1959, when you bought a house in this country, 33 per cent of the money you paid for the house went for construction labor on the job. Now the cost of housing has gone up but if you buy a house today, 18 percent of the money you plant down for the house is for construction labor. That doesn't mean, as I say, that the house costs less; it costs more, but what happened? The cost of land upped 300 percent; the cost of hiring the money, of financing, upped 260 percent; the cost of closing fees have been doubled; the cost of material has been doubled, and the one item that has contributed the least to increase in prices is the cost of the construction labor itself on the job. And this is the thing that the President's economic advisors point to, not to the cost of interest, not to the high cost of land, but to labor, and that is an old story with us. Any time something goes wrong, they try to assess the blame and put it on labor.

Then we have the spectacle of the President's economic advisors headed up by Dr. McCracken, who came out with what they called inflation ethics. Just a couple of weeks ago they came out with a statement that if the steelworkers were to apply the same settlement they got a month or so ago from the canned industry, if they were to apply this to the steel settlement, the steel contracts, this would be very, very damaging to the economy.

So here we have the steelworkers and their employers who had not yet sat down at the bargaining table being told by government, be careful, don't give them too much of a wage increase, and this affects 450,000 basic steelworkers. So here we have the government in on the side of the employer at the bargaining table even before the negotiations start.

And there is every indication that the Administration is toying with the idea of compulsory arbitration.

This is not a good picture—the attempt to make labor the scapegoat and deliberately in an attempt to bring wages down, and, of course, if this plan were to be successful, and I don't think it is going to be, it will have a depressing effect on the entire economy and on everybody and every citizen of this great nation because this American economy that has produced so much over the years, produced more than any other economy of any other nation on earth, is based on the amount of mass purchasing power in the hands of the great mass of the people. The things that we can make and produce are sold to the American people. The American people, the American worker, is the best customer of American business, and this is a matter of record, and if you are going to destroy the purchasing power of your best customer, then you are going to bring the economy down and perhaps bring it to a halt.

Well, as far as the trade union movement is concerned, we are not going to buy that at all. We are not going to be intimidated. We are going to continue to move ahead and we are going to continue to demand a fair share for the worker of the wealth that the economy produces, and this is what the trade union movement is all about, and this is what it has always been all about.

Now there is a great deal to do in this country and we in the trade union movement

take pride in the fact that every activity that is directed toward the general welfare of the people as a whole finds the trade union movement in the forefront.

Now we have the problem of the nation's health, and this, of course, is one of our No. 1 legislative objectives this year—a national health plan. We have no problem as far as medical know-how is concerned. We have the best doctors in the world. We have hospitals. We haven't enough of them. We need some more. We have the best specialists in medicine in the world, but the problem stems from the fact that this whole industry, this industry of caring for the sick, is fragmented, and it is fragmented in the way that adds to the cost to the patient, and we have got to the point now in this country where it is almost impossible to meet the economic demands that come from illness.

We have cases where an individual entering the hospital and before getting to the operating room or before getting any attention at all, piles up all sorts of bills, so much to this specialist, so much to that specialist. Hospital rooms now are approaching, in fact they are not approaching, they are right at the \$100 a day level. The only people who can afford to be sick today in America are the very, very wealthy who have all the wherewithal they need, and the very, very poor who get care through the charity method. All those in between are in a real bind insofar as the cost of illness in this country is concerned. We feel that something should be done about it, and that government should do something about it, that Congress should do something about it, and we are going to be very, very active to see that they do.

Then we have got the minimum wage law. Now we put the minimum wage law on the statute books many years ago, in 1938—put a minimum of 25 cents an hour. Just think of it, 25 cents an hour. That was all we asked for, and at that time we were told that this would ruin business, this would put many small businesses out of business. Well, we went ahead. We brought millions under that law. We have raised it. We have got it now to \$1.60 an hour and it covers tens of millions of employees in industries that were not receiving a living wage.

Now is our real interest in that? We have a humanitarian interest in anything that affects workers anywhere, even workers outside the country. So we have this interest in low paid workers but we have another interest, and it is the economy as a whole.

When you get people getting 75 cents, 90 cents an hour and perhaps supplementing their income by getting food from the welfare agencies, those people are not playing their part in adding to the purchasing power that we need to keep our economy going, and we like to see the people who are getting 80 and 90 cents an hour get twice that, because then they will be able to play their part in the market and buy the things that the rest of the workers in this country can produce and give the whole economy an upward shot.

Well, we are asking for \$2 an hour immediately and then a raise within a year to \$2.25 an hour. This is still far below the government's own figure as to a minimum wage or a subsistence wage to keep people out of poverty and despite the fact that it is quite obvious that this would help millions of people, it would also help the economy as a whole, we find the Secretary of Labor testifying just yesterday against the increase of the minimum wage.

What is the argument? Well, business couldn't stand it. It would hurt small business and it would be inflationary. The same old arguments we have been hearing for 30 years, nothing new.

It is a funny thing, you bring a worker in a low paid industry up from \$1.60 an hour to \$2.00 an hour, an advance of 40 cents—\$16 a

week, and we are told this is inflationary. The idea is that this puts too much money into the spending stream and will push prices up, and this to me is absolutely ridiculous because these people don't buy any luxury goods. Most of their money goes just for food, clothing and shelter.

At the same time we don't hear a single word from the Administration about the doubling of the interest rates, about the millions and millions of dollars of profits that the banks made in the last two years due to this high interest rate. Why is it that high interest rates and enormous profits to banks and large corporations are not inflationary but a "lousy" 40 cents an hour to a day laborer is inflationary? This is something we can never understand.

Well, we are going to be in these things, all of the things that apply to the consumer, minimum wage, consumer protection, truth-in-lending, truth-in-labeling, and so forth, because this is our business.

During these recent years of national turmoil and stress the American trade union movement has remained solidly dedicated to the general welfare of all the people of this great country. In carrying out our demand for a very fair share of wealth, we are going to adhere to the solid principles on which our movement is founded, and we have always believed that whatever is good for the American people as a whole, must of necessity, be good for the trade union movement for the workers that we represent.

So we intend to continue to be identified in Washington as a people's lobby and as we go away from a war-oriented economy to a period of reconversion we realize that the nation must face up to the vital domestic problems that affect the lives and welfare of all of our people.

We need more housing in this country. We need to rehabilitate our cities, many of which have become vast slums. We need better medical care. We have the know-how and we should see to it that this medical care is delivered to the great mass of the American people and not just to the very wealthy or the very poor.

We are in good shape I would say as national AFL-CIO to meet these challenges but 1972 is going to be a crucial year for all who believe that the prosperity of this nation is measured not by the health of its banks and large corporations but by the economic welfare and standing of the great mass of its people. This has always been our measuring rod and it is the measuring rod we are going to continue to use in the days ahead.

So when we look at 1972 we have got to see to it that we elect those in Washington who are responsive to the needs of this great nation, who are responsive to the needs of the little people of America.

We have a very efficient organization in many respects. We have a fine research department, organizing department, civil rights, but one of our best departments is COPE, the AFL-CIO political arm, and they are prepared and getting prepared for 1972. We are going to need, however, the full cooperation of every international union, every local union at every level of this great federation.

Now I am confident in the days to come, American labor will play its part as it always has played in improving the lot of the great mass of the American people. We don't buy the idea that labor is the scapegoat. We don't buy the idea that prosperity comes from keeping the banks and the large corporations prosperous. We still adhere to the theory that the prosperity of this great nation must be based on the purchasing power of the great mass of the American people, our members and all those who work for wages.

I am supremely confident come 1972 we are going to do our job again and I am confident we are going to have the cooperation

of Bill Gillen and this great American organization representing the workers in the insurance industry.

Thank you very much.

KORCZAK ZIOLKOWSKI, MOUNTAIN CARVER

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota is justly famous as the home of "The Shrine of Democracy" at Mount Rushmore near Rapid City, S. Dak. This memorial to four great American Presidents is visited by hundreds of thousands of visitors every year who are left awed by this great tribute to these deserving Americans. Yet, not far away, another tribute to another American is under construction. This is the Crazy Horse Memorial being sculpted by Korczak Ziolkowski near Custer, S. Dak.

After 22 years of work nearly 2,700,000 tons of rock have been blasted away. This is seven times more stone than was removed at Mt. Rushmore all together. A rough outline of Crazy Horse's profile, the top of his arm, and the top of the horse's mane are silhouetted free against the sky. The opening under Crazy Horse's outstretched arm is clear through the mountain. When this tunnel is completed, a 10 story building would be able to be fitted in it.

Thus far, the project has been financed entirely without the aid of either Federal or State funds. The U.S. Treasury Department has, however, seen fit to make contributions to the Memorial tax exempt. Fundamentally, the project is financed through a \$2 per car admission fee of the visitors who can see not only the magnificent project under construction, but also Mr. Ziolkowski's studio-home and gallery. The proceeds go solely to purchase the dynamite and equipment and to pay for any help the sculptor has with him. Mr. Ziolkowski himself donates his time to the project and has never had a salary or expense account.

This story is eloquently told in Korczak Ziolkowski, Mountain Carver by Rev. Joseph Swastek. I would recommend this book highly to you, and to whet your appetite I would like at this point to reproduce one of the chapters from the book called "Thunder in the Sky." It follows:

THUNDER IN THE SKY

In the Black Hills of South Dakota, the mountain vacation land of the United States, twenty-four miles from Rapid City, in the glare of the summer sun of 1939, two men were helping Gutzon Borglum dynamite out of Mount Rushmore the world's greatest monument to four great Americans. These four Americans were presidents who personified to the world the individual freedom and equality of opportunity for which America stands and on which American democracy rests—Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt. The monument was the world-famed Mount Rushmore National Memorial aptly called *The Shrine of Democracy*.

As the two men watched the sixty-foot faces of the four president emerging more

and more distinctly from the granite of the mountain-side, and while they listened to the thunderous booms of periodic dynamite blasts and to the staccato pounding of air drills, an idea fired their imagination. They decided to construct an even larger monument—not only to enshrine a great ideal but also to repair an even greater wrong. They determined also that this new memorial, like the Mount Rushmore shrine, should be raised in the Black Hills where once the thunder of white men's guns had shattered the red man's peace.

The Black Hills are a small group of mountains partly in northeastern Wyoming but principally in western South Dakota. They stretch over a total area of about 6,000 square miles—roughly 100 miles in length and fifty miles in width—about a third of which is covered with dense dark pine from which the region derives its name. Fed by several streams and creeks, the region forms an oasis in a semi-arid plain.

This was one reason why the Dakota Sioux Indians inhabited the Black Hills more than a century ago. The Dakotas were the largest native group among the Sioux Indians, who were second only to the Algonquins in numbers among all the Indian nations within the present area of the United States. They numbered over 30,000 men, women and children and, according to an authority, were universally conceded to be of the highest type, "physically, mentally and probably morally of any of the western tribes." Brave, vigorous, hardy and unrivalled as horsemen, they were described by one American general as the best light cavalry in the world.

The Dakotas loved their hills and regarded them with religious veneration as well as native affection and loyalty. Perhaps they knew of the incredibly rich mineral deposits of gold, silver, copper and tin hidden in the Black Hills, particularly gold. If they did, they made little noise about them and still less use of them, preferring the animal treasures found in the streams and woods. In this they differed from the white men who visited their hills from time to time.

In 1874, an expedition under General George Custer discovered gold in the Black Hills, starting the last important gold rush in the United States. The floating white population of the West—prospectors, miners, desperados—rushed into the hill oasis, peopling Deadwood and other mining towns almost overnight. Wild Bill Hickok, Calamity Jane and the Wells Fargo stagecoach drivers became familiar and fabulous figures in this "Richest One Hundred Miles Square in the World"—an area that fully justified its flamboyantly boastful designation by yielding over \$100,000,000 in gold alone and becoming one of the richest gold-mining districts in the United States.

It also became one of the bloodiest for a brief span of years. As the miners poured into the Black Hills, disrupting the primitive life of the natives and despoiling both people and land, the Sioux Indians rose to defend their sacred mountains and their fields and streams. Under the leadership of Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse, they overwhelmed the regiment of General Custer at the Little Big Horn in 1876 and temporarily stemmed the white man's invasion of their domain. But when they heard and faced the thunder of booming cannons, they soon realized that they fought a losing battle. Their arrows and anger were no match for the white man's artillery and artifice.

In the spring of 1877 Crazy Horse surrendered with 2,000 warriors and was herded into a reservation, a virtual prisoner. Several months later, while trying to get his tuberculous young wife to a doctor, he was bayoneted to death by a soldier. One of the American officers who fought against him remarked upon his death: "Crazy Horse was one of the great soldiers of his day and gen-

eration. As the grave of Custer marked the high-water mark of Sioux supremacy in the trans-Mississippi region, so the grave of Crazy Horse marked the ebb."

The Dakota Sioux never recovered from the blow, losing the Black Hills, as they had lost so much of their land elsewhere in America, to the white invaders who were ruthlessly pushing westward, driven by insatiable land hunger and greed for wealth. Dispossessed, exploited, beaten but never broken, the proud Dakotas treasured the memory of Chief Crazy Horse as a tragic symbol of the red man's greatness—a warrior martyred for his devotion to his race and land.

The new memorial conceived in the summer of 1939 at Mount Rushmore's *Shrine to Democracy* was to enshrine that memory in a colossal granite monument carved out of a mountain as a lasting tribute to a man and a race that remained unbroken even in defeat and despair. The man who conceived this memorial was Henry Standing Bear, a leader among the Pine Ridge Sioux of South Dakota. While serving as an interpreter for Gutzon Borglum, Chief Standing Bear was impressed with America's tribute to its great sons. Proud of his Indian heritage and mindful of the red man's moments of greatness, he determined to immortalize in granite one of its heroes—a warrior chief who had lived, hunted, fought and died in the Black Hills.

The man whom Chief Standing Bear entrusted with the task of realizing his dream was an assistant of Gutzon Borglum, a Polish American sculptor named Korczak Ziolkowski. Orphaned by his parents at the age of three, Boston-born Ziolkowski was thirty-one years old at the time and perhaps the most promising self-taught sculptor in the United States. By dint of hard work, native talent, friendly encouragement of perceptive Bostonians and the inspiration of his wife Dorothy Brewster Comstock, he had carved several striking subjects in wood and marble—figureheads, fountains, equestrians, busts and figures. Perhaps the most famous of these was the heroic marble head of Paderewski called *Study of an Immortal*, which won the first sculptural award at the New York World's Fair in 1939.

Early that year at the invitation of Gutzon Borglum Korczak Ziolkowski went to South Dakota where he spent several months working with air drills and dynamite upon the presidential memorial at Mount Rushmore, one of the Black Hills. A firm believer in freedom and equality of opportunity, in fair play and justice for all men regardless of their color of social background, Ziolkowski listened with sympathetic understanding to Chief Standing Bear's saga of the Black Hills and to his dream of a memorial that would commemorate the bravery of a heroic race struggling undauntedly against insuperable odds to maintain its identity, its native land, its way of life.

So was born the Crazy Horse Memorial project now in progress. There is a certain historic and cultural justice in this spectacle of a Polish American sculptor undertaking a vast memorial to an Indian martyr who died for the freedom of his people. Fittingly, it was a Pole, a member of a nation steeped in the Christian tradition, who carved the gigantic statue of Christ on top of an Andean peak in South America, as a symbol of American belief in Christian justice. Fittingly, too, it is a descendant of the Polish people three times invaded and partitioned by greedy neighbors, who is carving the statue dedicated to the Indian race partitioned and decimated by greedy white invaders from beyond the Atlantic.

Once more the sound of thunder echoes in the sky of the Black Hills, the thunder of dynamite blasting the side of a mountain. But it is a welcome not a fearful echo, for it announces the construction of a monument that will stand through the ages as a symbol of the red man's courage and its belated

recognition by the white man—an eloquent testimony to the American sense of justice and fair play for all men.

A HERO AT AGE OF 74

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in a time when very few people seem willing to "get involved" in helping their fellowman, a refreshing and commendable action has been brought to my attention.

Dr. J. Virgil Fishel of Arcola, Ill., a country doctor who is still practicing at the age of 74, recently rescued a woman trapped in her automobile by rising flood waters.

I believe that recognition should be given to such acts of heroism, and would like to call the following article to the attention of my colleagues. Dr. Fishel is the father of my constituent, Mrs. Robert Allington of Sunnyvale, Calif.

[From the *Tuscola (Ill.) Journal*, June 10, 1971]

DR. J. VIRGIL FISHEL—A HERO AT AGE OF 74

Douglas County had a lot of unusual weather conditions on June 2.

Several emergencies arose as a result of severe weather conditions and Dr. J. Virgil Fishel of Arcola was an outstanding hero of one very difficult situation.

There were storm warnings out all day and it rained heavily during the day in the eastern part of the county.

The rain came to Tuscola at 5 p.m. and a couple of inches fell during the evening.

The area south of here was hit much harder. There were high winds, some hail and it was said that south of Galton, there was six inches of rain in five minutes.

However much there was, a lot of flooding resulted and it was necessary to close route 45 between Arcola and Tuscola to passenger cars for about an hour. Heavy trucks were permitted to go through.

Route 133 east of Interstate 57 was also flooded.

A mobile home being towed between Tuscola and Arcola on Interstate 57 was blown over. It was extensively damaged.

The most serious emergency occurred during the height of the storm.

Dr. Fishel was returning to his home in Arcola from Jarman hospital, where he had been on an emergency call. He had been called to the hospital to remove a needle from a boy's hand.

The doctor was proceeding south on route 45, south of Galton, when he noticed a car in the ditch. A closer look revealed that the car was occupied by a woman.

The car was occupied by Mrs. Gracie Burch, Arcola, who later told how she got into her predicament. She had met a bus on the flooded pavement and the wake left by the speeding bus just floated her car off the road and into the ditch.

The car came to rest near a culvert running under the Illinois Central railroad tracks and the force of the current prevented her from opening her car door.

Dr. Fishel stopped and called to her and told her she had better get out of the car quickly. When he saw she was helpless, he got out of his own car, affected her rescue and took her home to Arcola.

It was said Dr. Fishel waded water up to his chin and withstood the stiff current in bringing Mrs. Burch to safety. Of course, he

was soaked to the skin by the time he completed the rescue.

After getting into some dry clothes at home, Dr. Fishel was back on the job of ministering to the sick that evening with hardly a moment of rest.

Dr. Fishel is a 1927 graduate of the UI school of medicine. He practiced in Chicago before coming to Arcola 35 years ago.

Dr. Fishel will be 75 on his next birthday in November. He is also somewhat handicapped because of surgery that removed part of his left foot several years ago.

However, his manner and carriage are still quite youthful and he certainly demonstrated that he was more than equal to the emergency that occurred during the storm.

Dr. Fishel is the founder of a nursing home in Arcola that bears his name. He is active in his medical society, he still makes house calls and he has served as deputy county coroner for many years.

BALTIC ANNIVERSARIES REMEMBERED

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, Baltic Americans are especially reminded this month of the colonialism under which the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia must live. It was 31 years ago—June 15, 1940—when the Baltic republics were forcibly annexed to the Soviet empire. A year later, in June of 1941, Lithuanians successfully overthrew the Soviet-imposed regime, regaining self-determination for their land. This brief respite from external domination lasted less than 7 weeks as the Nazis subsequently took over Lithuania.

One of the tragedies of the last three decades in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania has been the loss of over one-quarter of the population during this period of occupation. Hundreds of thousands were taken from their homes. Many died from inhumane treatment by the invaders. Those surviving were transported to the Arctic or Siberia. Severe disruption of these countries' cultural and ethnic character, which was traditionally distinct from both German and Soviet influence, has resulted. National identity as well as self-determination has been stripped from these defenseless countries.

To their credit, however, the Balts have persistently fought for freedom. More than 30,000 Lithuanians died in organized resistance against the invaders between the years of 1940 and 1952. Since that time, the Baltic resistance has taken more passive means in continued opposition to external oppression.

Baltic-Americans and other freedom-conscious Americans are concerned about the kind of exploitation and subjugation that results when human rights and the freedom of self-determination are denied. This is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, as noted by the 89th Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 416, requesting the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. I join in calling on the President to bring this concern to the United Nations and include at this point in the

RECORD the text of House Concurrent Resolution 416 which was passed unanimously by the House and the Senate in 1966:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

In addition to the concurrent resolution cited above, there are other precedents of concern by the United States for the Baltic countries. Every President since 1940 has stated that the policy of our country is nonrecognition of the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. A select committee of the House in the 83d Congress investigated this matter and made certain recommendations.

During this time of both sad and happy recollections of the events of 1940 and 1941 for the Baltic people, we should all make a renewed effort to restore basic human rights and self-determination where they have been denied and where people are oppressed.

TRIBUTE TO DR. HAIM SHEBA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Israel these days is mourning one of her leading citizens, Dr. Haim Sheba, former director of Tel Hashomer Hospital. My wife and I had the privilege of counting this wonderful man as a friend, and we extend our sympathy to his family, to his many devoted admirers, and indeed to all his countrymen. Inserted herewith is an

article from the Jerusalem Post on the tributes paid to Dr. Sheba at his funeral:

HAIM SHEBA LAID TO REST

(By Macabee Dean)

TEL AVIV.—A cross-section of the entire nation—from Prime Minister Golda Meir to the most humble hospital patient—yesterday gathered at Tel Hashomer to pay final tribute to Dr. Haim Sheba, a man who became a legend during his lifetime.

"For the past two decades, Tel Hashomer Hospital and Dr. Sheba have been inseparable. Today, they became indivisible, for the Workers Committee has decided that henceforth the hospital will be called 'Sheba Hospital,'" declared Professor Richard Stein, a member of the staff and an old friend who almost broke down while eulogizing him.

Present at the eulogies were not only members of the Government (Mrs. Meir, Yigal Allon, Pinhas Sapir, Moshe Dayan, Victor Shemtov, Shimon Peres and Israel Galili), and the outstanding figures of the medical profession, but also thousands of his patients, soldiers and civilians alike, some still in their hospital pajamas. Emek Hefer, where Dr. Sheba worked for many years, sent a special delegation to the funeral.

President Shazar, who has been hospitalized, was represented by his Aide-de-Camp, Sgan Aluf Yisrael Yarkoni.

The body of Dr. Sheba, who passed away at the age of 63 from a sudden heart attack on Thursday, lay in state from 11 a.m. until three o'clock in the square in front of the Nursing School at Tel Hashomer.

A continuous stream of mourners filed past the bier which was draped in the national colours, and surrounded by wreaths. The doctor's son, Shmuel Sheba, chanted *kaddish*. Dr. Sheba was eulogized by Health Minister Shemtov who called Dr. Sheba, "a man who lived his entire life on a spiritual plane."

"He was a veteran fighter," Mr. Shemtov said, "and when he fell ill, neither his family nor his friends could persuade him to spare himself—for his life belonged to his patients."

George Wise, President of the Tel Aviv University, called him a "righteous person," a man who "enriched everyone who came in contact with him." Dr. Noah Kaplinsky, chairman of the Israel Medical Association, said that Dr. Sheba's death had created "a gap in our ranks, a gap which can never be filled."

Professor Stein, the last to speak at Tel Hashomer, termed him a "humble genius . . . a man who built Tel Hashomer into the hospital it is today."

The coffin was carried by military pallbearers to an open Army van; and the funeral procession, which consisted of hundreds of vehicles, wended its way to the Kiryat Shaul Cemetery. Here, at the graveside in the civilian section, the Chief Army Chaplain, Tat-Aluf Mordechai Piron, quoted from the Psalms and Shmuel Sheba again chanted *kaddish*.

Defense Minister Moshe Dayan recalled the years he had known Dr. Sheba, a man "who treated his patients as if they were holy, a man who spoke in a low and serene voice, a man who was eternally smiling, both externally and internally, a man who had spent his whole life fighting for the betterment of man."

Looking at the grave, Mr. Dayan said: "This is the final station for all of us in life, but so very few of us will ever reach it with such a human and perfect life behind them."

Asher Wallfish adds: The Cabinet stood in silence at its weekly session yesterday, to mark Dr. Sheba's memory. Premier Golda Meir delivered a eulogy, in which she expressed her own profound mourning and the grief of her colleagues, as well as of the entire nation. Describing Dr. Sheba's great modesty, she stressed that the loss was personal and private, as well as public. She listed some of the milestones in Dr. Sheba's career, from his

days working with immigrants in the Cyprus detention camps, through the Hagana and the I.D.F., and finally to his achievements in the sphere of public medicine.

The Histadrut Central Committee yesterday also devoted part of its meeting to commemorate the late Dr. Haim Sheba. An eulogy was delivered by Histadrut Secretary-General Yitzhak Ben-Aharon.

THE MILWAUKEE PROJECT: NEW RESULTS IN INFANT EDUCATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, two important articles have just been published about a remarkable infant education project in Milwaukee, Wis., which has produced solid evidence that, first children start learning virtually from birth and second, that if the process is begun soon enough, education can be a vehicle for helping bring children of the illiterate poor out of the poverty cycle.

Carl T. Rowan has written about the Milwaukee Infant Education Center in his syndicated column appearing in the Washington Sunday Star, June 27. Stephen P. Strickland's report on the project and its implications is the lead story in the July issue of American Education. Both articles tell of the results of a project designed and implemented by a multidisciplinary team from the University of Wisconsin which, for four and a half years, has been teaching infant children of poor, functionally retarded parents in a severely distressed section of the city of Milwaukee. Those results are striking: the oldest children in the program are now four and a half years of age, and some of them are measuring as high as 135 on intelligence quotient tests.

One particularly fortunate aspect of the Milwaukee Infant Education project—which sets it apart from many "research and demonstration" efforts—is that the researcher-educators who have been involved in it are making a concerted effort to share their successful designs, techniques and instructional materials.

Mr. Rowan suggests that one of the lessons to be learned from the Milwaukee project is that Head Start programs may be getting to children too late. Both Mr. Rowan and Mr. Strickland quote the Milwaukee project's director, Dr. Rick Heber, as saying that his experience with the Infant Education Center shows "a capacity for learning on the part of extremely young children surpassing anything which previously I would have believed possible."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article by Mr. Rowan in the RECORD:

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

MILWAUKEE STUDY EXPLODES THE INFERIORITY IDEA

(By Carl T. Rowan)

The nation was buzzing a couple of years ago over Prof. Arthur R. Jensen's theory that heredity, not environment, renders blacks 15 IQ points dumber than whites.

The scientific community recently was embroiled in controversy over Dr. William Shockley's thesis that blacks lack a certain gene common to Caucasians and that this makes them mentally inferior. Shockley is unhappy because the National Academy of Sciences won't conduct studies to verify his thesis.

Some educators—and politicians around the White House—have raised the question of whether it is a waste of money to try to educate the slumdwelling poor in conventional ways. The suspicion is that most of these youngsters are uneducable and might better be taught simple vocational skills.

Jensen, Shockley and the doubting "educators" ought to take a close look at a remarkable project in Milwaukee that has shown disadvantaged children to be capable of educational achievements far beyond anyone's expectation.

A University of Wisconsin team has taken infants from the worst slums of Milwaukee, all of whose mothers had IQs of less than 70, and subjected them to "every aspect of sensory and language stimulation."

This massive intervention into the lives of these children included occupational training for the mother as well as training in home-making and baby-care techniques.

After four years, the IQs of the youngsters have jumped more than 50 percent, with some scoring as high as 135.

Dr. Rick Heber, professor of education and child psychology at Wisconsin and director of the project, said recently:

"We have seen a capacity for learning on the part of extremely young children surpassing anything which, previously, I would have believed possible. The trend of our present data does engender the hope that it may prove to be possible to prevent the kind of mental retardation which occurs in children reared by parents who are both poor and of limited ability."

Heber noted at the start of the project that of the 6 million mentally retarded people in the United States, almost 5 million have "no identifiable gross pathology of the nervous system." These 5 million are almost exclusively residents of economically distressed urban and rural areas.

Moreover, Heber and his team saw that mental retardation in the slums is strikingly concentrated within individual families where the intelligence of the mother is low.

At first this was thought to support the "heredity is more powerful than environment" school. After all, if children of normal IQ mothers lived in the slums and still achieved, while children of low IQ mothers were retarded, could anything but heredity be the reason?

The Milwaukee project has shown, however, that a mother of low IQ creates an especially crippling environment for her children—above and beyond the ordinary handicaps of the slums.

Heber's Infant Education Center and project workers have in effect supplanted the retarded mothers of a group of youngsters (where cognitive development is concerned) and shown that "heredity" did not doom the infants to retardation.

It should be clear that such massive intervention into the environments of disadvantaged children is not now applicable to public education. The cost of the Milwaukee project averaged about \$10,000 per child.

But some lessons from the project are applicable.

"Our data suggests that even Head Start is getting children when they are too old," says Dr. Pat Flanagan, a Heber associate.

The most important impact of the Milwaukee project could be in changing attitudes about the potential of America's disadvantaged children.

If teachers and school administrators simply start to believe these children are educable, and earnestly take whatever "com-

pensatory" intervention is now feasible, it could make a world of difference for a lot of children—and for the nation.

TRAGIC BUNGLING IN POLICE RAID

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of June 25, 1971, carried an editorial concerning the recent raid by U.S. Treasury agents on the home of Mr. Kenyon Ballew under the heading "Tragic Bungling in Police Raid." So that my colleagues may be aware of the view of the Daily News I include the text of the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

TRAGIC BUNGLING IN POLICE RAID

In the three weeks that have gone by since the shooting of a 27-year-old gun collector during a raid on his Silver Spring apartment by U.S. Treasury agents and Montgomery County police, nothing has happened to erase our original suspicion that the whole tragic operation was ill-conceived at the start and bungled at the finish.

If Kenyon Ballew was guilty of anything other than trying to protect his family from what to an ordinary man must have seemed to be a terrifying assault by strangers upon his home, no one has shown it.

The fact that he is under intensive care at a hospital with a bullet in the brain does not explain why he hasn't been charged with keeping hand grenades (those that were seized in the raid were "dummies," empty casings, according to his wife) and police themselves admit that the guns in his collection were legally his.

Treasury agents had secured a search warrant from U.S. Magistrate Archie Meatyard on the basis of information which an unidentified source had passed on to a Prince Georges County policeman who in turn had tipped the Treasury. The frailty of this information is demonstrated not so much by the double or triple hearsay as by the simple fact that after the raid and the shooting nothing appears to have been found to justify the action in any way.

It's acknowledged that "no-knock" raids entail some possible perils other than those to the Constitution, but this was not exactly a "no-knock." The lawmen, some of whom, at least, appeared to be dressed in "hippy" clothes, smashed down the door at dusk with a battering ram (the warrant did not permit a nighttime raid). How much warning they gave of their identity and intention is hard to tell. The way things went, it would take an immoderately trustful householder to believe that he had nothing to fear from the intruders.

If there's any good excuse for what happened to the Ballews, we'd like to hear it, starting with Mr. Meatyard, who seems to have licensed a search without first determining what less traumatic measures might be taken first. Like how about sending a policeman around in uniform some morning to knock on the door and make polite inquiry as to the armaments kept therein? Who knows, he might have been shown around.

Finally, there is no excuse for the action of Montgomery's Acting Police Chief Kenneth Watkins who still insists upon keeping secret the facts in this case, public information which the people have every right to know.

It is necessary to remind Col. Watkins that police business is public business, and that police, even when they make mistakes, are responsible to the people and to no one else.

TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me from Hon. Randolph Thrower before he retired as Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, together with the data about which the letter was written. I also offer a schedule of the 100 largest offers-in-compromise cases handled by the Service in 1970. I am continuing this service begun by former Senator John Williams, of Delaware, for the information of the Senate and, by means of its publication in the RECORD, of the country.

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

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1971.

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: In response to your request, we are undertaking to furnish you the type information dealing with our collection work which for many years was given to Senator Williams. We share your view that the active interest shown by Senator Williams in securing and publishing this information has served a constructive purpose, and we welcome the fact you plan to continue this interest.

This letter will provide information on accounts classified as uncollectible in the 58 district offices throughout the country. We also plan to furnish you a separate listing of the hundred largest compromise settlements; these data are now being compiled and will be sent you in the near future.

By way of background, you will appreciate that an account is considered by the Service to be delinquent only after a series of earlier efforts to collect the tax—typically including the mailing of three or four notices of tax due—have proved unsuccessful. At that stage, the Service has no choice but to consider an account as delinquent and at this point it becomes a responsibility of our Collection Division.

The following table summarizes as of December 31, 1969 and 1970, the taxpayer delinquent accounts broken down as to active and inactive status. Accounts in the inactive category are those in which collection action has been deferred pending the outcome of audit examinations, court cases, or other contingent actions.

TDA INVENTORY
[Amount in thousands]

	Active	Inactive	Total
Dec. 31, 1969	\$1,366,820	\$651,969	\$2,018,789
Dec. 31, 1970	1,529,999	631,592	2,161,591
Change from Dec. 31, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1970	+163,179	-20,377	+142,802
Percent of change	+12	-3	+7

	Number	Active	Inactive	Total
Dec. 31, 1969	964,510	100,672	1,065,182	
Dec. 31, 1970	952,660	69,508	1,022,168	
Change from Dec. 31, 1969 to Dec. 31, 1970	-11,850	-31,164	-43,014	
Percent of change	-1	-31	-4	

The above statistics show that although accounts in inventory have declined, their dollar value has increased significantly. During 1970, limited additional manpower resources were made available by our appropriations committees which permitted us to throw more manpower into the work. As a result, substantially more cases were closed, despite an increasing number of issuances; thus, the inventory reduction in number. At the same time, however, the average dollar value per delinquent account issued in 1970 was \$1,336, some \$144 more per account than issued in 1969. Equally important, the average dollar value per delinquent account closed in 1970 was \$1,277 or \$150 more per account than closed in 1969.

The following table shows the increase in delinquent accounts issued and closed in 1969 vis-a-vis 1970. The increase in inventory dollar value reflects the factors discussed above, coupled with the steady growth in taxable income.

[Dollars in millions]

Delinquent accounts	Number calendar year		Amount, calendar year	
	1969	1970	1969	1970
Issued	2,689,203	2,742,999	\$3,208	\$3,666
Closed	2,470,741	2,763,817	2,786	3,531

Attachment 1 is the year-end inventory broken down by the various tax groups and showing the inactive accounts in the column to the right. The figures in the inactive category are included in the figures shown in the columns under the various tax groups as well as in the total column. All offices were current in their issuances as of December 31, 1970.

Attachment 2 contains a district-by-district tabulation of accounts classified as uncollectible in 1970. As we have explained in previous reports, the classification of accounts as uncollectible does not necessarily mean that the potential revenue is irrevocably lost to the government. Rather, uncollectible accounts are those on which the likelihood of collection is so remote that it would be unwise to devote further manpower to them when it can be better used on more productive work. Typical of these are no asset cases, taxpayers who cannot be located, and those where collection would cause undue hardship to the taxpayer or his family. Under stringent controls and procedures, these accounts are classified as uncollectible. When subsequent information is developed that indicates the possibility of collecting such accounts, collection action is resumed. Even where there is no indication of the taxpayer's capability to resume periodic payments, which would justify reactivating the accounts, the Service does frequently recover all or part of the amount due from refunds that later come due.

In total, accounts classified as uncollectible increased sharply in both number (+83,000) and amount (+\$148 million) in 1970 when compared to 1969. This was a nationwide trend; in fact, only 7 of 58 districts showed a decline in the number of accounts classified as uncollectible, and only 9 of 58 districts showed a decline in their dollar value. Moreover, not a single district had a decline in both number and amount. General economic conditions caused some of the gain. Mari-

huana assessments, which are traditionally uncollectible, were also a factor. In fact, our Western Region has reported that 58% of their large dollar amounts classified as uncollectible is due to marihuana assessments.

While the Service has no control over the taxpayer's ability to pay, our Data Processing system does give us an efficient and expeditious means of recovering such monies due when the economic status of the taxpayer brightens. Our Data Processing system analyzes subsequent returns filed by taxpayers who have accounts classified as uncollectible. If a refund is due, it is offset against the uncollectible amount; if uncollectible because taxpayer could not be located and a new address is shown, or if uncollectible because of inability to pay and income is in excess of a predetermined level (based upon the taxpayer's financial circumstances) the accounts are reissued for further collection effort.

Attachment 3 is a listing of the names of taxpayers who had obligations to the government in excess of \$25,000 which in 1970 were designated as uncollectible, together with the type of tax involved and the district office in which this action took place.

In other words, the enclosure is a listing of accounts of such size—taking into account the volume of collection activity in the various districts—as would require special identification. You will appreciate therefore that the enclosure represents a partial listing.

Because of practical limits on the Service's ability to report and make use of all the information available, the data reported includes no addresses, nor does it include every account over \$25,000. The reason for the latter is that levels of reporting vary from district to district and are set in light of our purpose to identify accounts included in the district total that are large enough to distort that district's total. For example, a large account could warp entirely one's appreciation of the total value of the accounts written off as uncollectible in a small district, whereas, the same account would not have this effect in a large district. Thus, in a small district we might provide that all accounts over \$25,000 be reported, but in a large district we might set this amount at \$75,000.

Attachment 4 contains a district-by-district tabulation of abatements which are of course entirely different from uncollectibles. Except in the case of offers in compromise, an assessment is abated only if it is in excess of the tax amount actually due and legally owing at the time. These cannot be reinstated except through a subsequent assessment. The following types of assessment qualify for abatement:

1. Assessments in excess of the amount legally due as determined by audit examination.
2. Assessments in excess of the amount accepted on an offer in compromise.
3. Jeopardy assessments later determined by court ruling to be excessive.
4. Jeopardy assessments when it is administratively determined that jeopardy does not exist.
5. Transferee assessments in excess of the basic transferee assessments.
6. 100 percent penalty assessments in excess of the basic corporate assessment.

I trust the information furnished will be helpful to you. It has been my purpose to communicate the standing of the various facets of our collection work in a way that will bring out its scope and range. In that light, therefore, I will welcome any thoughts you may have as to how we might further improve this report. Once again, I appreciate your interest in this vital phase of the Service's activities.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

RANDOLPH W. THROWER,
Commissioner.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED AUG. 26, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Ace Bonding Co., Inc., was 182 Decatur Street SE., now 175 Butler Street SE., Atlanta, Ga. Case No. 58-068528A; district, Atlanta. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 8, 1969	Total
June 30, 1959	Feb. 5, 1965	2,466.92	173.34	1,121.37	848.31	4,609.94
June 30, 1960	do	8,831.27	441.56	2,326.62	2,600.10	14,199.55
June 30, 1961	July 19, 1966	3,475.03		988.43	677.63	5,141.09
June 30, 1962	June 28, 1966	2,181.04		489.51	428.79	3,099.34
June 30, 1963	July 29, 1966	2,628.30	214.69	443.34	541.88	3,828.21
June 30, 1964	July 19, 1965	2,780.65	694.77	705.45	313.22	4,494.09
June 30, 1965	Jan. 7, 1966	1,430.56	222.08	27.70	383.53	2,113.87
June 30, 1966	Dec. 9, 1966	1,794.08		25.31	304.39	2,123.78
Total		25,637.85	1,746.44	6,127.73	6,097.85	39,609.87

Amount of offer: \$19,000 plus collateral agreement. See terms below. Kind of tax: Corporation income. Date and place notice of lien filed: Apr. 5, 1965, Mar. 20, 1967, Sept. 10, 1965, Apr. 27, 1967. Mar. 11, 1965, Fulton County. Is case pending before appellate office? Yes. Is case pending before the Tax Court? No. Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No. Was bond filed? No. Terms of offer: \$19,000; \$9,000 payable upon notice of acceptance, then quarterly payments (\$250) beginning June 30, 1969, and continuing for each quarter thereafter through the quarter ending Mar. 31, 1975, with a \$4,000 payment due within 30 days after the Mar. 31, 1975 payment, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on Form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$3,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, through June 30, 1979, inclusive. Recommended by W. S. Pooley, revenue officer, Aug. 8, 1969; R. H. Milkhar, reviewer, Aug. 11, 1969. I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: A. C. Ross. For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Henry C. Stockell, Jr.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT, ACCEPTED OCT. 12, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-XX. In re offer in compromise: Liability of Richard S. Atkinson, Marion, S.C. Case No. XXX-XX-XXXX; district, Columbia. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Sept. 16, 1970	Total
1947	Sept. 16, 1966	\$599.07	\$53.90	\$665.06	\$156.71	\$1,474.74
1947 Def.	do	0	299.53	0	71.89	371.42
1948	do	457.49	41.18	480.44	119.68	1,098.79
1948 Def.	do	0	228.75	0	54.90	283.65
1949	do	457.49	41.18	452.99	119.68	1,071.34
1949 Def.	do	0	228.75	0	54.90	283.65
1950	do	409.77	36.87	381.15	107.19	934.98
1950 Def.	do	68.00	238.88	62.91	73.65	443.44
1951	do	779.00	62.82	677.86	202.04	1,721.72
1951 Def.	do	0	389.50	0	93.00	482.50
1952	do	843.00	68.58	682.97	218.78	1,813.33
1952 Def.	do	0	421.50	0	101.16	522.66
1953	do	843.00	68.58	632.39	218.78	1,762.75
1953 Def.	do	0	421.50	0	101.16	522.66
1954	do	792.00	61.56	542.65	204.85	1,601.06
1954 Def.	do	0	396.00	0	95.04	491.04
1955	do	810.10	19.10	506.44	199.01	1,534.65
1955 Def.	do	0	405.00	0	97.20	502.20
1956	do	810.00	19.10	457.78	199.01	1,485.89
1956 Def.	do	0	405.00	0	97.20	502.20
1957	do	825.75	19.10	417.14	202.76	1,464.75
1957 Def.	do	0	412.88	0	99.09	511.97
1958	do	1,521.45	38.54	677.29	374.40	2,611.68
1958 Def.	do	0	760.73	0	182.58	943.31
1959	do	2,372.82	61.24	913.92	584.17	3,932.15
1959 Def.	do	0	1,186.41	0	284.74	1,471.15
1960	do	3,307.57	86.34	1,075.49	814.54	5,283.94
1960 Def.	do	0	1,653.79	0	396.91	2,050.70
1961	do	12,086.96	331.61	3,204.98	2,980.46	18,604.01
1961 Def.	do	0	6,043.48	0	1,450.44	7,493.92
1962	Dec. 2, 1966	6,937.91	4,183.52	2,310.39	2,307.81	15,739.63
1963	do	6,522.50	3,261.25	1,409.71	1,838.01	13,031.47
Total		40,443.88	21,946.17	15,551.56	14,101.74	92,043.35

Amount of offer: \$55,000. Kind of tax: Income. Date and place notice of lien filed: Mar. 14, 1967, and Apr. 8, 1967, Marion County, Marion, S.C. Is case pending before appellate office? No. Is case pending before the Tax Court? No. Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No. Was bond filed? No. Term of offer: \$55,000 payable as follows: \$6,500 paid on previous offer in compromise, \$48,500 to be paid within 30 days after notification of acceptance of this offer, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the payment is made in full, with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 to the Internal Revenue Service for the years 1970 through 1979, inclusive. Recommended by H. L. Cunningham, revenue officer, Aug. 24, 1970; W. H. South, Jr., reviewer, Sept. 17, 1970. I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: H. M. McLeod. For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Henry C. Stockell, Jr.

Footnote at end of table.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT, ACCEPTED APR. 22, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-X. In re offer in compromise: Liability of Louis Axelrod, 229 Beach 14th St., Far Rockaway, N.Y. (Unit ledger cards read: Louis Axelrod and/or Joseph Senzon). Case No. XXX-XX-XXXX; District, Brooklyn, N.Y. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 26, 1970	Total
Sept. 30, 1950	June 26, 1951	6,716.81	0	0	11,546.97	18,263.78
Dec. 31, 1950	do	12,107.70	0	0	13,810.68	25,918.38
Total		18,824.51	0	0	25,357.65	44,182.16

Amount of offer: \$2,000.00. Kind of tax: 100 percent Penalty Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes. Date and place notice of lien filed: August 29, 1951—Register, Kings County; August 29, 1951—Register—New York County; August 30, 1951—County Clerk—Nassau County; August 30, 1951—Register—Queens County. Is case pending before appellate office? No. Is case pending before the tax court? No. Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No. Was bond filed? No. Terms of offer: \$2,000, payable \$200 cash with this offer and the balance within 75 days of acceptance of offer, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until payment in full is made, and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1974, inclusive, and has submitted a collateral agreement (covering a taxpayer involved in a joint assessment), whereby taxpayer agreed that acceptance of the offer shall not be construed as operating to release or discharge his obligor from the liability. Recommended by: Rupert W. Gill, revenue officer, Jan. 15, 1970; Fred Lipman, reviewer, Apr. 2, 1970. I accept, for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: John J. Hyde. For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offers should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagan, Apr. 16, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JUNE 4, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Louis S. Ballard, Jr., 6335 West Northwest Highway, Apt. 1613, Dallas, Tex. Case No. XXXX; District Dallas. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 25, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1964	Aug. 23, 1968	228,281.65	0	46,514.93	22,100.55	296,897.13

Amount of offer: \$15,000. Kind of tax: Income. Date and place notice of lien filed: Oct. 17, 1968, Los Angeles County, Calif., Feb. 6, 1969, Dallas County, Tex., Feb. 17, 1969, Harris County, Tex. Is case pending before appellate office? No. Is case pending before the tax court? No. Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No. Was bond filed? No. Terms of offer: \$15,000, payable at \$250 on the 1st of each month beginning 30 days after acceptance, with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on deferred payments from the date of acceptance until paid in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions of Form 656 (revised July 1957). Taxpayer has executed a collateral agreement (form 2261, revised May 1969) for payment of a graduated percentage of future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979 inclusive. He has executed a collateral agreement (form 2261-C, Sept. 1963) waiving net operating carryback or carry over losses for the years 1966 to 1968 inclusive. In addition the taxpayer has executed a collateral agreement. The taxpayer has agreed to waive claiming any capital loss carry over for any taxable year beginning after Dec. 31, 1969. Recommended by: R. K. Roberts, revenue officer, Feb. 27, 1970; B. E. McDuff, reviewer, Apr. 24, 1970. I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Ellis Campbell, Jr. For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthy, May 15, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAR. 21, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Orion P. Barron, 625 Borgess, Monroe, Mich. Case No. XXX-XX-XXXX; District Detroit. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Jun. 18, 1970	Total
1949	Oct. 18, 1968	551.74		465.87	128.37	2,003.83
				232.94		
				33.10		
				506.78		
				253.39		
1950	do	1,013.57		91.22	1,040.23	3,091.69
				273.31		
				136.66		
1951	do	546.62		520.73	100.58	1,627.11
				49.21		
				596.02		
				298.01		
1952	do	1,192.04		1,064.05	219.34	3,476.74
				107.28		
				750.51		
				375.26		

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAR. 21, 1970—Continued

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 8, 1969	Total
1953	Oct. 18, 1963	1,501.02	135.11	1,249.79	401.17	4,142.86
1954	do	2,218.15	1,109.08	205.17	1,713.82	5,599.46
1955	do	1,221.19	610.60	34.83	870.26	2,923.55
1956	do	775.80	387.90	18.20	506.31	1,806.40
1957	do	1,590.65	795.33	40.56	942.67	3,611.86
1958	do	987.81	493.91	23.68	526.14	2,182.08
1959	do	657.08	328.54	14.11	310.56	1,410.26
1960	do	1,501.20	1,038.09	34.84	619.44	3,450.98
1961	do	196.02	387.51	69.12	58.35	711.00
1962	Apr. 16, 1968	442.93	514.27	129.69	124.75	1,211.64
1963	do	898.93	813.37	209.27	22.31	1,943.88
Total		15,294.75	11,154.66	10,363.89	2,650.04	39,463.34

Amount of offer: \$15,294.75 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 16, 1968, Monroe County, Mich., Sept. 9, 1968, Monroe County, Mich.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$15,294.75 paid with the filing of the offer with waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500, for the years 1971 to 1975, inclusive.
 Recommended by John J. Healy, revenue officer, Feb. 26, 1970; B. P. Rutkowski, O/C coordinator, Mar. 6, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Thomas A. Cardozo, Mar. 27, 1970.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. Clarence E. Price, Mar. 18, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

In reoffer in compromise: Liability of John F. Bauerschmidt, 120 Woodbine Ave., Rochester, N.Y.
 Case No. 16-69-75 WT; District Buffalo, N.Y.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 20, 1970	Total
January 1959-April 1959	Nov. 20, 1964	1.58	1,411.35	1,639.03	458.91	3,510.87
January 1960-April 1960	do	0	1,682.02	1,590.70	546.65	3,819.37
January 1961-April 1961	do	3,368.26	1,691.96	1,214.65	1,664.57	7,919.44
January 1962-April 1962	do	5,477.38	1,461.62	725.62	2,255.17	9,919.79
January 1963-April 1963	do	5,436.80	1,449.82	407.80	2,238.15	9,532.57
Total		14,284.02	7,696.77	5,577.80	7,143.45	34,702.04

Amount of offer: \$19,800.
 Kind of tax: Withholding and FICA.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Jan. 7, 1965—Monroe County, refiled: Dec. 24, 1969.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$19,800 payable as follows: \$4,200 within 30 days of acceptance and, beginning with July 20, 1970, \$300 on the 20th of each month for 8 months, \$500 on the 20th of each month for 12 months, and \$200 on the 20th of each month for 36 months, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).
 Recommended by A. G. Bruneth, revenue officer, Mar. 23, 1970; Robert Van Volkenburgh, reviewer, June 8, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: John E. Foley, July 27, 1970.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. Marvin E. Hagen-FJL, June 19, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED OCTOBER 29, 1969

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Kenneth Chaplain and Evamae W. Branamen, 4411 Loch Raven Blvd., Baltimore, Md.
 District, Baltimore.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Dec. 11, 1969	Total
Accounts of Kenneth C. Branamen, 1962	Aug. 28, 1964	10,724.24	5,705.76	1,181.151	1,150.10	18,761.25
1963	do	2,571.01	2,724.50	126.81	370.69	5,793.01
Accounts of Kenneth C. and Evamae W. Branamen.						

Footnote at end of table.

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 8, 1969	Total
1957	Mar. 29, 1968		633.99		64.75	698.74
1958	do		457.39		46.71	506.39
1959	do		1,381.11		59.45	1,581.62
1960	do	565.26	3,719.55		229.30	4,954.74
1960 additional	Aug. 28, 1964	3,423.83	1,902.94		1,389.41	7,260.17
1961	Mar. 29, 1968	804.10	4,435.67		277.94	6,052.88
1961 additional	Aug. 28, 1964	6,348.78	218.40		1,466.60	7,921.83
1964	May 3, 1968	933.16	108.51		77.37	1,119.04
1965	June 24, 1966	3,625.80		383.09	324.88	4,333.77
Total		28,996.18	21,287.82	4,796.04	3,900.40	58,980.44

Amount of offer: \$21,000 deferred.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Jan. 15, 1965, July 1, 1968, Aug. 21, 1968, Sept. 6, 1968, Baltimore City, Md.; Jan. 15, 1965, July 1, 1968, Aug. 21, 1968, Baltimore County, Md.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: The sum of \$21,000 to be paid as follows: \$3,000 paid with the offer; \$3,000 to be paid 30 days after acceptance; \$250 to be paid on Aug. 29, 1969, and on the last day of each month thereafter for 59 months.
 Recommended by: Isaac Litt, revenue officer, Oct. 6, 1969; Constantine Avgerinos, reviewer, Oct. 6, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Francis G. Duehay, acting district director, Oct. 28, 1969.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. Cecil H. Haas, Oct. 21, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. xxxxx
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Mark Brankovich, 1250 Hilldale, Los Angeles, Calif.
 Liabilities as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Feb. 12, 1970	Total
Feb. 1965-Jan. 1966	Aug. 25, 1967	0	31,001.75	3,331.13	4,557.65	38,899.53

Amount of offer: \$10,000.
 Kind of tax: 100 percent penalty re withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Los Angeles County.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$10,000 paid with the offer, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on Form 656 (revised February 1969). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1976, inclusive.
 Recommended by M. Nimovitz, Revenue Officer, Feb. 3, 1970; Parrington, Mar. 3, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: E. S. Schmidt.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. Richard C. Schwartz, Mar. 10, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

[Date of Acceptance, Nov. 10, 1969]

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-x
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Frank I. and Evelyn E. Bringham, Geary, Okla.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Nov. 23, 1969	Total
1946	Feb. 29, 1968	710.02	177.51	888.46	173.15	1,949.14
1946	Apr. 19, 1968	None	35.50	None	3.73	39.23
1947	Feb. 23, 1968	749.94	187.49	893.41	178.84	2,009.68
1947	Apr. 19, 1968	None	37.49	None	3.56	41.05
1948	Feb. 23, 1968	46.73	11.68	52.87	10.98	122.26
1948	do	522.05	130.51	559.28	118.86	1,330.70
1949	Apr. 19, 1968	None	26.10	None	2.48	28.58
1950	Feb. 23, 1968	459.85	114.96	465.05	102.21	1,142.07
1950	Apr. 19, 1968	None	22.99	None	2.19	25.18
1951	Feb. 23, 1968	179.04	44.76	170.32	38.83	432.95
1952	do	712.52	178.13	635.08	150.68	1,676.41
1952	Apr. 19, 1968	None	35.63	None	3.38	39.01
1953	Feb. 23, 1968	763.50	190.88	634.70	157.34	1,746.42
1953	Apr. 19, 1968	None	38.18	None	3.62	41.80
1954	Feb. 23, 1968	745.03	186.27	574.69	97.79	1,603.83
1954	Apr. 19, 1968	None	37.25	None	3.54	40.79
1955	Feb. 23, 1968	809.62	202.41	575.89	106.26	1,694.18
1955	Apr. 19, 1968	None	40.48	None	3.85	44.33
1956	Feb. 23, 1968	844.00	211.00	549.71	110.78	1,715.49
1956	Apr. 19, 1968	None	42.20	None	4.01	46.21
1957	Feb. 23, 1968	117.45	29.36	69.44	134.32	350.57
1958	do	658.50	164.63	349.87	86.43	1,259.43
1958	Apr. 19, 1968	None	32.92	None	3.12	36.04
1959	Feb. 23, 1968	1,003.25	250.81	472.84	131.68	1,858.58
1959	Apr. 19, 1968	None	50.16	None	4.80	54.96
1960	Feb. 23, 1968	1,077.06	269.27	443.00	141.36	1,930.69
1960	Apr. 19, 1968	None	53.85	None	5.12	58.97
1961	Feb. 23, 1968	1,114.87	278.72	391.66	146.32	1,931.57

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT—Continued

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 8, 1969	Total
1961-----	Apr. 19, 1968	None	55.75	None	5.30	61.05
1962-----	May 17, 1968	3,598.75	1,108.16	1,042.79	448.31	6,198.01
1963-----	Apr. 8, 1968	1,039.62	311.89	231.11	128.73	1,711.35
1964-----	do	167.69	50.30	None	20.76	238.75
1966-----	May 10, 1968	6,349.98	1,905.00	536.03	799.22	9,590.23
Total-----		21,669.52	6,512.24	9,536.20	3,331.55	41,049.51

Amount of offer: \$15,000 plus collateral agreement.
 Kind of tax: Income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Blaine County, Okla.: Apr. 25, 1968, July 5, 1968, July 19, 1968, Sept. 3, 1968, Gregory County, S. Dak.: July 3, 1969.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$15,000 to be paid within 30 days from date of notice of acceptance together with waiver of refunds, interest, default agreement, and other provisions of form 656. In addition the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1969 to 1974, inclusive, and to a reduction in the "tax basis" of certain assets for Federal income tax purposes.
 Recommended by: _____, revenue officer, Oct. 21, 1969; _____, advisor/reviewer, Oct. 21, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: William H. Tompkins, Nov. 12, 1969.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted.
 (Signed) W. B. Riley, Oct. 30, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JULY 6, 1970

E.I. or S. S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of John C. and Muriel L. Cawman, 439 South Park Drive, Collingswood, N.J., District, Newark.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 15, 1970	Total
1945-----	Aug. 1, 1952	1,338.56			4,324.74	5,663.30
1946-----	do	4,079.53			4,246.79	8,326.32
1947-----	do	7,169.47			7,463.42	14,632.89
1948-----	do	4,660.70			4,851.79	9,512.49
1951-----	May 13, 1952	3,189.40		31.58	3,444.55	6,665.53
1952-----	May 11, 1953	3,152.08			3,215.12	6,367.20
1955-----	Jun. 8, 1955	1,577.75		15.78	1,241.12	2,834.65
1968-----	May 16, 1969	189.00		.98	11.34	201.32
Total-----		25,356.49		48.34	28,798.87	54,203.70

Amount of offer: \$1,000 (no deposit).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Oct. 9, 1952, Oct. 6, 1953, Sept. 12, 1952, Mar. 1, 1968, Oct. 9, 1969, Camden County.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$1,000 to be paid within 30 days after notification of acceptance, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until payment is made in full, and waiver of refunds, default agreement other provisions on Form 656. In addition, the taxpayers have executed a collateral agreement to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1974, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Joseph J. O'Hara, Offer Examiner, May 8, 1970; Como T. DiGiacomo, Reviewer, May 12, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: R. H. Nash, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Cecil H. Haas.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED AUG. 19, 1970

E.I. OR S. S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Miriam Chamberlain, 3922 Emerald St., Torrance, Calif.
 Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 12, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1963-----	Apr. 12, 1968	8,634.84	431.74	2,068.92	1,088.00	12,223.50
Dec. 31, 1964-----	do	18,960.95	948.05	3,405.44	2,389.00	25,703.44
Total-----		27,595.79	1,379.79	5,474.36	3,477.00	37,926.94

Footnote at end of table.

Amount of offer: \$9,000.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 27, 1968, Los Angeles; July 25, 1968, Maricopa.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$9,000 to be paid as follows: \$6,806 already submitted and \$2,194 to be paid at the rate of \$50 payable on the 10th day of the month following notice of acceptance of the offer and \$50 payable on the 10th day of each month thereafter, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1965).
 Recommended by: Harold Bates, revenue officer, June 5, 1970; Harrington, reviewer, June 9, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Ralph B. Starr, acting August 12, 1970
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz/dw, August 12, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAY 1, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Vern Chatterton, 7031 Von Dette Circle, Dayton, Ohio.
 Case No. XXXX
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 27, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1953-----	Oct. 27, 1967	2,034.40	683.60	2,233.93	407.70	5,359.63
Dec. 31, 1954-----	do	3,118.64	1,020.52	2,345.12	620.87	7,105.15
Dec. 31, 1955-----	do	4,728.86	1,311.10	3,272.24	905.99	10,218.19
Dec. 31, 1956-----	do	821.06	224.73	518.89	156.87	1,721.55
Dec. 31, 1957-----	do	1,942.68	536.08	1,111.16	371.81	3,961.73
Dec. 31, 1958-----	do	188.09	48.32	96.30	35.46	368.17
Dec. 31, 1959-----	do	5,712.60	1,586.47	2,581.94	1,094.86	10,975.87
Dec. 31, 1960-----	do	26.66	6.67	10.45	5.00	48.78
Dec. 31, 1964-----	May 31, 1968	156.69	43.56	23.81	22.91	246.97
Dec. 31, 1966-----	Oct. 7, 1968	536.43	159.12	59.79	64.88	820.22
Dec. 31, 1967-----	do	26.83	6.71	.88	3.13	37.55
Total-----		19,292.94	5,626.88	12,254.51	3,689.48	40,863.81

Amount of offer: \$6,500.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Feb. 23, 1968, Montgomery County, Ohio.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$6,500 payable within 30 days after notice of acceptance of the offer, with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until payment is made in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on Form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 to the district director for the years 1971 to 1975, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Howard S. Rinehart, Revenue Officer, Apr. 16, 1970; A. L. Kenkel, Reviewer, Apr. 24, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Paul Niederecker.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Clarence E. Price, Jr.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED DEC. 23, 1969

E.I. or S. S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Ivan L. and Maurine R. Cluff, Rt. 1, Box 15, Queen Creek, Ariz.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Dec. 15, 1969	Total
Dec. 31, 1965-----	Jan. 6, 1967 Apr. 15, 1968	25,589.72	7,077.26	2,731.63	3,339.92	38,738.53

Amount of offer: \$8,700.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: May 3, 1967, Maricopa County, Ariz., Apr. 28, 1969, Maricopa County, Ariz.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$8,700 to be paid on the 30th of the month following acceptance of the offer together with waiver of refunds, interest, default agreement and other provisions of form 656 (revised 1957). In addition the taxpayers have also executed a future income collateral agreement for the period 1969 through 1973 as follows: 20 percent of annual income in excess of \$7,500 and not in excess of \$10,000; 30 percent of annual income in excess of \$10,000 and not in excess of \$15,000; and 50 percent of annual income in excess of \$15,000. Further, taxpayers have agreed that the \$19,000 capital loss due from 1966 shall not be claimed as a deduction from Federal income tax in any year.
 Recommended by: Robert E. Tate, Nov. 4, 1969; Richard A. Sica, reviewer Dec. 15, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: George D. Patterson.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. XXXX
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Randall L. Coakley, Route 1, Princess Anne Station, Virginia Beach, Va.
District, Richmond.
Liability as follows:

Table with columns: Taxable period, Date assessed, Tax, Penalty, Interest assessed, Interest accrued to Nov. 1, 1969, Total. Rows include Federal unemployment taxes and Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions taxes.

Amount of offer: \$36,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
Kind of tax: Federal unemployment withholding and Federal insurance contributions taxes.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Aug. 4, 1967, Aug. 17, 1967, Sept. 22, 1967, Oct. 3, 1967, Oct. 9, 1967, Oct. 18, 1967, Dec. 8, 1967, Jan. 3, 1968, Jan. 31, 1968, Circuit Court, Virginia Beach, Va.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED AUG. 28, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-XXXX
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Leon A. Cohen, 4344 Conway Valley Court NW., Atlanta, Ga.
Case No. XXX-XX-XXXX; District, Atlanta.
Liability as follows:

Table with columns: Taxable Period, Date assessed, Tax, Penalty, Interest assessed, Interest accrued to July 12, 1970, Total. Row for 1958.

Amount of offer: \$80,000. See terms below.
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed July 12, 1967, Fulton County.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$80,000, payable \$1,500 submitted with previous offer, the balance of \$78,500 payable upon notice of acceptance, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payment is made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on Form 656 (revised Feb. 1969).

Footnote at end of table.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT (ACCEPTED OCT. 23, 1970)

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Jones A. Costello, R.D. No. 1 Sunburn Acres, Greensburg, Pa.
District, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Liability as follows:

Table with columns: Taxable period, Date assessed, Tax, Penalty, Interest assessed, Interest accrued to Oct. 31, 1970, Total. Rows for 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965.

Amount of offer: \$2,000.
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: July 7, 1969, June 4, 1969, Jan. 8, 1969, Feb. 13, 1969, Prothonotary, Allegheny, Mercer, and Westmoreland Counties, Pa.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$2,000 payable upon notice of acceptance of the offer with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the deferred payment from the date of the notice of acceptance of the offer until the deferred payment is made in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Henry L. Dees, 313 Collega St., London, Ky.
Case No. 61-0563086; District, Louisville.
Liability as follows:

Table with columns: Taxable period, Date assessed, Tax, Penalty, Interest assessed, Interest accrued to Nov 22, 1969, Total. Row for See attached schedule.

Amount of offer: \$11,500 (See terms below).
Kind of tax: excise, diesel fuel.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Oct. 15, 1968; June 28, 1968, Rockcastle County, Ky.; Laurel County, Ky.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$11,500 payable within 30 days after date of notice of acceptance of the offer, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payment is made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on Form 656 (Rev. 7-57).

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED APR. 7, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-XXXX
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Francis T. and Geraldine C. Dillon, Route 2, Box 25, Murietta, Calif.
Case No. XXX-XX-XXXX (1); District, Los Angeles.
Liability as follows:

Table with columns: Taxable period, Date assessed, Tax, Penalty, Interest assessed, Interest accrued to Jan. 15, 1970, Total. Row for Dec. 31, 1963.

Amount of offer: \$8,500 plus collateral agreement (terms below).
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: None.
Is case pending before appellate office? Yes.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$8,500, of which \$3,500 was submitted with the offer and the balance is payable Feb. 1, 1970, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions of form 656 (revised February 1969).

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED APR. 1, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of David Lee Sportswear Inc., Wayne St. and Clay Ave., West Hazleton, Pa., and Nathan Glassberg, president, David Lee Sportswear Inc. now: c/o Jay Linn Sportswear, Lilly, Pa.
Case No. WT-15:1967, 24-0795089, xxx-xx-x...; District, Philadelphia.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Jan. 15, 1970	Total
Account of David Lee Sportswear, Incorporated.						
June 30, 1964	Aug. 11, 1964	21,988.30	366.47	39.58	7,283.67	29,678.02
Account of Nathan Glassberg 100 Percent Penalty Assessment, a/c David Lee Sportswear Inc.						
June 30, 1964	Apr. 12, 1968	18,094.74			1,908.87	20,003.61
Total		40,083.04	366.47	39.58	9,192.54	49,681.63

Amount of offer: \$18,094.75.
Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act tax and 100 percent penalty assessment.
Date and place notice of lien filed: November 4, 1964, and March 14, 1969, Prothonotary, Luzerne County, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$18,094.75 cash, together with waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).
Recommended by: H.R. Walsh, offer examiner, Dec. 12, 1969; R. L. Wallace, offer reviewer, Feb. 17, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Seymour I. Friedman.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Cecil H. Haas.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAY 27, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-x...
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Louise Dixon, 1177 E. 98th St., Cleveland, Ohio.
Case No. IT 25-67L; District, Cleveland.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to June 16, 1970	Total
Account of Roy and Louise Dixon.						
1950	Dec. 5, 1951	34,839.15	36,902.91	2,398.33	47,536.90	121,677.29

Amount of offer: \$5,053.25 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
Kind of tax: income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 6, 1951, July 1, 1952, July 11, 1952, March 25, 1954 (Cuyahoga County), July 1, 1952, July 19, 1952, Lorain County.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? Yes.
Terms of offer: \$1,000 deposited with offer. Balance of \$4,053.25, payable 60 days following notice of acceptance; together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the deferred payment from the date offer is accepted until respective payment is made in full, waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July, 1957).
In addition, taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of her future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979 inclusive. Also, Louise Dixon has submitted a collateral agreement covering the valuation of specific assets.
Recommended by: Fred L. Nicholson, revenue officer, Mar. 17, 1970; John G. Price—SPS Reviewer, Apr. 15, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Turbett, Jr.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthy, ABC, May 15, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT, ACCEPTED OCTOBER 23, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Margaret Costello Foukes, 604 Park St., McKeesport, Pa. District, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 31, 1970	Total
1962	Sept. 6, 1968	6,605.31	369.74	2,393.06	798.58	10,166.69
1963	do	7,927.66	396.39	2,089.91	958.47	11,372.63
1964	do	3,033.25	187.01	761.57	366.71	4,348.54
1965	Sept. 27, 1968	4,389.32	219.47	644.21	529.35	5,782.35
Total		21,955.74	1,172.61	5,888.75	2,653.11	31,670.21

Amount of offer: \$500.
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: July 7, 1969, June 4, 1969, Jan. 8, 1969, Feb. 13, 1969, Prothonotary, Allegheny, Mercer, and Westmoreland Counties.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$500 cash, together with waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656 (rev. July 1957).
Recommended by: Frank S. Grant, Revenue officer, Sept. 4, 1970, Chief, collection division, Oct. 9, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: H. Alan Long.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Cecil H. Haas.

Footnote at end of table.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED NOV. 20, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-x...
In re offer in compromise: Liability of William V. Gadek, 215 High Street, Perth Amboy, N.J.
Case No. xxx-xx-xxxxA; District, Newark, N.J.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 1, 1970	Total
1949	May 31, 1968	2,827.44	989.60	3,071.93	534.38	7,423.35
1950	do	4,086.73	1,430.36	4,194.91	772.39	10,484.39
1951	do	4,523.55	1,583.25	4,371.88	854.95	11,333.63
1951	July 12, 1968	226.18			30.10	256.28
1952	May 31, 1968	4,215.39	1,475.39	3,821.12	796.70	10,308.60
1952	July 12, 1968	210.77			28.05	238.82
1953	May 31, 1968	1,407.17	492.51	1,191.13	265.95	3,356.76
1954	do	850.85	279.79	669.17	160.80	1,978.61
1955	do	3,656.16	1,036.41	2,656.09	654.15	7,982.81
1955	July 12, 1968	182.81			24.33	207.14
1956	May 31, 1968	3,135.04	871.55	2,089.41	560.92	6,656.92
1956	July 12, 1968	90.94			12.10	103.04
1957	May 31, 1968	2,739.08	761.47	1,661.17	490.07	5,651.79
1958	do	2,999.38	833.81	1,639.07	536.64	6,008.90
1959	do	3,741.30	3,999.97	1,200.03	669.37	7,270.67
1959	July 12, 1968	187.07			24.90	211.97
1960	May 31, 1968	3,351.26	931.66	1,429.21	595.60	6,311.73
1960	July 12, 1968	167.56			22.30	189.86
1962	July 21, 1967	5,101.76	2,700.93	1,285.30	1,534.32	10,622.31
1962	do	1,285.96	1,476.84	533.47	543.27	3,839.54
1963	do		987.62	733.37	493.22	5,336.72
1964	Sept. 27, 1968	3,122.51				
Total		48,108.91	16,889.16	31,167.26	9,608.51	105,773.84

Amount of offer: \$22,000 (\$5,000 on deposit).
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Feb. 28, 1968, and Dec. 10, 1968, Middlesex County, N.J.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$22,000 consisting of \$5,000 deposited with the offer, \$7,000 payable within 60 days upon notice of acceptance and the balance payable at the rate of \$250 per month on the 30th day of each month thereafter, until the offer is paid in full, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (Rev. 2-69).
Recommended by: Benedict R. Montanelli, July 30, 1970; Como T. DiGiacomo, reviewer, Aug. 5, 1970.
I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: R. H. Nash, Jr.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthy (regional counsel), Nov. 12, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. xxxxxxxx
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Richard D. Garrett, 2000 Bradford Rd., Richmond, Va. District, Richmond.
Liability as follows:
Account of Robert M. Taylor and Richard D. Garrett, trading as R. & R. Installation Service.

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 15, 1970	Total
June 30, 1967	Sept. 22, 1967	13,220.64		141.15	1,965.76	15,327.55
Sept. 30, 1967	Nov. 17, 1967	17,963.94	538.91	26.58	2,606.67	21,136.10
Dec. 31, 1966	Nov. 22, 1968	1,979.33		213.79	156.21	2,349.33
(940).						
Dec. 31, 1967	May 17, 1968	4,395.12	659.27	77.49	513.40	5,645.28
(940).						
Total		37,559.03	1,198.18	459.01	5,242.04	44,458.26

Amount of offer: \$7,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal insurance contributions taxes and Federal unemployment taxes.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Oct. 17, 1967, Feb. 8, 1968, June 4, 1968, Feb. 4, 1969, Hustings Court, pt. II, Richmond, Va. Circuit Court, Chesterfield County, Va.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$7,000 payable \$3,000 5 days after notice of acceptance, \$1,000 payable 60 days after notice of acceptance, and the balance of \$3,000 payable monthly in installments of \$50 each commencing 30 days thereafter and continuing on the same day of each following month, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1969). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive, and waiver of refunds made for periods ending prior to or during the calendar years in which this agreement is in force.
Recommended by: Henry C. Gregory, revenue officer, Feb. 18, 1970; M. V. Orr, Feb. 14, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: W. P. Alexander.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: _____, (Regional Counsel) Mar. 24, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. XXXX
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Lonnie George, George's Truck Stop, R.R. 5, Franklin, Ind. Case No. 35-0962000; District, Indianapolis.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to July 15, 1970	Total
6006	Aug. 1, 1969		109.80		6.29	116.09
6009	do.		429.72		24.62	454.34
6012	do.		633.94		36.32	670.26
6103	Dec. 6, 1968	939.04		427.20	90.59	1,456.83
6103	Aug. 1, 1969		469.52		26.90	496.42
6106	Dec. 6, 1968	556.80		244.86	53.71	855.37
6106	Aug. 1, 1969		278.40		15.95	294.35
6109	Dec. 6, 1968	431.60		183.33	41.64	656.57
6109	Aug. 1, 1969		215.80		12.36	228.16
6112	Dec. 6, 1968	299.20		122.60	28.86	450.66
6112	Aug. 1, 1969		149.60		8.57	158.17
6203	Dec. 6, 1968	194.26	224.28	179.72	38.49	636.75
6203	Jan. 3, 1969					
6206	Dec. 6, 1968	465.60	232.80	179.49	64.23	942.12
6206	Jan. 3, 1969					
6209	Dec. 6, 1968	236.80	118.40	87.73	32.67	475.60
6209	Jan. 3, 1969					
6212	Dec. 6, 1968	570.80	285.40	202.92	78.74	1,137.86
6212	Jan. 3, 1969					
6303	Dec. 6, 1968	1,136.88	579.81	407.43	137.61	2,261.73
6303	Mar. 14, 1969					
6306	Dec. 6, 1968	1,272.32	648.88	436.67	154.00	2,511.87
6306	Jan. 3, 1969					
6309	Dec. 6, 1968	1,292.00	658.92	424.04	156.39	2,531.35
6309	Mar. 14, 1969					
6312	Dec. 6, 1968	1,809.00	922.59	566.59	218.96	3,517.14
6312	Jan. 3, 1969					
6403	Dec. 6, 1968	1,972.76	1,006.11	588.61	238.79	3,806.27
6403	Jan. 3, 1969					
6406	Dec. 6, 1968	2,020.20	1,030.30	572.13	244.51	3,867.14
6406	Mar. 14, 1969					
6409	Dec. 6, 1968	2,310.00	1,178.10	619.56	279.60	4,387.26
6409	Mar. 14, 1969					
Total			5,242.88	1,989.80	31,912.31	

Amount of offer: \$20,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Excise (diesel fuel).
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Apr. 9, 1969, Johnson County, Ind., Oct. 2, 1969, Johnson County, Ind.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$20,000 payable \$5,000 with this amended offer and the balance to be paid at the rate of \$2,500 every 6 months, starting Dec. 1, 1970, and \$2,500 to be paid every 6 months thereafter (final payment to be made on or before June 1, 1973), together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Robert E. Maze, revenue officer, June 8, 1970; Earl J. Blough, review officer, July 15, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: James E. Daly, July 30, 1970.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Clarence E. Price, reviewer.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAR. 3, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of estate of August Gieseke, Beatrice Gieseke, administratrix; Beatrice Gieseke—surviving spouse, 5681 Pernod Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
 Case No. XXX-XX-XXXXA1; district, St. Louis.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable Period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 25, 1970	Total
1952	Aug. 25, 1967	3,263.26	294.55	2,771.40	1,012.67	7,341.88
1953	do.	4,474.38	397.87	3,531.51	1,344.60	9,748.36
1954	do.	2,488.80	238.65	1,802.57	436.39	4,966.41
1955	do.	2,777.55	0	1,845.05	444.40	5,067.00
1956	do.	3,058.35	0	1,848.08	489.34	5,395.77
1957	May 31, 1968	4,359.79	0	2,649.14	501.37	7,510.30
1958	do.	0	0	1,223.45	68.82	1,292.27
Total		20,422.13	931.07	15,671.20	4,297.59	41,321.99

Amount of offer: \$15,000.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date notice of lien filed: June 6, 1968, St. Louis and Clayton, Mo. July 16, 1968, St. Louis and Clayton, Mo. Sept. 16, 1968, Hillsboro, Mo.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.

Footnotes at end of table.

Was bond filed? No.
 Recommendation of district director: Acceptance.
 Terms of offer: Proponent (surviving wife and administratrix of the estate of August Gieseke, deceased) offers to pay \$15,000 in full upon notification of the acceptance of offer, together with standard provisions of form 656 (Rev. 7-57).
 Recommended by: Thomas J. Stevens, Attorney, Feb. 18, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: E. C. Coyle, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Frank C. Conley (Regional counsel).

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED OCT. 24, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of John (Jr.) and Angela Giumarro, 45 Southgate Ave., Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y.
 Case No. WT-33/66; District, Manhattan, N.Y.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Dec. 10, 1969	Total
John Giumarro, Jr., as individual.						
Jan. 1, 1960- Dec. 31, 1961.	June 10, 1966	2,495.21	0	0	524.03	3,019.24
John Giumarro, Jr., as officer of Express Construction Corp.						
July 1, 1960- Sept. 30, 1961.	Feb. 26, 1965	5,710.10	0	0	1,655.92	7,366.02
John Giumarro, Jr., as officer of F.G.M. Properties, Inc.						
Oct. 1, 1959- June 30, 1960.	Feb. 26, 1965	4,596.80	0	0	1,332.82	5,929.62
John Giumarro, Jr., as officer of Stedman Realty Corp.						
Oct. 1, 1958- Dec. 31, 1958.	Apr. 21, 1961	2,152.39	0	0	1,119.22	3,271.61
John and Angela Giumarro, as officers of Peerless Masonry, Inc.						
Jan. 1, 1957- Mar. 31, 1957.	Jan. 6, 1961	818.77	0	438.01	0	1,256.78
John and Angela Giumarro, as officers of Jonlee Homes, Inc.						
Jan. 1, 1956- Apr. 1, 1957.	Jan. 6, 1961	1,894.00	0	0	1,003.29	2,897.29
Total		29,551.41	0	0	13,619.70	43,171.11

Amount of offer: \$3,500.
 Kind of tax: Withholding, Federal Insurance Contributions Act, Federal Unemployment Tax Act taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Mar. 8, 1965, New York County; May 22, 1961, Mar. 12, 1965, Westchester County; June 19, 1961, Greenberg, Elmsford, N.Y.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$3,500 to be paid as follows: \$500 will be paid upon receipt of notice of acceptance of this offer, the balance of \$3,000 will be paid at the rate of \$100 per month by the last day of each and every month thereafter until the full amount of the offer is paid, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on each installment from the date of acceptance of this offer until each installment is paid. In addition the taxpayers have agreed to waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (Rev. 7/57). The taxpayers have also agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income for the years 1969 through 1978, inclusive, to the District Director of Internal Revenue as additional consideration for acceptance of this offer.
 Recommended by: M. Reisman, Revenue officer, Aug. 27, 1969, Jerry Rosenfield, reviewer, Sept. 25, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Edw. J. Fitzgerald, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: (sgd) Marvin E. Hagen HWF.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-XXXX
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of William R. Hancock, 115 Elm St., South Dartmouth, Mass.
 Case No. XXX-XX-XXXX; District, Boston.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 11, 1970	Total
Sept. 30, 1966- Sept. 30, 1967.	Sept. 11, 1968	None	29,535.93	None	2,953.59	32,489.52

Amount of offer: \$7,500.
 Kind of tax: 100 percent penalty withholding and Federal insurance contributions act taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Nov. 13, 1968, Registrar of Deeds, Bristol City. Nov. 20, 1968, Town Clerk, Dartmouth, Dec. 16, 1968, Clerk, D.S.D.C., Boston.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$7,500, payable 30 days after acceptance together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until paid in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).
 Recommended by: Roland J. Talbot, revenue officer, Apr. 30, 1970; John R. Cox, May 1, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: William E. Williams.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, May 19, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S.No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Wendell M. Harger, 11416 Love N.E., Albuquerque, N. Mex Case No. 85-0159293; District, Albuquerque.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to	Total
June 30, 1962	Feb. 26, 1964	1,623.90	*405.98 **27.07 *243.81	153.34	752.47	2,962.76
Sept. 30, 1962	do	975.25	**16.25 *601.13	77.46	451.90	1,764.67
Mar. 31, 1963	Sept. 30, 1963	1,879.52	**40.08 *1,206.64 **80.45	59.94	983.49	3,564.16
June 30, 1963	do	4,376.41		47.93	2,209.67	7,921.10
Sept. 30, 1963	Oct. 23, 1963	10,946.25	**182.44	0	4,228.65	15,357.34
Do	Mar. 19, 1965	664.67	0	55.25	200.71	920.63
Dec. 31, 1963	Apr. 23, 1965	2,250.78	562.70	165.54	838.28	3,817.30
Total		22,716.78	3,366.55	559.46	9,665.17	36,307.96

*Del. **DR.
Amount of offer \$3,000.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act and Federal unemployment taxes.

Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Oct. 7, 1963; Oct. 31, 1963; Mar. 5, 1964; Apr. 29, 1965; June 17, 1965 in Bernalillo County, N. Mex.; all liens refiled on Mar. 25, 1970
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$500 is to be paid on Apr. 15, 1970, and \$500 is to be paid on each of the following dates: Oct. 15, 1970, Apr. 15, 1971, Oct. 15, 1971, Apr. 15, 1972, and Oct. 15, 1972, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from date of acceptance to date of payment, and waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1969). The taxpayer has executed form 2261, collateral agreement, to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1974 inclusive. The taxpayer has also executed a collateral agreement-Taxpayer Involved in Joint Assessment.
Recommended by: Robert F. Blant, Revenue Officer, March 26, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: 1 May 18, 1970.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. W. B. Riley, May 12, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED SEPT. 29, 1970

E.I. or S.S.No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Mary A. Higdon, Wyoming State Hospital, Evanston, Wyo. Case No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**; district Cheyenne.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Sept. 15, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1953	July 15, 1960	835.65	3,343.64	1,493.89	2,867.61	8,540.79
Dec. 31, 1954	do	3,485.26	2,536.55	1,097.08	3,673.42	10,792.41
Dec. 31, 1955	do	3,030.07	1,696.83	771.96	2,883.47	8,382.33
Dec. 31, 1956	do	4,869.42	2,727.42	899.71	4,634.17	13,130.72
Total		12,220.50	10,304.44	4,262.64	14,058.67	40,846.25

Amount of offer: \$4,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Sept. 1, 1960, Fremont County; Dec. 6, 1967, Unita County; Dec. 5, 1967 (refiled), Fremont County.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$4,000—\$1,000 with the offer, now on deposit with Internal Revenue Service, and \$3,000 payable in 10 equal monthly installments of \$300 per month, commencing on the 15th day of the month following notice of acceptance of the offer. In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of her future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1971 through 1975, inclusive.
Recommended by: C. M. Robinson, revenue officer, Aug. 3, 1970; _____, Aug. 13, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: 1 R. L. Hutt.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: W. B. Riley, ELL.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAR. 25, 1970

E.I. OR S. S. No. (H) **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Herbert S. and Libby Lee Holtzman, 8116 Franklin Avenue, West, Minneapolis, Minn.
Case No. IT-27-68-A; District, St. Paul.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Feb. 24, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1955	Nov. 24, 1967	5,163.80	2,592.59	3,596.48	1,047.11	12,399.98
Dec. 31, 1956	do	24,700.11	13,051.76	15,721.11	5,096.50	58,569.48
Dec. 31, 1957	do	9,072.95	4,536.47	5,230.37	1,837.27	20,677.06
Dec. 31, 1958	do	1,426.09	713.04	736.55	288.78	3,164.46
Dec. 31, 1959	do	4,634.93	2,674.55	2,115.75	986.78	10,412.01

Footnotes at end of table.

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Feb. 24, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1960	Nov. 24, 1967	288.14	14.41	114.24	40.84	457.63
Dec. 31, 1961	do	3,172.03	158.60	1,067.32	449.64	4,847.59
Total		48,458.05	23,741.42	28,581.82	9,746.92	110,528.21

Amount of offer: \$31,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Mar. 4, 1968, Hennepin County, Minn.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$31,000, payable \$20,000 on the 90th day following notice of acceptance and the balance, at the rate of \$300 a month, due the 1st day of each month thereafter together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$8,500 for the years 1970 to 1979 inclusive, and to a reduction in the "tax basis" of certain assets for Federal tax purposes.
Recommended by: D. K. Rockenbach, revenue officer; John R. Schlaeppli, Jan. 20, 1970.
I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: 1 George O. Lethert.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted Mar. 9, 1970. K. Martin Worthy, ABC.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED FEB. 19, 1970

E.I. or S.S.No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**-A.
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Bernard & Gwen Blaize, 35 31st Street, Gulfport, Miss. Case No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**-A; district, Jackson; not in suit, X.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 15, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1961	Dec. 29, 1967	5,547.00	277.35	1,898.74	802.54	8,525.63
Dec. 31, 1962	do	10,442.42	533.24	3,010.68	1,525.88	15,512.22
Dec. 31, 1963	do	10,416.43	520.82	2,315.59	1,561.73	14,814.57
Total		26,405.85	1,331.41	7,225.01	3,890.15	38,852.42

Amount of offer: \$15,000.
Kind of tax: Individual income tax.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Mar. 12, 1968, Harrison County, Gulfport, Miss.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: A total of \$15,000 of which \$10,000 is to be paid within 40 days of receipt of the notice of acceptance of the offer and the remaining \$5,000 to be paid 1 year later, together with waiver of refund and other provisions of form 656 (revised July 1957).
Recommended by: Dick R. Wilhite, Jan. 20, 1970; _____, reviewer, Feb. 9, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: 1 J. S. Martin Jr.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Henry C. Stockell, Jr., 1 Feb. 12, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED DEC. 16, 1969

E.I. or S.S.No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Roy C. Jellison, 7049 Macapa Dr., Hollywood, Calif. Case No. **xxxx**; District, Los Angeles.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Nov. 19, 1969	Total
1957	May 19, 1967	4,764.01	2,382.01	2,573.35	1,071.90	10,791.27
1958	do	957.34	3,438.45	3,302.04	957.70	8,655.53
1959	do	15,305.82	7,847.44	6,594.43	3,525.51	33,273.20
Total		21,027.17	13,667.90	12,469.82	5,555.11	52,720.00

Amount of offer: \$21,100 plus collateral agreements (terms below).
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Aug. 23, 1967, Los Angeles County, Oct. 11, 1967, Los Angeles County.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: The total sum of \$21,100 payable on a deferred payment basis as follows: \$10,000 paid with the offer, plus \$200 to be paid on Nov. 1, 1969, and \$200 to be paid on the first day of each following month, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent a year on the deferred payments from the date the offer is accepted until paid in full, with waiver of refund, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1969). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1969 to 1978, inclusive. Mr. Jellison also executed a collateral agreement with respect to his ex-wife, Fern Jellison, his coobligor for the years 1957 and 1958 only.
Recommended by: Charles J. Foltz, revenue officer, Nov. 3, 1969.; P. Harrington, reviewer, Nov. 17, 1969.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: 1 F. S. Schmidt.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, Dec. 5, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JUNE 22, 1970

E.I. S.S. No. (H) **xxx-xx-xxxx** (W) **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Lewis B. and Isabelle Jensen, 304 Nova Way, Chula Vista Calif.
 Case No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**(1); District, Los Angeles.

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 15, 1969	Total
Dec. 31, 1961	Proposed deficiency.	10,594.89	529.74		4,767.70	15,892.33
Dec. 31, 1962	do	25,073.92	1,253.70		9,778.83	36,106.45
Dec. 31, 1963	do	21,449.73	1,072.49		7,078.41	29,600.63
Dec. 31, 1964	do	32,165.50	1,608.27		8,584.69	42,358.46
Total		89,284.04	4,464.20		30,209.63	123,957.87

Amount of offer: \$5,040 plus collateral agreement (terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Proposed deficiency.
 Is case pending before appellate office? Yes.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$5,040 payable—\$60 on the 15th day of August 1969 and \$60 payable on the 15th day of each succeeding month for 23 months; \$100 payable on the 15th day of August 1971 and \$100 payable on the 15th day of each succeeding month for 35 months, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions of Form 656 (revised February 1969). As an additional consideration the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their annual income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1969 to 1978 inclusive, and have agreed to waive any deduction on their current and future income tax returns in respect to any and all moneys repaid to the person or persons from whom said moneys were allegedly embezzled.
 Recommended by: Ronald J. McNutt, revenue officer, Aug. 21, 1969; Paul Harrington, Oct. 8, 1969.
 I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Schmidt.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. K. Martin Worthy, Jan. 23, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED APR. 23, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Roy H. Johnson, 1407 Lowell Ave., New Hyde Park, N.Y.
 Case No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**; District, Brooklyn.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 30, 1970	Total
ULC reads: William C. Stillwell and/or Roy H. Johnson, former officers of Johnwell Contracting Corp.						
June 30, 1953	Mar. 11, 1954	6,373.44			6,463.59	12,837.03
Sept. 30, 1953	do	3,258.34			6,152.31	9,410.65
Dec. 31, 1953	do	6,142.53			6,336.73	12,479.26
ULC reads: William Stillwell and/or Roy Johnson, former officers of Worcester Builders, Inc.						
June 30, 1954	Feb. 15, 1957	755.63			1,309.64	2,065.27
Total		16,529.94			20,262.27	36,792.21

Amount of offer: \$13,900.
 Kind of tax: 100 percent penalty Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Apr. 23, 1954, Nassau County, Mineola, N.Y., Dec. 1, 1964, Nassau County, Mineola, N.Y.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$13,900, \$400 paid with the offer, the balance of \$13,500 payable within 60 days after notice of acceptance, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656. In addition, the taxpayer executed a collateral agreement stating that the offer is submitted to compromise his individual liability only and shall not be construed as operating to release his obligor on the joint assessments.
 Recommended by: Melvin Greenberg, Exam. Officer M-3, Jan. 28, 1970; Fred Lipwar, reviewer, Mar. 10, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Eugene W. Sturtevant.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen Apr. 16, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED DEC. 19, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Spiros W. and Victoria M. Kallas, 1688 Twain, Las Vegas, Nev.
 Case number: **xxx-xx-xxxx** district, Reno.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Dec. 27, 1970	Total
1960	Mar. 23, 1968	104,113.70	0	46,101.17	14,735.75	164,950.62

Footnote at end of table.

Amount of offer: \$3,375 collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 20, 1968, Clark County, Nev.; Apr. 10, 1969, Clark County, Nev.; Apr. 16, 1970, Milwaukee County, Wis.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: The amount of the taxpayers' amended offer is \$3,375, paid as follows: \$1,513.20 paid with the original offer, and \$1,861.80 paid with the amended offer, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). As an additional consideration, the taxpayers have executed a collateral agreement, wherein they agree to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970-1979, inclusive, and furthermore they have agreed to a waiver of a capital loss sustained prior to 1970, under the terms as described on the Collateral Agreement.
 Recommended by: Robert J. Agonia, revenue officer, August 28, 1970; D. W. Sherman, reviewer, October 16, 1970.
 I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Actg. R. C. Randal.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthy, A.B.C., November 23, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED OCT. 22, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Harold E. Knittel, 704 Cactus Lane, Las Vegas, Nev.
 Case No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**; District, Reno.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 24, 1970	Total
4512	Sept. 24, 1951	6,277.37	0	0		6,277.37
4612	do	2,509.04	0	0		2,509.04
4712	do	21,667.86	0	0		21,667.86
5512	June 29, 1956	1,496.82	0	0	12,450.56	13,947.38
Total		31,951.09	0	0	12,450.56	44,401.65

Amount of offer: \$2,000.
 Kind of tax: Federal income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Nov. 20, 1963, Clark County, Nev. Refiled Nov. 20, 1967, Clark County, Nev.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$2,000 on deposit with the director, plus a future income collateral agreement for the years 1971 to 1980, inclusive, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).
 Recommended by: Hugh P. Rough, revenue officer, August 24, 1970; reviewer, D. W. Sherman, special procedures officer, Sept. 3, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: W. A. Bates, Oct. 22, 1970.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, Sept. 30, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. **XXXX**
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Daniel H. Laidman and Ben Laidman, 8425 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to June 17, 1970	Total
Account of Daniel H. Laidman.						
Mar. 1967 and						
Apr. 1967	Jan. 27, 1969	64,909.40			3,426.37	68,335.77
Account of Ben Laidman.						
Mar. 1967 and						
Apr. 1967	Jan. 27, 1969	64,909.40			3,426.37	68,335.77
Total		129,818.80			6,852.74	*136,671.54

*This is like assessment against each taxpayer.
 Amount of offer: \$51,218.40.
 Kind of tax: 100 percent penalty re: withholding and Federal Insurance Contribution Act taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Feb. 2, 1970, San Bernardino County (Daniel); June 26, 1969, Los Angeles County (Daniel); Oct. 10, 1969, Los Angeles County (Ben).
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$51,218.40 payable on the deferred basis as follows: \$7,604.04 already paid; \$23,111 to be paid Jan. 30, 1971; \$7,500 to be paid June 30, 1971, and the balance to be paid at the rate of \$400 per month, commencing on the 1st day of the 1st month following notice of acceptance and continuing on the 1st day of each succeeding month, with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until payment is made in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1969).
 Recommended by: M. Himovitz, revenue officer, June 26, 1970; Harrington, reviewer, Aug. 24, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Schmidt.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, Sept. 15, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT, ACCEPTED DEC. 8, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Alfred J. Land, 1106 Rosedale Rd., Valley Stream, N.Y. Case No. WT-FICA 42A-1965A; District, Brooklyn. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Dec. 31, 1969	Total
Samuel Messing and/or Alfred J. Land.						
June 30, 1961, Sept. 30, 1961 and Dec. 31, 1961.	Jan. 25, 1963	31,091.34			17,042.06	48,133.40
Dec. 31, 1961 and Mar. 31, 1962.	July 12, 1963	5,217.69			2,108.02	7,325.71
Total		36,309.03			19,150.08	55,459.11

Amount of offer: \$27,500 plus collateral agreements (see terms below). Kind of tax: 100 percent penalty assessment withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

Date and place notice of lien filed: March 26, 1963, Nassau County Clerk and others. Is case pending before appellate office? No. Is case pending before the tax court? No. Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No. Was bond filed? No. Terms of offer: \$27,500, payable \$5,000 on deposit, \$5,000 within 10 days after notice of acceptance of the offer and the balance at the rate of \$300 per month on the first day of each month thereafter, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and the waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$15,000 for the years 1969 to 1976, inclusive. The taxpayer has also executed NAR form 3-77 (3-65) which provides that the offer covers his individual liability only, and, if accepted, shall not be construed as operating to release or discharge his coobligor, Samuel Messing, from the liability. Recommended by: Adolph M. Lenin, Internal Revenue Agent, Sept. 25, 1969; Leon Unger, Jr., Group Supervisor, Sept. 30, 1969. I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. J. Thomas. For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, October 23, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT, ACCEPTED MAY 20, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx. In re offer in compromise: Liability of David W. and Frances H. Langenes, 901 6th Ave. North, Fargo, N. Dak. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 15, 1969	Total
1953	Dec. 13, 1968	1,004.06		883.17	50.52	
	Feb. 14, 1969		891.49		35.80	2,865.04
	Dec. 13, 1968	897.84		735.87	45.18	
1954	Feb. 14, 1969		471.03		18.92	2,168.84
	Dec. 13, 1968	1,265.32		961.14	63.67	
1955	Feb. 14, 1969		664.56		26.69	2,981.38
	Dec. 13, 1968	729.44		510.32	36.71	
1956	Feb. 14, 1969		381.62		15.33	1,673.42
	Dec. 13, 1968	1,724.70		1,103.12	91.26	
1957	Feb. 14, 1969		906.27		36.40	3,910.04
	Dec. 13, 1968	1,451.41		841.24	73.03	
1958	Feb. 14, 1969		761.68		30.59	3,157.95
	Dec. 13, 1968	574.35		298.43	28.90	
1959	Feb. 14, 1969		297.13		11.93	1,210.74
	Dec. 13, 1968	1,636.04		751.93	84.63	
1960	Feb. 14, 1969		856.82		34.41	3,409.64
	Dec. 13, 1968	2,137.34		854.09	110.56	
1961	Feb. 14, 1969		1,121.47		45.04	4,328.34
	Jan. 3, 1969	1,205.48		472.46	56.62	
1962	Feb. 7, 1969		719.60		29.73	2,483.89
	Jan. 3, 1969	1,250.71		354.11	58.74	
1963	Feb. 7, 1969		651.73		26.92	2,342.21
	Jan. 3, 1969	1,383.71		308.74	64.99	
1964	Feb. 7, 1969		721.15		29.79	2,508.38
1965	Dec. 27, 1968	462.01		74.83	22.15	
	Feb. 7, 1969		236.07		9.75	804.81
1966	Feb. 21, 1969	639.81		61.20	24.91	725.92
Total		16,362.22	8,834.56	8,210.65	1,163.17	34,570.60

Amount of offer: \$17,330 plus collateral agreement; (see terms below). Kind of tax: Income. Date and place notice of lien filed: Aug. 22, 1969, Eddy County, N. Dak.; Aug. 22, 1969, Cass County, N. Dak.

Is case pending before appellate office? No. Is case pending before the tax court? No. Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No. Was bond filed? No. Terms of offer: \$17,330, consisting of \$2,000 cash, and \$15,330 payable on or before Aug. 20, 1970, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the deferred balance is paid in full, and waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive. Recommended by: C. C. Ferris, Revenue Officer, Sept. 2, 1969; J. C. Armstrong, Special Procedures Officer, Sept. 8, 1969. I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: L. G. Kiskern. For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Walter L. Watson, May 7, 1970.

Footnote at end of table.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAY 21, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Sam Lapp, 80 Central Park West, New York, N. Y. Case No. 13-xxx-xx-xxxx A; district Mannattan, N.Y. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Jan. 31, 1970	Total
1943	July 23, 1957	0	0	2,701.66	4,355.99	7,057.65
1944	do	3,346.46	644.13	2,480.76	4,860.96	11,332.31
1945	do	4,522.90	1,083.02	3,081.50	6,525.56	15,212.98
1946	do	5,860.24	644.50	3,641.03	7,621.17	17,766.94
1947	do	3,194.45	584.89	1,793.08	4,185.72	9,758.14
1948	May 8, 1957	950.47	0	460.28	1,077.27	2,488.02
1959	Mar. 31, 1961	18,784.09	520.88	1,082.53	10,231.63	30,619.13
1960 (ME)	Oct. 13, 1961	10,000.00	304.52	296.00	5,129.72	15,730.24
1960 (D)	Dec. 6, 1963	3,567.95	0	556.55	1,298.54	5,423.04
1961	Nov. 6, 1964	1,641.36	26.80	289.16	536.92	2,494.24
1963	June 25, 1965	3,239.44	0	211.10	893.50	4,344.04
1964	July 16, 1965	4,068.53	64.12	61.68	1,125.32	5,319.65
Total		59,175.89	3,872.86	16,655.33	47,842.30	127,546.38

Amount of offer: \$25,000. Kind of tax: Income tax. Date and place notice of lien filed: Oct. 7, 1957, Oct. 21, 1959, New York County. Is case pending before appellate office? No. Is case pending before the Tax Court? No. Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No. Was bond filed? No. Terms of offer: \$25,000 consisting of \$100 deposited with the offer and the balance to be paid at the rate of \$100 per week starting with the week after the submission of this offer (offer was submitted on May 23, 1969) and every week thereafter until the \$25,000 is paid together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date of acceptance of this offer. The respective date of each installment, on each such installment, and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay to the District Director of Internal Revenue a graduated percentage of his income in excess of \$15,000 per annum for the years 1969 through 1978, inclusive. Recommended by: M. Reisman, Revenue Officer, Sept. 17, 1969; Jerry Rosenfeld, Reviewer, Dec. 19, 1969. I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Edward J. Fitzgerald. For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worth, POB, May 1, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED AUG. 26, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Joseph E. and Joan Lenahan, 3828 Jupiter Road, Louisville, Ky. Case No. XXXX A; District Louisville. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to	Total
1961	Proposed	20,410.08	0	0	0	20,410.08
1962	do	10,119.43	0	0	0	10,119.43
1963	do	886.07	0	0	0	886.07
Total		31,415.58	0	0	0	31,415.58

Amount of offer: \$1,650 (see terms below). Kind of tax: Income. Date and place notice of lien filed: None. Is case pending before appellate office? No. Is case pending before the tax court? Yes. Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No. Was bond filed? No. Terms of offer: \$1,650 payable at the rate of \$30 within 30 days after receipt of notice of acceptance of the offer and \$30 every 30 days thereafter until paid in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). Recommended by: John V. Vaccaro, revenue officer, July 3, 1969; Edward P. Montgomery, Chief, DAR Branch, July 3, 1969. I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Robert J. Deim. For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Clarence E. Price, SEH, Aug. 13, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Robert L. and Clare S. Leroux, 3580 Raymar Dr., Cincinnati, Ohio. Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx District, Cincinnati, Ohio. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to July 31, 1970	Total
1955	Feb. 16, 1968	603.33	315.03	425.84	135.46	1,479.66
1956	do	468.38	338.58	302.49	118.94	1,228.39
1957	do	3,917.27	2,064.36	229.48	883.29	7,093.40
1959	do	3,416.20	3,651.69	2,060.72	1,043.99	10,172.60
1959	Mar. 8, 1963	2,540.43	684.10	474.63	1,431.69	5,130.85
1960	Feb. 16, 1968	0	3,970.38	908.49	585.63	5,164.50
1960	Mar. 8, 1968	8,482.32	2,120.58	662.34	4,707.69	16,272.93
1961	Feb. 16, 1968	0	386.38	0	55.97	442.35
1961	Mar. 8, 1963	1,411.66	352.92	75.45	783.47	2,623.50
1962	July 28, 1967	1,581.40	550.17	689.70	234.32	3,055.59
1963	do	2,089.06	571.83	594.44	293.98	3,549.31
1964	do	2,289.66	632.07	514.15	322.80	3,758.68
1965	Aug. 11, 1967	2,247.43	617.54	278.70	408.12	3,551.79
1966	July 7, 1967	2,394.41	0	178.24	294.54	2,867.19
Total		31,441.55	16,255.63	7,394.67	11,298.89	66,390.74

Amount of offer: \$35,091.32.
 Kind of tax: Income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Aug. 1, 1967, Oct. 31, 1967, Nov. 24, 1967, Nov. 30, 1967, Dec. 4, 1967, Hamilton County, Ohio.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$1,000 paid with the offer, and \$34,091.32 to be paid within 10 days after date of acceptance of the offer, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer was accepted until the respective payment is made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).
 In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1971 to 1980, inclusive.
 Recommended by: John T. Buckingham, Aug. 17, 1970; A. L. Kenkel, reviewer, Aug. 17, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: E. H. Hudson, Aug. 18, 1970.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Clarence E. Price, Aug. 18, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED AUG. 3, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Michael A. Levinson, 3478 Paradise Rd., Las Vegas, Nev.
 Case No. [redacted] District, Reno.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to June 16, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1959	Feb. 16, 1968	17,698.47	0	8,511.83	2,507.16	28,717.46
Dec. 31, 1960	do	19,184.73	0	7,848.66	2,685.86	29,719.25
Total		36,883.20	0	16,360.49	5,193.02	58,436.71

Amount of offer: \$12,500.
 Kind of tax: Federal income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 26, 1968, Clark County, Nev.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: Taxpayer originally offered \$5,000 to be paid on notification of acceptance of the offer. He agreed to amend the offer by increasing the amount to \$12,500 of which \$3,750 was deposited with the district director and the balance of \$8,750 is to be paid to the director within 30 days following notification of acceptance of the offer, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions of form 656 (revised July 1957).
 Recommended by: Hugh P. Hough, revenue officer, Mar. 30, 1970; Donald W. Sherman, Apr. 13, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: W. O. Bates.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, VRB.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED DEC. 15, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Mary Levy, 1804 So. 8th Pl., Las Vegas, Nev.
 Case No. [redacted] District, Reno.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Nov. 15, 1969	Total
1959	Jan. 27, 1967	1,900.56	0	706.78	323.10	2,930.44
1960	do	1,625.49	0	558.28	276.33	2,460.10
1962	Dec. 11, 1960*	28,459.67	14,229.84	0	0	42,689.51
Total		31,985.72	14,229.84	1,265.06	599.43	48,080.05

*Not assessed.
 Amount of offer: \$1,250.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Apr. 26, 1967, and Oct. 18, 1966, Clark County, Nev.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? Yes.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$1,250, \$250 submitted with prior offer in compromise dated June 10, 1968, and \$1,000 cash to be paid upon approval of this offer, together with waiver of refunds, interest, and default agreement, and other provisions on form 656.
 Recommended by: Ambrose M. Damon, revenue officer, Sept. 12, 1969; D. W. Sherman, Special Procedures Officer.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, Oct. 17, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JUNE 30, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Alvin T. Locke and Marian F. Locke, 10532 Catawba Way Rancho Cordova, Calif.
 Case No. [redacted] District of San Francisco.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to July 25, 1969	Total
Dec. 31, 1958	Feb. 25, 1966	1,630.00	815.00	670.98	501.23	3,617.21
Dec. 31, 1959	do	7,764.00	3,882.00	2,730.16	2,387.43	16,763.59
Dec. 31, 1960	do	2,977.78	1,488.89	868.45	915.74	6,250.86
Dec. 31, 1964	Aug. 11, 1967	2,094.78	0	490.06	245.74	2,830.54
Total		14,466.56	6,185.89	4,759.65	4,050.14	29,462.24

Footnote at end of table.

Amount of offer: \$2,000 payable on deferred basis at \$75 per month.
 Kind of tax: Individual income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 14, 1966, San Mateo, 1958, 1959, 1960 IT; Dec. 14, 1966 Santa Clara, 1958, 1959, 1960 IT; Apr. 5, 1968, Alameda County, 1964 IT.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: The total sum of \$2,000—\$75 payable on acceptance of the offer, and \$75 on the 20th of each month thereafter, until paid in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).
 In addition, the taxpayer has agreed in a collateral agreement to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 through 1979, inclusive, and also executed a collateral agreement to waive any unused capital loss due from 1965 to be claimed as capital loss, under the provisions of sec. 1212 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.
 Recommended by: Jerry Fortigary, July 8, 1969; Jerome W. Stacke, July 9, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Herbert M. Futrell.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, June 9, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

[Accepted Feb. 17, 1970]

In re offer in compromise: Liability of John D. and Jeanne T. McCann, Jr., 90 Oak Tree Lane, Manhasset, N.Y.
 Case No. IT 48-1969 A; District, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Feb. 28, 1970	Total
1962	July 29, 1966	656.44	0	128.11	141.76	926.31
1961	do	3,823.15	1,377.53	975.53	1,118.35	7,294.56
1960	do	24,979.53	7,030.13	8,061.75	6,880.19	46,951.60
1959	do	2,716.87	114.62	1,019.27	605.11	4,455.87
1958	do	551.40	0	239.94	118.25	909.59
1957	do	3,055.20	0	1,512.83	655.75	5,223.78
Total		35,782.59	8,522.28	11,937.43	9,519.41	65,761.71

Amount of offer: \$22,000.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Oct. 20, 1966, Nassau County Clerk, Mineola, N.Y.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$22,000 to be paid within 30 days after acceptance, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum, waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656, revised July 1955. In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1974, inclusive.
 Recommended by: George Mazzei, revenue officer, for operating supervisor, Jan. 15, 1970; Fred Lipman, reviewer, Jan. 16, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: John J. Flynn.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, EH, Feb. 10, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED APRIL 7, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Carlos J. and Ethel N. McKinney, 834 Sunnyside Ave., San Diego, Calif.
 Case No. [redacted] A-2; District, Detroit.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to November 30, 1969	Total
1957	Aug. 8, 1958	916.20	0	25.53	621.89	1,563.62
1958	Aug. 21, 1959	6,131.25	70.80	135.72	3,817.32	10,155.09
1959	Aug. 5, 1960	6,370.12	75.56	117.53	3,597.69	10,160.70
1960	July 14, 1961	9,384.00	154.27	138.21	4,785.72	14,442.30
Total		22,781.57	300.63	416.99	12,822.42	36,321.61

Amount of offer: \$4,700 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: July 3, 1959, Jan. 11, 1960, October 25, 1960, October 10, 1961, Wayne County, Mich.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$4,700, \$2,300 on deposit with original offer, the balance of \$2,400 payable within 30 days of notice of acceptance together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on all deferred payments from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full, with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).
 In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1969 to 1973, inclusive.
 Recommended by: C. R. McQuinn, Jr., revenue officer, Oct. 22, 1969; A. P. Zelenak, special procedures, Oct. 22, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Thomas A. Cardozo, Apr. 7, 1970.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Clarence E. Price.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED APR. 30, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-...
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of John A. McLamb, 219 Vineland Dr., Fayetteville, N.C. District, Greensboro.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to June 2, 1970	Total
1963	Sept. 26, 1969	13,349.84	7,514.12	3,835.43	858.57	25,557.96
1964	Feb. 14, 1969	12,765.62	6,384.60	2,902.46	1,496.11	23,548.79
1965	May 16, 1969	1,535.31		284.28	96.45	1,916.04
Total		27,650.77	13,898.72	7,022.17	2,451.13	51,022.79

Amount of offer: \$3,650 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Aug. 25, 1969, Oct. 15, 1969, Dec. 1, 1969, Cumberland County, N.C., Mar. 26, 1970, Harnett County, C.N.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$3,600, \$100 to be paid within 30 days from the date of acceptance of offer and \$50 to be paid on the 1st day of each month thereafter for 71 months, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, and to a waiver of a capital loss carryover for Federal income tax purposes. The taxpayer also executed a collateral agreement, protecting the Government's right to collect from the obligor for the year 1965.
 Recommended by J. R. Burke, Jr., Apr. 17, 1970; C. W. Cooper, Apr. 22, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: J. E. Wall.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Henry C. Stockell, Jr.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-...
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Roy W. and Lucille E. Mann, 804 Collinwood Rd., Rome, Ga.
 Case No., XXXX District, Atlanta.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 4, 1970	Total
Roy W. Mann						
1957	Oct. 4, 1969	43,913.21	21,956.61	28,644.64	5,928.28	100,442.74
1958	do	20,299.12	10,149.56	2,023.20	2,740.38	45,212.26
Roy W. and Lucille E. Mann						
1959	Apr. 4, 1969	30,570.91	34,126.66	36,331.33	7,454.98	108,483.48
1960	do	90,304.44	45,152.22	42,650.90	12,191.04	190,298.60
1961	do	21,385.36	10,692.68	8,817.21	2,887.02	43,782.27
Total		206,373.04	122,077.73	128,467.28	31,201.30	488,219.35

Amount of offer: \$75,000 plus collateral agreement. See terms below.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: June 23, 1969, Floyd County, June 23, 1969, Chattooga County.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$75,000 payable \$15,000 yearly in the years 1970-74 inclusive, in equal quarterly installments of \$3,750 payable on or before Mar. 31, June 30, Sept. 30, and Dec. 31 of each year, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 2, 1969). In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970-1979, inclusive, and to a reduction in the "tax basis" of certain assets for Federal income tax purposes.
 Recommended by: W. S. Pooley, Revenue Officer, August 4, 1970; J. C. Sanders, Reviewer, September 3, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: A. C. Ross.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthup, ABC, October 5, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED DECEMBER 17, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Charles P. Martyn, Rural Route Number 1 Hutchinson Island, Stuart, Fla.
 Case No. IT-27-A; district, Jacksonville.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Jan. 31, 1970	Total
1959	Aug. 26, 1966	30,000.00	0	11,454.25	6,174.60	47,628.85
Total		30,000.00	0	11,454.25	6,174.60	47,628.85

Amount of offer: \$5,000.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: None in file.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.

Footnote at end of table.

Terms of offer: \$5,000, payable 60 days after acceptance of the offer with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payment is made in full together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1956). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the year 1969 to 1978, inclusive. Said offer and collateral agreement are amended to provide that all payments under said offer and under said collateral agreement shall be applied in payment of tax (and not interest) until the tax has been paid in full, and thereafter, payments made shall be applied in payments of interest.

Recommended by: Jerome J. Caplan, Appellate Conferee, Nov. 17, 1969; V. M. Lewis, reviewer, Jack Durant, Ch. Special Procedures Section, Dec. 10, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: A. J. O'Donnell, Jr., District Director, Dec. 17, 1969.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Henry C. Stockell, Jr.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED SEPT. 18, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Vincent and Ann Mastrogiacomo, 100-03 Liberty Ave., Ozone Park, N.Y.
 Case No., XXX-XX-XXXX; District, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 10, 1970	Total
ULC reads: Vincent Giacomo A/K/A Vincent Mastrogiacomo.						
Dec. 31, 1958	Feb. 25, 1966	5,084.77	1,670.40	2,101.34	1,854.09	10,710.60
Dec. 31, 1959	do	3,257.68	1,063.48	1,145.54	1,198.94	6,665.64
Dec. 31, 1960	do	1,576.00	510.88	459.63	579.02	3,125.53
Dec. 31, 1961	do	1,606.00	520.73	372.02	590.97	3,089.72
Dec. 31, 1962	do	2,031.10	659.90	348.62	746.65	3,786.27
Dec. 31, 1963	do	1,799.20	582.88	200.87	660.93	3,243.88
ULC reads: Vincent and Ann Mastrogiacomo.						
Dec. 31, 1965	Nov. 24, 1967	573.11	143.86	55.52	198.93	971.42
Dec. 31, 1966	Feb. 16, 1968	473.97	118.49	23.78	164.38	780.62
Total		16,401.83	5,270.62	4,707.32	5,993.91	32,373.68

Amount of offer: \$4,000 plus collateral agreement.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: June 9, 1966 register, Queens County, N.Y.; Apr. 26, 1968 register, Queens County, N.Y.; July 19, 1968 register, Queens County, N.Y.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$4,000 payable \$1,000 cash with this offer, and the balance to be paid at the rate of \$50 on the first day of each month following notice of acceptance, for a total of 60 months, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full, and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).
 In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 per annum, for the years 1970 to 1976, inclusive.
 Recommended by Joe C. Gargano, July 24, 1970; Fred Lyman Neuvier, July 24, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: John J. Flynn.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JUNE 23, 1970

In re offer, in compromise: Liability of Jules and Kathryn Michael, 183 E. Roma St., Villa Caparra, San Juan, P.R.
 Case No., M-69-5; District, Office of International Operations.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 15, 1970	Total
1951	Apr. 8, 1954	2,398.76	0	394.65	3,140.54	5,933.95
1952	Mar. 15, 1955	2,448.26	0	276.53	2,479.55	5,204.34
1953	Nov. 8, 1954	18,331.34	0	716.76	17,736.63	36,784.73
	Aug. 21, 1959	1,700.20	1,201.89	554.24	2,243.50	5,699.83
1954	do	26,787.85	0	6,991.26	17,367.99	51,167.10
1955	Aug. 14, 1959	3,380.00	0	675.76	2,180.64	6,236.40
Total		55,046.41	1,201.89	9,609.20	45,168.85	111,026.35

Amount of offer: \$10,000 plus collateral agreement (See terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: June 19, 1959, November 25, 1959, October 13, 1960 (refiled) U.S. District Court—San Juan, P.R.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: The sum of \$10,000 payable as follows: \$560 tendered with the offer, \$160 on April 30, 1969, and \$160 on the last day of each month thereafter, with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on deferred payments from date this offer is accepted until paid in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656. In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive, and to pay the Internal Revenue Service any net proceeds to which Mr. Michael is entitled from a suit filed by him in the U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York.
 Recommended by: Jose Lozques Calderon, Revenue Officer, December 31, 1969; Donald Schumaker Special Procedures Officer, April 28, 1970.
 I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: C. I. Fox, Director of International Operations.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthy, ABC, June 1, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED FEB. 25, 1970

E.I. or S.S. number, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Feb. 25, 1970.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of John L. Nichols and Estate of Gertrude T. Nichols, 747 Penn St., Reading, Pa.
 Liability as follows:

Period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 8, 1970	Total
*1947	May 12, 1954	14,181.08	13,917.75	10,283.27	783.64	39,965.74
**1948	do	5,454.27	2,804.45	1,735.54	199.69	10,194.17
**1949	do	4,221.22	2,980.50	1,052.90	165.09	8,419.71
**1950	do	5,444.82	2,722.41	1,031.41	163.97	9,382.61
**1951	do	1,603.64	801.82	207.58	4.25	2,617.17
Total		31,705.03	23,226.93	14,310.70	1,336.74	70,579.40

Amount of offer: \$7,656.50.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Berks County, May 17, 1954.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Recommendation of Director: Acceptance.
 * John L. Nichols.
 ** John and Gertrude Nichols.
 Terms of offer: \$7,656.50 in cash upon acceptance of offer, with waiver of refunds and other provisions of form 656 submitted to compromise the above liability, plus statutory additions, and collateral agreements.
 Recommended by Alan B. Cobb, Attorney, Feb. 18, 1970: William J. Hagan, assistant regional counsel, Feb. 18, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Seymour I. Friedman.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Cecil H. Haas.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S. S. No., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Eli H. Millner, 26 Simeon Road, Bethel, Conn. District, Hartford.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 31, 1970	Total
1947	July 31, 1961	44.00	36.96	35.32	42.91	159.19
1948	do	626.00	525.84	464.89	610.47	2,227.20
1949	do	364.00	305.76	248.48	669.76	1,588.00
1950	do	445.00	373.82	277.07	433.97	1,529.86
1951	do	738.00	619.92	415.22	719.70	2,492.84
1952	do	851.00	714.86	427.74	829.91	2,823.51
1953	do	1,274.02	1,070.18	563.92	1,242.43	4,150.55
1954	do	4,004.74	2,372.81	1,512.31	3,380.10	11,269.96
1955	do	5,191.07	2,740.88	1,648.84	4,203.93	13,784.72
1956	do	8,597.69	4,536.06	2,215.02	6,960.89	22,309.66
1957	do	6,427.22	3,389.61	1,270.21	5,202.92	16,289.96
1958	Mar. 29, 1963	790.99	236.40	186.79	442.11	1,656.29
1959	do	1,010.09	86.66	177.93	471.96	1,746.64
1960	do	4,512.20	225.61	524.09	2,038.81	7,300.71
1961	do	909.67	45.48	51.08	411.15	1,417.38
1963	Jan. 13, 1967	1,297.37	324.34	213.75	329.14	2,164.60
Total		37,083.06	17,605.19	10,232.66	27,990.16	92,911.07

Amount of offer: \$12,500.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: State of Connecticut, Aug. 9, 1961 and Feb. 26, 1969; town clerk, Danbury, Conn., June 19, 1961 and Feb. 26, 1969; John Hancock Life Insurance Co., Feb. 26, 1969.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$12,500 cash paid in full with amendment to the original offer, together with waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656.
 Recommended by James J. Gott, reviewer, Mar. 19, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Joseph J. Conley, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen (TGS).

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S. S. No., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Eli H. Millner, 26 Simeon Rd., Bethel, Conn. District, Hartford.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 31, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1955	July 31, 1961	115.59	63.25	41.75	94.98	315.57
Mar. 31, 1956	do	115.90	57.95	36.51	92.14	302.50
June 30, 1956	do	88.00	44.00	26.40	69.96	228.36
Sept. 30, 1956	do	99.30	49.65	28.30	78.94	256.19
Dec. 31, 1956	do	103.50	51.75	27.95	82.28	265.48
Total		522.29	266.60	160.91	418.30	1,368.10

Footnote at end of table.

Amount of offer: \$200.
 Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contribution Act taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Secretary of State Conn. Aug. 9, 1961 and Feb. 26, 1969.
 Town Clerk, Danbury, Conn. Oct. 19, 1961 and Feb. 28, 1969.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$200 cash paid in full with amendment to the original offer, together with waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656.
 Recommended by: James J. Gott, Reviewer, Mar. 19, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: I
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen (TGS), Apr. 14, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAY 21, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Moller Textile Corp., c/o Moller Textile, Ltd., P.O. Box 31, Nahariya, Israel.
 Case No., 13-69-140 CIT; District, Manhattan, N.Y.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Dec. 15, 1969	Total
1960	Proposed assessment	56,019.16			29,129.96	85,149.12
1961	Proposed assessment	82,956.53			38,160.00	121,116.53
Total		138,975.69			67,289.96	206,265.65

Amount of offer: \$15,000.
 Kind of tax: Income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: None.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? Yes.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$15,000 to be paid in full upon acceptance of this offer together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (Rev. 7/57). In addition, the taxpayer has executed a future income collateral agreement in which the corporation has agreed to pay to the District Director of Internal Revenue a graduated percentage of its income in excess of \$8,000 per annum for the years 1969 through 1978, inclusive.
 Recommended by: M. Reisman, Revenue Officer, Aug. 1, 1969; Jerry Rosenfeld, Reviewer, Aug. 26, 1969.
 I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: _____
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthy, Feb. 24, 1970.
 CC-GL P. L. Barker - Internal Revenue Service.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S. S. No., **xxxx**.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Merle W. Moore, 4238 North 68th Pl., Scottsdale, Ariz.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Nov. 4, 1969	Total
Dec. 31, 1958	Apr. 4, 1969	633.06	0	386.58	22.16	1,041.80
Do	do	42.18	0	23.23	1.48	66.89
Sept. 30, 1957	do	221.63	0	151.96	7.76	381.35
Mar. 31, 1957, Dec. 31, 1958, and Dec. 31, 1959	Apr. 18, 1969	44.05	470.44	24.36	16.97	555.72
Total		940.92	470.44	586.16	48.27	2,045.76

Amount of offer: \$250.
 Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contribution Act Tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: June 2, 1969, and June 5, 1969, Maricopa County, Ariz.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$250 cash to be paid of the 1st Monday following notification of acceptance of the offer in compromise by the Internal Revenue Service together with waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656.
 Recommended by: R. J. Tate, revenue officer, September 23, 1969; Richard A. Sera, reviewer, December 9, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S. S. No., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Merle W. and Nadia H. Moore, 4238 North 68th Pl., Scottsdale, Ariz.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 14, 1969	Total
Dec. 31, 1957	Mar. 14, 1969	7,238.40	3,619.20	4,720.42	380.02	15,958.04
Dec. 31, 1958	do	4,048.69	1,926.29	2,397.38	209.12	8,581.48
Do	do	4,468.91	2,283.03	2,646.20	236.32	9,634.46
Do	Oct. 30, 1959	1,247.58	0	60.92	894.89	2,203.39
Do	do	1,554.86	0	50.48	1,115.30	2,720.64
Total		18,558.44	7,828.52	9,875.40	2,835.65	39,098.01

Amount of offer: \$2,500.
 Kind of tax: Income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 3, 1959, refiled Oct. 31, 1967, Sept. 18, 1969, Maricopa County, Ariz.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$2,500 cash to be paid on the 15th of the month following acceptance of the offer by the Internal Revenue Service together with waiver of refunds and other provision on form 656. The taxpayers have also executed a future income collateral agreement for the period 1970 through 1979 as follows—20 percent of annual income in excess of \$7,500 and not in excess of \$10,000. Thirty percent of annual income in excess of \$10,000 and not in excess of \$15,000 and 50 percent of annual income in excess of \$15,000.
 Recommended by: _____, September 23, 1969; Richard A. Siacs, Reviewer, December 9, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: _____
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Richard F. Moran, 137 Seymour St., Hartford, Conn. District, Hartford.
 Liability as follows:

Quarter taxable period ended	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued Apr. 30, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1956	May 20, 1958	11,146.05	2,227.35	664.20	9,597.60	23,635.20
June 30, 1957	Sept. 23, 1957	167.87	100.87	22.60	904.91	1,196.25
Sept. 30, 1957	May 20, 1958	1,987.79	536.69	166.17	1,807.54	4,498.19
Total		13,301.71	2,864.91	852.97	12,310.05	29,329.64

Amount of offer: \$2,350.
 Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contribution Act tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Nov. 22, 1957, Town Clerk, Hartford, Conn.; June 25, 1958, Town Clerk, Hartford, Conn.; Nov. 15, 1967, Secretary of State, Hartford, Conn.; Nov. 20, 1967, Town Clerk, Hartford, Conn.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: The total sum of \$2,350 to be paid in full within 30 days of acceptance, and waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656, revised July, 1957. Interest is payable on the deferred payment at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date of acceptance to the date of payment.
 Recommended by: George Zukauskas, Review Officer, Feb. 27, 1970; James J. Gott, Reviewer, Mar. 6, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Joseph J. Carley, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, Mar. 25, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

In re offer in compromise: Liability of W. J. O'Neal, 676 Orangewood Dr., Covina, Calif.
 Case No., 95-2260319(1); District, Los Angeles. Not in suit, X.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued Dec. 3, 1969	Total
Dec. 31, 1966	Mar. 13, 1967	8,237.24	411.86	41.19	1,427.10	10,117.39
June 30, 1966	Sept. 9, 1966	8,273.01	0	73.04	1,604.47	9,950.52
Mar. 31, 1966	June 10, 1966	27,926.01	0	95.15	6,504.81	34,525.97
Total		44,436.26	411.86	209.38	9,536.38	54,593.88

Amount of offer: \$20,000 plus collateral agreement (terms below).
 Kind of tax: Withheld income and Federal Insurance Contribution Act taxes. Federal Unemployment Tax Act taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: June 24, 1966, Oct. 26, 1966, Oct. 13, 1966, Mar. 13, 1967, Los Angeles.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$20,000, payable \$6,000 already submitted, \$3,500 payable Jan. 2, 1970, \$2,625 payable Apr. 2, 1970, \$2,625 payable July 2, 1970, \$2,625 payable Oct. 2, 1970, and \$2,625 plus accrued interest payable on Jan. 2, 1971, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions of form 656 (revised February 1969). As an additional consideration, the taxpayer has agreed that he will not claim net operating losses that he may have sustained for the calendar years 1965 and 1966 as a deduction on his Federal income tax returns for any year subsequent to the year ending Dec. 31, 1969.
 Recommended by: Ronald J. McNutt, revenue officer, Nov. 4, 1969; Harrington, reviewer Nov. 12, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Schmidt.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAR. 2, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Mary H. Pennington, Apartment 26, Butler Towers, Butler, Pa.
 Case No. PIT-GL-719; district, Mid-Atlantic; not in suit, X.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Feb. 15, 1970	Total
1963	May 12, 1966	8,322.96	7,555.24	1,863.38	4,143.47	21,885.05
1964	do	38,293.81	19,303.54	2,467.59	12,987.81	73,052.75
Total		46,616.77	26,858.78	4,330.97	17,131.28	94,937.80

Footnote at end of table.

Amount of offer: \$6,000 plus collateral agreements.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date notice of lien filed: May 16, 1966, Butler County, Pa.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Recommendation of District Director: Acceptance.
 Terms of offer: (1) Payment of \$6,000 within 30 days after date of notice of acceptance; (2) collateral agreement for future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1967 to 1976, inclusive; (3) collateral agreement providing that the joint and several liability of the taxpayer and her deceased husband will be compromised only as to the taxpayer and not as to her deceased husband.
 Recommended by: Gary L. Stansbery, Attorney, Feb. 18, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: H. Alan Long.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Cecil H. Haas.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JULY 31, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Jack Peskin, 3523 La Serena Dr., Covine Calif.
 Case No., XXXX 1; District, Los Angeles.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to July 5, 1970	Total
1959	Jan. 10, 1964	20,271.77	6,111.53	4,568.78	10,019.12	40,971.20
1960	Jan. 3, 1954	1,183.70	109.69	322.77	850.72	2,466.88
Total		21,455.47	6,221.22	4,891.55	10,869.84	43,438.08

Amount of offer: \$6,500.00 plus collateral agreement (terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Mar. 26, 1964, Hamilton County, Ohio, May 19, 1969, Los Angeles County.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: The total sum of \$6,500 payable on a deferred payment basis as follows: \$600 paid with the offer, plus \$100 to be paid on June 15, 1970, and \$100 to be paid on the 15th day of each following month, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent a year on the deferred payments from the date the offer is accepted until paid in full, and waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1969).
 In addition the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$6,000 for the years 1970 to 1977, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Charles J. Foltz, revenue officer, June 5, 1970; Harrington, reviewer, June 9, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: L. C. Jobe.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, July 6, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED NOVEMBER 23, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Charles R. and Madge Pitzer, 4012 Shady Valley, Arlington, Tex.
 Case No., XXX-XX-XXXX; District, Dallas.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Sept. 30, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1960	Apr. 19, 1968	13,471.53	0	3,444.10	1,975.73	18,891.36
Dec. 31, 1961	do	10,122.14	0	2,587.80	1,497.16	14,207.10
Dec. 31, 1963	do	9,291.83	0	2,359.22	1,369.81	13,020.86
Dec. 31, 1964	July 19, 1968	27,219.82	1,370.36	4,890.86	3,771.19	37,252.23
Dec. 31, 1965	Apr. 19, 1968	25,047.53	1,252.38	2,969.64	3,725.30	32,994.85
Dec. 31, 1966	Apr. 26, 1968	4,270.37	235.58	248.80	757.72	5,512.47
Dec. 31, 1967	Apr. 7, 1969	4,271.84	1,291.20	269.91	497.69	6,330.64
Total		93,695.06	4,149.52	16,770.33	13,594.60	128,209.51

Amount of offer: \$36,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: June 28, 1968, Aug. 13, 1968, Sept. 16, 1968, Apr. 11, 1969, Tarrant County, Tex.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$36,000, \$5,000 paid with submission of offer, as amended Sept. 10, 1970; \$3,000 to be paid upon acceptance of offer and the balance as follows: \$1,000 per month, to be paid on the last day of each month, for the months of September 1970 through March 1971; \$5,000 to be paid on Apr. 30, 1971; \$1,000 to be paid on the last day of each month May 1971 through September 1971; \$5,000 to be paid on Oct. 31, 1971; and \$1,000 to be paid on the last day of each month, November 1971 through April 1972, together with interest at 6 percent per annum from the date offer is accepted until paid in full. Also included is waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1969). In addition, taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$10,000 for the years 1971 to 1980, inclusive.
 Recommended by: H. Thompson, Revenue Officer, Sept. 11, 1970; B. E. McDuff, Reviewer, Sept. 22, 1970.
 I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Ellis Campbell, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthy, Nov. 9, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. (H) [redacted] (W) [redacted]
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Joseph C. and Mary C. Player, 111 Roosevelt Dr., Chery Hill, N.J.
 District, Newark, N.J.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 15, 1970	Total
Sept 30, 1965, and Mar. 31, 1966—Mar. 31, 1967.	Apr. 12, 1968	38,054.46			4,775.45	42,829.91

Amount of offer: \$9,000 (no deposit).
 Kind of tax: 100 percent penalty, withholding income and Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Sept. 5, 1968, Camden County.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of Offer: The total sum of \$9,000 payable as follows: \$3,100 to be paid, on or before 30 days following acceptance of the offer and the balance to be paid at the rate of \$325 on or before the 15th day of every 3d month thereafter until paid in full, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the payments are made in full and waiver of refund, default agreements, and other provisions on form 656, revised July 1957. In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future "annual income" in excess of \$9,000 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Offer Examiner E. Donald Congo, May 8, 1970; Charles M. Kahn, Reviewer, May 11, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: R. H. Nash, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Cecil H. Haas.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. [redacted]
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of David B. Pollins, 200 Central Park South, New York, N.Y.
 District, Newark, N.J.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Nov. 30, 1969	Total
Responsible Officer of Carpentry, Inc., 3d quarter 1966 through 2d quarter 1967	July 12, 1968	42,390.33			3,391.23	45,781.56
Responsible Officer of Carpentry Associates, 2d quarter 1967	Oct. 18, 1966	6,130.36			398.47	6,528.83
Total		48,520.69			3,789.70	52,310.39

Amount of offer: \$17,000 (\$3,279.48 deposited).
 Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act (100 percent penalties).
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Feb. 20, 1969, New York, N.Y.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$17,000 consisting of \$1,000 deposited with the original offer, \$2,279.48 paid with the amended offer, balance of \$13,720.52 payable at the rate of 686.03 quarterly, 1st payment due upon receipt of notice of acceptance and following payments due on or before the 30th day of each third month thereafter, with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the deferred payments, waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (Rev. 7/57). The taxpayer has also executed a collateral agreement with respect to capital loss carryovers incurred by his wife.
 Recommended by: Seymour J. Kitay, Offer Examiner, October 21, 1969; Charles M. Kahn, reviewer, October 23, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: J. Robert Murphy.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Cecil H. Haas.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. [redacted]
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Albert S. Pratt, Jr., 1775 Athens Court, Claremont, Calif.
 Case No., 14A 1967; District, Los Angeles.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	100 percent penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 10, 1970	Total
September 1963	Feb. 10, 1967	34,574.72			6,396.33	40,971.05

Footnote at end of table.

Amount of offer: \$2,500.
 Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal insurance contributions tax (100 percent penalty ETS-Hokin & Galvan, Inc.).
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Los Angeles County, April 12, 1967.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer \$2,500 payable as follows: \$50 paid July 13, 1967, the balance payable \$50 per month until paid in full, payment beginning upon notice of acceptance of this offer and the first day of each month thereafter until paid in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions of form 656. (Revised July 1957.)
 Recommended by:
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Schmidt.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, February 17, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. [redacted]
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Keila E. Pratt, 1775 Athens Ct., Claremont, Calif.
 Case No., 15 A/1967; District, Los Angeles.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	100 percent penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 10, 1970	Total
September 1963	Feb. 10, 1967	34,574.72			6,396.33	40,971.05

Amount of offer: \$2,500.
 Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Tax (100 percent penalty ETS-Hokin and Galvan, Inc.).
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Los Angeles County, Apr. 13, 1967.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$2,500 payable as follows: \$50 paid July 13, 1967, the balance payable \$50 per month until paid in full, payment beginning upon notice of acceptance of this offer and the first day of each month thereafter until paid in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions of form 656. (revision July 1957).
 Recommended by: Mazz R. Hierley, revenue officer, Feb. 5, 1970; F. P. Harrington, reviewer, Feb. 5, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Schmidt.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, Feb. 17, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED FEB. 3, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. [redacted]
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Matthew L. Prescott, 163 North 87th St., Wauwatosa, Wis.
 Case No. [redacted] A1; District, Milwaukee.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Nov. 11, 1970	Total
1949	June 16, 1967	37.00	27.75	38.30	19.62	122.67
1950	do	553.00	464.54	539.26	311.04	1,867.84
1951	do	1,759.29	1,477.80	1,610.04	968.52	5,815.65
1952	do	1,855.48	1,558.61	1,586.74	1,001.36	6,002.19
1953	Oct. 13, 1967	1,642.54	1,379.74	1,338.02	786.57	5,146.87
1954	do	1,552.14	919.63	1,163.49	457.28	4,092.54
1955	June 16, 1967	1,832.20	966.95	1,227.87	573.84	4,600.86
1956	do	2,477.35	1,285.40	1,511.59	771.38	6,045.72
1957	do	1,172.91	1,240.87	702.81	5,372.04	
1958	do	3,378.32	1,757.49	1,655.93	1,052.84	7,844.58
1959	do	4,566.46	2,334.05	1,964.33	1,414.62	10,279.46
1960	do	5,437.18	2,818.24	2,012.65	1,692.36	11,960.43
1961	do	6,592.20	3,421.74	2,044.66	2,052.86	14,111.46
1962	do	5,005.19	3,267.81	1,585.09	1,710.61	11,568.70
1963	Oct. 12, 1967	6,261.72	3,210.03	1,312.47	1,752.28	12,536.50
Total		45,205.52	26,062.69	20,831.31	15,267.99	107,367.51

Amount of offer: \$50,000 plus collateral agreement. (See terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 15, 1967 and July 3, 1968, Milwaukee County.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$50,000—Payable \$500 with the offer, the balance at \$500 per month beginning March 15, 1968, and each month thereafter, and increasing to \$775 on January 15, 1971, and increasing to \$1,000 per month on March 15, 1974, with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on deferred payments from the date this offer is accepted until paid in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (Revised February 1969).
 In addition, the taxpayer executed a collateral agreement for payment of a graduated percentage of future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1971 to 1980 inclusive. Two changes have been made in the standard form of the collateral agreement. Item 2(a).
 Recommended by: Thomas H. VanEngren, Revenue Officer, Oct. 8, 1970; Wallace E. Mujaeyusky, Group Supervisor, Oct. 8, 1970; Francis J. Harrigan, Oct. 28, 1970.
 I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: W. S. Stumpf.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthey, ABP.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED AUG. 18, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of L. D. Prough, Post Office Box 20143, Dallas, Tex. Case No. XXXX District, Dallas. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to July 30, 1969	Total
1960	May 6, 1966	3,627.00		1,106.69	703.42	5,437.11
1960	Aug. 26, 1966	24,868.78	14,862.76	8,122.88	7,177.50	55,031.92
1961	May 6, 1966	4,391.66		1,069.15	851.72	6,312.53
1962	do.	7,699.75		1,412.52	1,493.29	10,605.56
1963	Oct. 13, 1967	533.95	434.96	346.16	104.43	1,419.50
Total		41,121.14	15,297.72	12,057.40	10,330.36	78,886.62

Amount of offer: \$14,039.64.

Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Sept. 16, 1966, Marion County, Ind. Dec. 8, 1966, Dallas County, Tex. Dec. 14, 1966, Dallas County, Tex. Dec. 29, 1966, Dallas County, Tex.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$14,039.64 payable in full on the deferred payment basis within 30 days from the date of notice of acceptance of the offer, together with 6 percent accrued interest, waiver of refunds default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957) and a cobligor collateral agreement form RC-DAL and 748 (revised September 1961).
Recommended by: C. E. June 30, 1969; Homan F. Davis, reviewer, July 3, 1969.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Ellis Campbell, Jr., Aug. 18, 1969.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. W. B. Riley.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Renna Bros., Inc., South Norwalk, Conn., and Albert Renna, Sr., responsible officer, Greenwich, Conn. Case No. WT 30, 1966 Series, District, Hartford, Conn. Liability as follows:

Period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Sept. 25, 1969	Total
June 30, 1965	Jan. 11, 1966	15,534.58	4,852.41	497.72	4,935.00	25,819.71
Sept. 30, 1965	Jan. 10, 1966	6,057.10	5,176.19	337.76	2,523.88	14,094.93
Dec. 31, 1965	Jan. 25, 1966	12,307.50	205.13	0	2,752.77	15,265.40
1964 FUTA	June 4, 1965	0	144.57	0	36.63	181.20
1965 FUTA	Feb. 25, 1966	6,846.26	0	6.98	1,471.95	8,325.19
Total		40,745.44	10,378.30	842.46	11,720.23	63,686.43

Amount of offer: \$26,755.24.

Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes and Federal Unemployment Tax Act taxes.
Date notice of lien filed: Mar. 16, 1966, town clerk, Norwalk, Conn.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Recommendation of district director: Acceptance.
Terms of offer: \$26,755.24 cash together with waiver of refunds, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957).
Recommended by: John C. Galluzzo, Jr., attorney, Sept. 2, 1969.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: R. E. Sullivan.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen (TGS), Sept. 2, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED DEC. 31, 1969

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-XXXX. In re offer in compromise: Liability of Jack Rifkin, 121-19 235th St., Laurelton, N.Y. Case No. XXX-XX-XXXX District, Brooklyn, N.Y. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Dec. 31, 1969	Total
June 30-Dec. 31, 1960	May 18, 1962	54,402.25	0	0	26,370.40	80,772.65

Amount of offer: \$19,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).

Kind of tax: 100 percent Penalty Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes.
Date and place notice of lien filed: June 25, 1962, Register, Queens County, N.Y.; June 26, 1962, County Clerk, Nassau County, N.Y.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$13,500 to be paid within 30 days of notice of acceptance and the balance to be paid at the rate of \$100 on the 1st day of each succeeding month thereafter until paid in full, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full, and waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656, revised July 1957.
In addition the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$8,000 for the years 1969 to 1975 inclusive.
Recommended by: Oscar Mintzer, review officer; Rupert W. Gill, Nov. 13, 1969; Fred Lipman, reviewer, Dec. 5, 1969.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: G. B. Thomas, acting.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, SLL, Dec. 24, 1969.

Footnote at end of table.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED APRIL 17, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-XXXX. In re offer in compromise: Liability of Earl A. Rindfleisch, 13013 El Moro, La Mirada, Calif. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 23, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1956	Apr. 26, 1965	6,072.23	319.86	2,689.99	1,891.00	10,973.08
Dec. 31, 1957	do.	14,058.07	702.90	5,067.84	4,428.29	24,257.10
Dec. 31, 1958	do.	2,702.67	135.13	812.13	851.34	4,501.27
Dec. 31, 1959	do.	7,265.22	2,324.93	1,747.23	2,877.04	14,214.42
Dec. 31, 1960	do.	9,034.14	451.71	1,630.60	2,845.75	13,962.20
Total		39,132.33	3,934.53	11,947.79	12,893.42	67,098.07

Amount of offer: \$6,000 plus collateral agreements (terms below).

Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Apr. 15, 1967, San Bernardino; Nov. 7, 1966, Los Angeles.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$6,000 paid upon submission of the offer, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the deferred payment from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payment is made in full, with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on Form 656 (revised). In addition, Mr. Rindfleisch has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1974, inclusive. Mr. Rindfleisch has also executed a collateral agreement with respect to his cobligor, Emma Jean Rindfleisch, now known as Emma Jean Adams.
Recommended by: Joseph DeStefanis, Revenue Officer, Mar. 18, 1970; Harrington, Reviewer, Mar. 24, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Schmidt.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. Richard C. Schwartz, Apr. 7, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-XXXX. In re offer in compromise: Liability of Harold O. Risinger, R.R. No. 1, Starling Rd., Bethel, Ohio. Case No. XXX-XX-XXXX A; district, Cincinnati, Ohio. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 8, 1970	Total
1957	Sept. 9, 1967	1,328.88	1,864.44	746.58	510.93	4,450.83
1958	do.	1,473.15	736.57	739.24	353.56	3,302.52
1959	do.	1,808.08	904.04	798.82	433.94	3,944.88
1960	do.	5,276.41	2,638.20	2,014.58	1,266.34	11,195.53
1961	do.	1,487.52	743.76	478.70	357.00	3,066.98
1962	Oct. 13, 1967	1,281.35	640.68	335.47	296.31	2,553.81
1963	do.	1,377.53	688.76	278.00	318.51	2,662.80
1964	Sept. 16, 1966	6,070.00	0	510.54	1,327.31	7,907.85
1964	Sept. 5, 1967	1,841.78	4,179.08	324.48	1,314.18	7,659.52
Total		21,944.70	12,395.53	6,226.41	6,178.08	46,744.72

Amount of offer: \$2,000, plus collateral agreements. (See terms below.)

Kind of tax: Income tax.
Date and place notice of lien filed: May 26, 1967—Butler and Warren Cos. Feb. 28, 1968, March 1, 1968, Apr. 16, 1968—Warren Co. May 28, 1969—Hamilton, Clermont & Butler Co.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.
Terms of offer: \$2,000, payable \$50 with the offer and \$1,950 payable within 30 days after acceptance, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1971 to 1980, inclusive, and has agreed not to claim a deduction for Federal income tax purposes his unused long-term capital loss carried over to the taxable year ended Dec. 31, 1969, and to succeeding taxable years.
Recommended by: Ben Adairs, Apr. 21, 1970; A. L. Kenkel o/c reviewer, Apr. 30, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Paul A. Schuster.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: J. Pitts Vick.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. XXX-XX-XXXX. In re offer in compromise: Liability of Harold O. Risinger, R. R. No. 1, Starling Rd., Cincinnati, Ohio. Case No. 31-0566532; district, Cincinnati, Ohio. Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 8, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1964	Mar. 18, 1965	0	\$2.36	\$0.01	\$0.62	\$2.99
Mar. 31, 1965	June 18, 1965	0	34.43	0	9.97	44.40
June 30, 1965	Oct. 1, 1965	0	35.15	0	9.67	44.82
Sept. 30, 1965	Nov. 18, 1965	\$1,930.88	32.18	5.70	526.74	2,495.50
Dec. 31, 1965	Feb. 24, 1966	1,131.17	18.85	4.46	290.18	1,444.66
Do.	do.	160.77	0	.63	37.61	199.01
Total		3,222.82	122.97	10.80	874.79	4,231.38

Amount of offer: \$400 plus collateral agreements (see terms below).

Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contribution Act, and Federal Unemployment Tax Act taxes.
Date and place of lien filed: Oct. 26, 1967, in Butler and Warren Counties.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.

Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$400, payable \$50 with the offer and \$350 within 30 days after acceptance, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1971 to 1980, inclusive, and has agreed not to claim as a deduction for Federal income tax purposes his unused long-term capital loss carried over to the taxable year ended Dec. 31, 1969, and to succeeding taxable years.

Recommended by: Ben A. Davis, revenue officer, Apr. 21, 1970: A. L. Kenkel c/o reviewer, Apr. 30, 1970.

I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Paul A. Schueler.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: J. Pitts Vick.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED DECEMBER 16, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Wallace S. Roberts, 3 Woodland Rd., New Hartford, N.Y. New Address: Wedgewood Apts., Apt. 38-E, New Hartford, N.Y.
 Case No., I.T. 5-1967; District, Buffalo, N.Y.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to September 30, 1969	Total
1951	Mar. 12, 1965	0	225.01	0	61.41	286.42
1951	May 22, 1964	1,659.24	414.81	1,204.86	666.60	3,345.51
1952	do	1,977.84	494.56	1,317.54	794.60	4,584.44
1952	Mar. 12, 1965	0	269.60	0	73.58	343.18
1953	do	0	286.29	0	78.14	364.43
1953	May 22, 1964	2,097.06	524.27	1,271.13	842.49	4,734.95
1954	Mar. 12, 1965	0	234.47	0	63.99	298.46
1954	May 22, 1964	1,715.41	428.85	936.87	689.16	3,770.29
1955	do	2,733.84	683.46	1,328.06	1,088.32	5,844.68
1955	Mar. 12, 1965	0	209.71	0	57.24	266.95
1956	do	0	42.62	0	11.64	54.26
1956	May 22, 1964	582.61	145.65	248.24	234.07	1,210.57
1957	Mar. 12, 1965	0	141.16	0	38.53	179.69
1957	May 22, 1964	1,860.50	465.13	681.22	747.45	3,754.30
1958	do	382.92	95.73	117.23	153.84	749.72
1958	Mar. 12, 1965	31.00	35.20	10.81	21.27	98.28
1959	May 22, 1964	464.24	116.06	114.27	186.51	881.08
1959	Mar. 12, 1965	32.55	46.34	9.40	25.35	113.64
Total		13,537.21	4,858.82	7,240.63	5,844.19	31,480.85

Amount of offer: \$6,000.00 plus collateral agreement. (See terms below.)
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Mar. 29, 1965, Sept. 1, 1967, Sept. 9, 1967, Oneida Co., Utica, N.Y. and Town of New Hartford, New Hartford, N.Y.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.

Terms of offer: Amended offer secured, \$6,000 payable \$3,000 on Jan. 1, 1970 and the balance of \$3,000 on January 1, 1971, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payment is made in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$6,000 for the years 1970 to 1974 inclusive.

Recommended by: John P. Giglio, Aug. 21, 1969; Robert VanValkinbuo, Sept. 12, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: John E. Foley, Dec. 26, 1969.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, Nov. 3, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED DEC. 16, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Wallace S. and Janet K. Roberts, 3 Woodland Rd., New Hartford, N.Y.; Wedgewood Apts., Apt. 38-E, New Hartford, N.Y.
 Case No. I. T. 6-1967-A; District, Buffalo, N.Y.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Sept. 30, 1969	Total
1960	Mar. 12, 1965	31.41	44.82	7.19	20.81	104.23
1960	May 22, 1964	484.67	121.17	90.22	194.71	890.77
1961	do	1,249.71	312.43	157.65	511.93	2,231.72
1961	Mar. 12, 1965	92.56	122.98	15.62	58.83	289.99
Total		1,858.35	601.40	270.68	786.28	3,516.71

Amount of offer: \$2,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Apr. 29, 1965, Sept. 9, 1965, Oneida Co., Utica, N.Y., and Town of New Hartford, New Hartford, N.Y.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.

Terms of offer: Amended offer secured; \$2,000 payable \$1,000 on Jan. 1, 1970, and the balance of \$1,000 on Jan. 1, 1971, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payment is made in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, taxpayer Janet Roberts, agreed to pay a graduated percentage of her separate future income for the years 1970 to 1974, inclusive. In addition, Wallace S. Roberts has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his separate future income in excess of \$6,000 for the years 1970 to 1974, inclusive.

Recommended by: John P. Giglio, Review Officer, Aug. 21, 1969; Robert VanValkenbergh, Reviewer, Sept. 12, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: John E. Foley, Dec. 16, 1969.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, FJL; Nov. 1, 1969.

Footnote at end of table.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Neal (Neil) Rubin, 39 Park Dr., Lido Beach, N.Y. Case No. WT-40-A; district, Manhattan.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to July 15, 1970	Total
TRANSCRIPT READS: ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ AND/OR NEAL RUBIN FORMER OFFICERS: COFFEE SHOPS OF NEW YORK, INC.						
Dec. 31, 1962	May 6, 1966	2,883.95			725.26	3,609.21
Mar. 31, 1963	do	2,579.75			648.76	3,228.51
TRANSCRIPT READS: ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ AND/OR NEAL RUBIN FORMER OFFICERS: CUP & SAUCER, 57TH STREET CORPORATION						
Dec. 31, 1962	Aug. 26, 1966	3,351.71			781.35	4,133.06
TRANSCRIPT READS: ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ AND/OR NEAL RUBIN FORMER OFFICERS: WINSTON RESTAURANT, INC.						
Dec. 31, 1962	Dec. 2, 1966	2,987.79			1,951.61	10,939.40
Jan. 30, 1963	do	8,019.57			1,741.37	9,760.94
TRANSCRIPT READS: NEAL RUBIN AND/OR ABRAHAM LEFKOWITZ FORMER OFFICERS: COFFEE SHOPS OF NEW YORK, INC.						
June 30, 1963	Dec. 18, 1964	519.90			238.27	758.17
Mar. 31, 1963	Aug. 26, 1966	3,526.78			822.16	4,348.94
June 30, 1963	do	2,276.07			530.60	2,806.67
TRANSCRIPT READS: NEIL RUBIN, FORMER OFFICER: REST CORPORATION OF NEW YORK						
Mar. 31, 1963	Apr. 8, 1966	5,478.90			1,403.42	6,882.32
June 30, 1963	do	8,125.43			2,081.33	10,206.76
Total		45,749.85			10,924.13	56,673.98

Amount of offer: \$3,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: 100 percent penalty for Withholding and Federal Insurance Contribution Act taxes. Date and place notice of lien filed: New York County Jan. 22, 1965, June 16, 1966; Sept. 22, 1966; Dec. 9, 1966, Sept. 30, 1966; Dec. 12, 1966, Nassau County.

Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: The total sum of \$3,000 paid in full with submission of the offer together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on Form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive, and has stipulated that the offer is submitted to compromise his individual liability only and shall not be construed as operating to release his coobligor on the joint assessments.

Recommended by: Lorenzo Lombardo, revenue officer, Apr. 1, 1970; Jerry Rosenfeld, May 5, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Edw. J. Fitzgerald Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, May 14, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED AUG. 21, 1970

E.I. and S.S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx corrected to xxxxx
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of George J., Jr. and Barbara Ruppert, 3636 Eastern Ave., Sacramento, Calif.
 Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx; District, Los Angeles.
 Liability as follows:

Period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 15, 1970	Total
1960	June 2, 1966	13,781.67		4,246.45	3,265.94	21,294.06
1961	do	6,700.81		1,662.63	1,587.94	9,951.38
1965	Nov. 15, 1963	9,286.52	464.33	1,518.62	877.59	12,147.06
1966	Dec. 13, 1968	7,140.77		711.24	585.36	8,437.37
Total		36,909.77	464.33	8,138.94	6,316.83	51,829.87

Amount of offer: (Plus collateral agreement) (terms below) \$10,000.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Nov. 9, 1967, Feb. 14, 1969, Aug. 13, 1969, Orange County.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.

Recommendation of Director: Acceptance.
 Terms of offer: The total sum of \$10,000 payable on the deferred payment basis as follows: \$1,000 already paid, plus \$9,000 to be paid within 30 days after notice of acceptance, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the deferred payments from the date the offer is accepted until paid in full, with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (Rev. 7-57).

In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1976, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Melvern Stein, Attorney, August 12, 1970; /S/ Dorothy W. Westover, Act. Staff Asst., August 17, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: (Signed) Ralph B. Grant, Acting.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz (Dw).

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT MAR. 5, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Anthony Scarnigella, 15 Cottage Avenue, Montvale, N.J. District, Newark.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 31, 1969	Total
Proposed deficiencies.						
1955		7,061.49	3,530.75		8,579.71	19,171.95
1956		15,356.21	7,678.11		17,275.74	40,310.06
1957		18,417.22	9,208.61		19,061.82	46,687.65
1958		8,998.15	4,499.08		8,503.26	22,000.49
Total		49,833.07	24,916.55		53,420.55	128,170.15

Amount of offer: \$12,000. (No deposit).
 Kind of tax: Proposed income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: None.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? Yes.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$12,000 to be paid upon acceptance, with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). The taxpayer has also executed a collateral agreement with respect to additional payments from future income.
 Recommended by Seymour J. Kitay, offer examiner, Sept. 24, 1969; Charles M. Kahn, reviewer, Sept. 25, 1969.
 I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: I R. H. Nash, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthy, Nov. 6, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAY 13, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Sidney J. Scratow, 5668 Melvin St., Pittsburgh, Pa. District, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 31, 1970	Total
1955	Nov. 12, 1958	710.51	0	105.48	496.64	1,312.63
1958	May 8, 1959	407.70	0	0	270.71	678.41
1961	May 18, 1962	840.00	0	0	405.72	1,245.72
1962	Oct. 22, 1965	3,673.50	0	554.04	1,017.55	5,245.72
1962	July 26, 1963	2,304.60	0	38.72	947.19	3,290.51
1963	July 31, 1964	2,831.20	0	49.91	990.92	4,085.59
1964	June 9, 1965	24,562.11	1,155.39	3,761.49	7,344.07	36,823.06
1965	June 3, 1966	6,519.27	70.95	769.70	1,558.10	8,918.02
1966	Oct. 20, 1967	3,511.89	0	108.24	551.36	4,171.49
1967	May 24, 1968	4,597.92	147.13	278.14	560.94	5,584.65
Total		49,958.70	1,587.03	5,665.72	14,143.20	71,354.65

Amount of offer: \$4,000.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Feb. 7, 1957, Apr. 23, 1959, June 27, 1969, Sept. 12, 1962, Oct. 5, 1963, Nov. 10, 1964, Oct. 21, 1965, Jan. 21, 1966, July 20, 1966, Feb. 19, 1968, Sept. 23, 1968, Dec. 27, 1968, Allegheny Co., Pa.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$4,000, cash, together with waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, as additional consideration for the acceptance of the offer, the taxpayer has executed a collateral agreement whereunder he agrees to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 to the District Director for the years 1970 to 1974, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Frank S. Grant, revenue officer, Mar. 18, 1970; Chief, Collection Division, Apr. 13, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: I H. Alan Long.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Cecil H. Haas.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED FEB. 26, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. (H) **xxx-xx-xxxx** (W) **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of David C. and Janet Scott, 1211 New Mexico Ave., Lorain, Ohio.
 Case No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**; District, Cleveland.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 7, 1970	Total
1956 income	July 8, 1966	8,207.29	4,373.27	4,843.65	2,767.71	20,191.92
1957 income	do	8,599.81	5,016.47	4,246.41	2,995.58	20,858.27
1958 income	do	4,336.88	2,187.69	1,897.95	1,435.41	9,857.93
1959 income	do	6,452.70	3,226.35	2,411.89	2,129.39	14,220.33
Total		27,596.68	14,803.78	13,399.90	9,328.09	65,128.45

Footnote at end of table.

Amount of offer: \$2,000 plus collateral agreement on future income (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Individual income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Nov. 8, 1966, Lorain County, Cuyahoga County, and Summit County.

Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$2,000 payable at \$25 per month, 1st payment to be made Nov. 1, 1968, and each month thereafter, with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on deferred payments from date this offer is accepted until paid in full together with waiver of refunds, default agreements, and other provisions on form 656. As additional consideration, the taxpayers have submitted a collateral agreement based on future income from 1970 through 1980. As of Nov. 2, 1969, \$350 has been deposited to the special deposit account.
 Recommended by: Raymond D. Klings, revenue officer, Jan. 29, 1970; John G. —, SPS, reviewer, Feb. 4, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: I F. S. Turbett, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Clarence E. Price, JPC.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED SEPT. 30, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Ove C. and Pearl Selid, 333 Clay, Fairbanks, Alaska.
 Case No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**; District, Anchorage.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Sept. 1, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1960	July 28, 1967	26,909.97	8,935.95	12,641.28	7,078.90	55,566.10

Amount of offer: \$10,000.
 Kind of tax: Income—deficiency.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: September 15, 1967, Fairbanks, Alaska.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$10,000 payable \$3,000 with the offer, and the balance of \$7,000 at \$250 per month commencing 30 days after notice of acceptance and each month thereafter, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full, and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656.
 In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of future income in excess of \$10,000 for the years 1971 to 1975, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Max B. Pierce, revenue officer, August 4, 1970; F.W. Dennis, special procedures officer, August 18, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: I Lewis J. Conrad Assistant Director.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Robert L. Severance, 1124 Bexley Ave., Marion, Ohio.
 Case No. **xxxx**; District, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Aug. 1, 1969	Total
Quarters ended Sept. 30, 1959 thru Sept. 30, 1961 and Mar. 31, 1961 and June 30, 1961.	Oct. 24, 1962	33,979.36			13,876.88	47,856.24

Amount of offer: \$9,000.
 Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contribution Act, taxes, 100 percent penalty.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Sept. 15, 1967, Marion County, Ohio; Nov. 19, 1968, refilled Marion County, Ohio; May 14, 1969, Refilled Madison County, N.Y.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$9,000, cash paid with offer, and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on Form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$12,500 for the years 1970 to 1974, inclusive and in addition to waive the long term capital loss deduction of \$1,000 per year during the period of the collateral.
 Recommended by: Jerome J. Pasholk, revenue officer, June 10, 1969; A. L. Kenkel o/c reviewer, July 9, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: I Paul A. Schaefer.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Clarence E. Price.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED SEPT. 23, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. (H) **xxx-xx-xxxx** (W) **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Charles and Lillian Shane, 69 Northport Ave., Belfast, Maine.
 Case No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**; District, Augusta (Maine).
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty *	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to July 31, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1964	Dec. 1, 1967	9,276.70	11,862.64	3,269.19	2,831.64	27,240.17
Dec. 31, 1965	do	18,516.54	9,258.27	1,807.77	4,442.07	34,024.65
Dec. 31, 1966	Nov. 26, 1968	19,069.40	10,852.46	1,016.16	3,038.42	33,976.44
Dec. 31, 1967	May 17, 1968	887.00		4.73	117.35	1,009.08
Total		47,749.64	31,973.37	6,097.85	10,429.48	96,250.34

*Includes fraud and estimated tax penalties.
 Amount of offer: \$10,000.
 Kind of tax: Individual income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Jan. 18, 1968—Augusta, Maine; Jan. 25, 1968—Belfast, Maine.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$10,000 paid in full, plus waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income for the years 1970 to 1975, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Michael _____, revenue officer, July 9, 1970; John T. Burke, collection reviewer, July 14, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: John C. Hanson.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JUNE 24, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of John and Therasa Shedesky, 375 Brookview Drive Rochester, N.Y.
 Case No. 16-xxx-xx-xxxx District, Buffalo, N.Y.; Not in suit, N/A.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Jan. 29, 1970	Total
1959	Nov. 29, 1968	3,243.40	1,621.70	1,677.81	340.55	6,883.46
1960	do	5,285.69	2,642.85	2,417.15	555.60	10,900.69
1961	do	3,542.77	1,771.39	1,407.55	372.00	7,093.71
1962	do	4,003.19	2,001.60	1,350.28	420.33	7,775.40
1968	June 27, 1969	3,554.00	110.00	42.55	128.24	3,834.79
Total		19,629.05	8,147.54	6,895.34	1,816.12	36,488.05

Amount of offer: \$10,400.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: May 14, 1969, Monroe County.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: The total amount payable upon acceptance together with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on Form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive.
 Recommended by: A. G. Bruntth, Nov. 19, 1969; Robert VanWalhenbock, Dec. 30, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: John E. Foley, June 24, 1970.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, Feb. 13, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED AUG. 3, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. XXXX
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of John R. & Dorothy G. Smith, 1107 Greenhills Rd., Toledo, Ohio.
 Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx A; District, Cleveland.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Aug. 10, 1970	Total
1958	Mar. 15, 1968	700.65	350.33	373.07	151.10	1,575.15
1959	do	1,635.88	817.94	772.90	352.78	3,579.50
1960	do	1,668.41	834.21	688.16	359.81	3,550.59
1961	do	3,919.90	1,959.95	1,381.63	845.35	8,106.83
1962	do	3,548.53	1,774.27	1,037.82	765.26	7,125.88
1963	Nov. 24, 1967	3,368.78	1,684.39	729.27	726.01	5,928.81
1964	Nov. 3, 1967	1,941.72	970.86	297.32	428.41	3,304.34
1965	do	2,571.81	1,285.90	239.50	566.22	4,213.82
Total		19,355.68	8,314.63	5,519.67	4,194.94	37,384.92

Amount of offer: \$12,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: April 10, 1968, Lucas County, Ohio; December 16, 1968, Lucas County, Ohio; April 23, 1969, Lucas County, Ohio.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$12,000 payable on a deferred payment basis as follows: \$1,085.64 previously submitted and balance of \$10,914.36 as follows: 24 payments of \$100 per month followed consecutively by 12 payments of \$125 per month, 12 payments of \$150 per month, 12 payments of \$200 per month and 12 payments of \$234.53 per month. Payments are to begin within 30 days after date of notice of acceptance letter, and, in addition to the amounts set forth, will include stated interest of \$30 on each payment towards compliance with interest provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957) requiring payment of 6 percent interest per annum on deferred payments from the date of acceptance to the date the respective payments are made in full. The remainder of interest due under terms of this agreement will be paid in full with the last payment.
 Recommended by: William J. Gillispie, revenue officer, June 16, 1970; John G. _____ SPS reviewer, July 7, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Turbeth, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Clarence E. Price.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED APR. 23, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of William C. Stillwell, 30 Plymouth St., New Hyde Park, N.Y.
 Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx District, Brooklyn.
 Liability as follows:

Footnote at end of table.

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 30, 1970	Total
U L C Reads: William C. Stillwell and/or Roy H. Johnson—Former officers of Johnwell Contracting Corp.						
June 30, 1953	Mar. 11, 1954	6,373.44			6,463.59	12,837.03
Sept. 30, 1953	do	3,258.34			6,152.31	9,410.65
Dec. 31, 1953	do	6,142.53			6,336.73	12,479.26
U L C Reads: William Stillwell and/or Roy Johnson—Former officers of Dorchester Builders, Inc.						
June 30, 1954	Feb. 15, 1957	755.63			1,309.64	2,065.27
Total		16,529.94			20,262.27	36,792.21

Amount of offer: \$5,000.
 Kind of tax: 100 percent penalty withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Apr. 23, 1954, Nassau County, Mineola, N.Y., Dec. 1, 1964, Nassau County, Mineola, N.Y.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$5,000, \$50 paid with the offer, the balance of \$4,950 payable upon notice of acceptance, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656. In addition, the taxpayer executed a collateral agreement stating that the offer is submitted to compromise his individual liability only and shall not be construed as operating to release his coobligor on the joint assessments.
 Recommended by: George G. _____, Jan. 29, 1970; Edward S. Finn, reviewer, Mar. 26, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Eugene W. Sturtevant.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marvin E. Hagen, Apr. 16, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED APR. 8, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Richard E. Stratton III and Louise W. Stratton, Rt. 1, Box 156A, Brookhaven, Miss.
 Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx A; District, Jackson; not in suit X.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 1, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1962	Aug. 25, 1967	1,917.41	0	501.68		
Do	Mar. 1, 1968	0	47.65	73.87		
Do	Aug. 16, 1968	0	0	39.20		
Do	Oct. 4, 1968	2,179.57	2,048.49	730.59	521.92	8,060.38
Dec. 31, 1963	Aug. 18, 1967	3,998.14	.01	801.60		
Do	Mar. 1, 1968	0	104.69	159.79		
Do	Aug. 16, 1968	0	0	80.73		
Do	Oct. 4, 1968	3,205.25	3,601.70	891.81	1,087.10	13,930.82
Dec. 31, 1964	Dec. 20, 1968	15,980.44	8,430.41	3,528.83	1,752.95	29,692.63
Dec. 31, 1966	July 19, 1968	1,287.33	606.58	183.57		
Do	Feb. 6, 1970	2,130.33	760.41	584.35	18.34	5,570.91
Dec. 31, 1967	Do	25,010.57	12,505.29	2,712.89	143.81	40,372.56
Total		55,709.04	28,105.23	10,288.91	3,524.12	97,627.30

Amount of offer: \$7,590 plus collateral agreement.
 Kind of tax: Individual income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: See attached sheets.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$7,590 to be paid in full within 30 days of notification of acceptance, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the payment is made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions of form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1969 to 1978, inclusive. The taxpayers also agree that all monies received by them during the term of this collateral agreement by virtue of ownership of 10 percent of the Alcorn Pipe Line Company, a partnership, less applicable Federal income taxes, will be paid to the Internal Revenue Service.
 Recommended by: Harold E. Storm, revenue officer, Feb. 12, 1970; D. L. Ware, reviewer, Feb. 16, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: J. G. Martin, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Henry C. Stodkell Jr., Mar. 3, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAY 18, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Edward C. Strum, Jr. and Dorothy L. Strum, 219 East Ralston Ave., San Bernardino, Calif.
 Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx District, Los Angeles.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Dec. 31, 1969	Total
Dec. 31, 1959	Dec. 30, 1966	2,004.35	122.64	978.19	382.73	3,506.91
Dec. 31, 1960	do	4,143.28	207.16	1,418.88	797.26	6,566.58
Dec. 31, 1961	do	3,442.58	172.13	972.41	660.37	5,247.49
Dec. 31, 1962	do	2,750.08	137.50	611.80	525.88	4,025.26
Dec. 31, 1963	do	9,139.25	456.96	1,484.81	1,742.17	12,823.19
Dec. 31, 1964	do	11,480.69	574.03	1,176.38	2,181.61	15,412.71
Total		32,960.23	1,670.42	6,651.47	6,300.02	47,582.14

Amount of offer: \$4,000 plus collateral agreement. (Terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: San Bernardino County, March 30, 1967.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$4,000, payable \$1,000 within 30 days of acceptance of the offer; balance to be paid at the rate of \$50 per month commencing on July 15, 1969, and each 15th day thereafter, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1969). In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1969 to 1978, inclusive, and have agreed also to waive any deduction on their current and future income tax returns in respect to any and all moneys repaid to the person or persons from whom the said moneys were embezzled.
 Recommended by: E. C. Schonsman, revenue officer, Dec. 8, 1969; Harrington, reviewer, Dec. 11, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Schmidt.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JULY 10, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Franklin A. and Betty V. Sturdivant, Sparta, N.C. District, Greensboro.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr 15, 1970	Total
Dec 31, 1961	Proposed deficiency	10,415.90	5,207.95		4,999.63	20,623.48
Dec 31, 1962	do	25,826.37	12,913.19		10,847.08	49,586.64
Dec 31, 1963	do	32,970.28	16,485.14		11,869.30	61,324.72
Total		69,212.55	34,606.28		27,716.01	131,534.84

Amount of offer: \$7,457.37 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: None.
 Is case pending before appellate office? Yes.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$7,457.37 payable as follows: \$4,757.37 payable 180 days after notice of acceptance of the offer, and \$2,700 payable at \$75 per month commencing on the 30th day after notice of acceptance and on the 30th day of each month thereafter, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full, and waiver of refund, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656, revised July 1957. In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Robert B. Rabon, Revenue Officer, Jan. 5, 1970; C. W. Cooper, Feb. 2, 1970.
 I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: J. E. Wall.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthing, ABC, Mar. 24, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAY 15, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Tahoe-Truckee Development, Inc., c/o Thomas J. McIntosh, P.O. Box 6247, 1225 Solano Ave., Albany, Calif.
 Case No., I.T. NMF-151; District, San Francisco.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to	Total
1961	Proposed deficiency.	31,390.00	7,844			39,234

Amount of offer: \$100.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: None.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? Yes.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$100 to be paid upon receipt of notice of acceptance of offer together with waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 657 (rev. sec. 7-57).
 Recommended by: James S. Harrison, Nov. 7, 1969; David — Reviewer, November 12, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the statement: Joseph M. Cullen.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer (s) should be accepted. RCS/FGT, Dec. 16, 1969.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I., S. S. Nos. 54 — 54 —
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Robert M. Taylor, 10271 Rohious Road, Richmond, Va. District, Richmond.
 Account of Robert M. Taylor and Richard D. Garrett. Trading as R & R Installation Service 54-
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 15, 1970	Total
June 30, 1967	Sept. 22, 1967	\$13,220.64		\$141.15	\$1,963.76	\$15,327.55
Sept. 30, 1967	Nov. 17, 1967	17,963.94	\$538.91	26.98	2,686.67	21,136.10
Dec. 31, 1966 (940)	Nov. 22, 1968	1,979.33		213.79	156.21	2,340.33

Footnote at end of table.

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 8, 1969	Total
Dec. 31, 1967 (940)	June 17, 1968	4,395.12	659.27	77.49	513.40	5,645.28
Account of Robert M. Taylor	xxxx					
Sept. 30, 1967	Nov. 17, 1967	9,585.17	143.78	14.18	1,370.79	11,113.92
Dec. 31, 1967	Apr. 5, 1968	5,456.40		59.05	635.18	6,150.63
Total		52,600.60	1,341.96	532.24	7,248.01	61,722.81

Amount of offer: \$6,280 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of Tax: Withholding Federal insurance contributions and Federal Unemployment taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Oct. 10, 1967, Feb. 8, 1968, Feb. 9, 1968, June 3, 1968, June 4, 1969, Feb. 4, 1969; Circuit Court Chesterfield Court, Va. and Hastings Court Part II, Richmond, Va.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$6,280 payable \$1,000 5 days after notice of acceptance and \$5,280 payable in 18 monthly installments of \$60 each and 42 monthly installments of \$100 beginning 30 days after the payment of \$1,000 and continuing on the same day of each succeeding month for 60 months, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised 2-69). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive, and waiver of refunds made for periods ending prior to or during the calendar years in which this agreement is in force.
 Recommended by: Henry E —, Revenue Officer, Feb. 18, 1970; M. V. Orr, Feb. 19, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: W. P. Alexander, Acting.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Marion B. Morton, Mar. 24, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JULY 30, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Margaret M. Townsfield, 1445 North Fairfax Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.
 District, Los Angeles.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to May 29, 1970	Total
1963	Aug. 29, 1969	18,093.75	904.69	5,647.73	854.91	25,501.08
1964	do	20,365.53	1,018.28	5,134.90	962.28	27,480.99
1965	Oct. 31, 1969	6,422.90	1,926.88	1,234.08	288.92	9,872.78
Total		44,882.18	3,849.85	12,016.71	2,016.11	62,854.85

Amount of offer: \$6,500 plus collateral agreement (terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 5, 1969 Feb. 4, 1970, Los Angeles County.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: The total sum of \$6,500 payable on the deferred payment basis as follows: \$2,000 paid with the original offer, plus \$75 to be paid on Jan. 20, 1970, and \$75 to be paid on the 20th day of each following month, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent a year on the deferred payments from the date the offer is accepted until paid in full, with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 revised February 1969.
 In addition the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$6,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Charles J. Foltz, revenue officer, Apr. 17, 1970; Harrington, May 22, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: L. C. Jobe.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, President July 6, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S. S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Jacques Traubo, 100 Central Park South, New York, N.Y.
 Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx; District, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to November 20, 1970	Total
Dec. 31, 1944	Oct. 7, 1954	11,873.66	6,980.97	6,785.12	24,229.95	49,169.70
Dec. 31, 1945	do	11,952.55	6,026.27	6,186.65	23,398.90	47,564.37
Dec. 31, 1946	do	2,343.92	3,608.51	3,278.23	12,776.77	22,007.43
Dec. 31, 1958	Dec. 17, 1965	17,600.58	1,750.06	7,046.02	5,719.84	32,116.50
Total		43,770.71	18,365.81	22,596.02	66,125.46	150,858.00

Amount of offer: \$16,000, plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Federal income tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: See schedule on page 2.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the tax court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$10,000 tendered herewith and the balance of \$6,000 to be paid at the rate of \$100 per month for a period of 60 months, the first payment to be made July 20, 1969, and to continue thereafter on the 20th of each succeeding month until paid in full, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full, and waiver of refunds, and default agreement and other provisions on Form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970, to 1979, inclusive.

Recommended by: George —, revenue officer, Aug. 20, 1970; —, Chief, O/C Sect. Aug. 24, 1970, Fred —, reviewer, Aug. 27, 1970.
I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Eugene W. Sturtevant, acting, Sept. 8, 1970.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: K. Martin Worthy, Chief Counsel, ABC, Nov. 19, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAR. 19, 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of William J Travers, 130 Pepper Ave, Larkspur, Calif. Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx; District, San Francisco.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 31, 1970	Total
1963	Sept 6, 1968	6,449.62	362.43	1,875.81	660.39	9,348.25
1965	do	7,672.87	383.64	1,064.85	748.85	9,870.21
1966	June 30, 1967	16,880.87	844.03	1,329.87	1,667.86	20,722.63
Total		31,003.36	1,590.10	270.53	2,077.10	39,941.09

Amount of offer \$11,515 plus collateral agreement (see terms below)
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Oct 3, 1968 San Francisco, County, San Francisco, Calif. Oct. 3, 1968, Marin County, San Rafael, Calif. Jan. 20, 1969, Marin County, San Rafael, Calif.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.

Terms of offer: \$11,515 payable \$5,000 upon notice of acceptance of the offer and the balance at \$110 per month commencing 30 days after notice of acceptance and each month thereafter, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on Form 656 (Rev. 7-57). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1971 to 1977 inclusive.
Recommended by: B. Willis, revenue officer, Feb. 18, 1970, Samuel S. Peters, Group Supervisor, Feb. 18, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Joseph M. Cullen.

For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted, Richard C. Schwartz, Apr. 30, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx.
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Robert H. and Violet Van Buskirk, 1461 North Shaffer St., Orange, Calif.
Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx (2); District, Los Angeles.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 2, 1970	Total
Accounts of Robert H. Van Buskirk.						
Dec. 31, 1962	Dec. 19, 1967	25,411.67		6,792.08	3,963.95	36,167.70
Dec. 31, 1964	Dec. 19, 1967	13.50	5.68	50.06	4.08	73.32
Accounts of Violet Van Buskirk.						
Dec. 31, 1962	Dec. 31, 1968	25,832.67		6,861.46	2,935.09	35,629.22
Dec. 31, 1964	do	113.50	5.68	20.91	8.34	148.43
Total		51,371.34	11.36	13,734.51	6,911.46	72,018.67

Amount of offer: \$7,900 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Apr. 22, 1968, Orange County (Robert); Mar. 24, 1969, Orange County (Violet).
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.

Terms of offer: \$7,900 payable as follows: \$135 to be paid on the 10th of Apr. 1970, and \$135 on the 10th day of each succeeding month until paid in full, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent a year on the deferred payments from the date offer is accepted until paid in full, and waiver of refunds, default agreements, and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1969) In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1976, inclusive, and to waive certain net operating losses and/or capital losses for Federal income tax purposes.
Recommended by: M. Nimovitz, revenue officer, Apr. 10, 1970; Harrington, May 4, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Schmidt.

For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, May 7, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx.
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Robert H. Van Buskirk, 1452 N. Shaffer St., Orange, Calif. Case No. 95-2230409; District, Los Angeles.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 2, 1970	Total
Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act Tax.						
March 31, 1966	June 10, 1966	1,675.50		25.55	395.26	2,176.68
June 30, 1966	Sept 9, 1966	3,237.57		27.46	699.88	3,964.91
Dec. 31, 1966	Mar. 3, 1967	1,445.24	27.34	7.23	273.37	1,753.18
Federal Unemployment Act Tax.						
Dec. 31, 1966	Mar. 24, 1967	925.01		9.79	168.80	1,101.78
Total		7,283.32	107.71	48.21	1,537.31	8,996.55

Footnote at end of table.

Amount of offer: \$2,100 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act tax and Federal Unemployment Tax Act.
Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 2, 1966, Orange County, Oct. 3, 1966, Orange County, Mar. 17, 1966, Orange County, Apr. 6, 1967, Orange County.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.

Terms of offer: \$2,100, already paid in, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on form 656 (revised February 1969). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1976, inclusive, and to waive certain net operating losses and/or capital losses for Federal income tax purposes.

Recommended by: M. Nimovitz, revenue officer, Apr. 10, 1970, P. Harrington, May 4, 1970. I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: F. S. Schmidt.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, May 7, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED SEPT. 30 1970

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Glenn C. and Bessie H. Vaux, 701 McDermit, Las Vegas, Nev. Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx; District, Reno, Nev.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 14, 1970	Total
December 1951	Aug. 14, 1964	0	0	60.53	0	60.53
December 1952	do	0	0	332.97	0	332.97
December 1953	do	404.57	173.54	321.57	189.62	1,089.30
December 1954	do	595.94	343.11	333.68	347.45	1,620.18
December 1955	do	909.63	476.77	454.75	512.97	2,354.12
Separate returns of Bessie H. Vaux:						
December 1956	Nov. 8, 1963	2,731.15	759.27	1,070.08	1,242.52	5,803.02
December 1957	do	839.77	993.09	1,185.22	1,345.17	4,363.25
December 1958	do	2,424.21	735.09	718.71	1,348.37	5,226.38
Separate returns of Glenn C. Vaux:						
December 1956		2,643.55	1,392.27	1,162.98	1,493.33	6,692.13
December 1957		3,465.75	1,825.96	1,316.75	1,957.93	8,566.39
December 1958		2,581.52	1,358.77	825.90	1,457.91	6,224.10
Total		16,596.09	8,057.81	7,783.14	9,895.27	42,332.37

Amount of offer: \$21,842.
Kind of tax: Federal income tax.
Date and place notice of lien filed: 01-08-64 and 11-02-69, Clark County, Nev.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.

Terms of offer: The total sum of \$21,842 of which \$7,705 is on deposit with the District Director, \$4,137 to be paid on or by Oct. 1, 1970, and the balance of \$10,000 to be paid in 3 annual payments as follows: \$3,333.33 or more, on the 1st day of the 13th month \$3,333.33 or more, on the 1st day of the 25th month, and the balance to be paid on the 1st day of the 37th month; following notification of acceptance of this offer, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the deferred payments, if any, from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full, waiver of refunds, and other provisions on form 656, (revised July 1947). As an additional consideration, taxpayers have agreed to a future income collateral agreement for the years 1970 to 1974, inclusive, whereby a percentage of their annual income in excess of \$7,500 will be paid to the Director.

Recommended by: Hugh P. Hough, Revenue Officer, July 10, 1970; D. W. Sherman, Special Procedures Officer, Sept. 29, 1970.
I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: W. A. Bates.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Richard C. Schwartz, Sept. 28, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAR. 13, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. xxx-xx-xxxx.
In re offer in compromise: Liability of Dr. Stephen F. Verges, % Vasil Polyzois, 7504 Alaska Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. Case No. xxx-xx-xxxx; District, Baltimore.
Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 1, 1970	Total
1957	June 3, 1966	1,600.00	800.00	780.73	552.00	3,732.73
1958	Dec. 23, 1966	8,845.29	4,596.72	4,080.42	2,654.79	20,177.22
1959	do	3,842.02	2,120.38	1,541.84	1,177.49	8,681.73
1960	do	2,550.04	1,403.57	870.35	780.74	5,604.70
1961	do	2,579.70	128.99	725.70	534.85	3,969.24
Total		19,417.05	9,049.66	7,999.04	5,699.87	42,165.62

Amount of offer: \$5,500 cash plus collateral agreement.
Kind of tax: Income.
Date and place notice of lien filed: See statement below.
Is case pending before appellate office? No.
Is case pending before the tax court? No.
Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
Was bond filed? No.

Terms of offer: \$5,500 consisting of \$5,000 paid with the original offer and the balance of \$500 paid with this amended offer, together with waiver of refunds and other provisions on form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1969 to 1978, inclusive and has waived the right to receive any tax refunds that may become due to him through overpayments during the period of the agreement.

Date and place notice of lien filed: Montgomery Co., Md.: Feb. 6, 1967; Mar. 14, 1967; July 25, 1967; Washington, D.C.: Feb. 8, 1967; Mar. 14, 1967; July 26, 1967. Calvert Co., Md.: Apr. 5, 1967; July 26, 1967. Anne Arundel Co., Md.: June 21, 1967; July 25, 1967.
Recommended by: M. Bronstein, Feb. 25, 1970; Constantine Arguiros, receiver, Feb. 25, 1970. I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Irving Machiz, Mar. 16, 1970.
For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Cecil H Haas, Mar. 2, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JUNE 25, 1970

E.I. or S.S. No. **xxx-xx-xxxx** A.
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Joseph and Constance Visceglia, 1142 Puddingstone Rd.,
 Mountainside, N.J.
 Case No., **xxx-xx-xxxx** A; District, Newark, N.J.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Apr. 11, 1970	Total
Joseph Visceglia						
1945	May 11, 1962	2,166.60	1,277.73	2,100.03	1,636.04	7,180.40
1945	do	6,087.57	3,591.67	5,535.26	4,597.62	19,812.12
1947	do	2,393.81	1,493.26	2,033.00	1,846.35	7,766.42
Constance Visceglia						
1946	do	6,571.83	3,877.40	5,975.59	4,963.36	21,388.18
1947	do	20,443.11	10,221.56	17,361.80	14,565.71	62,592.18
Total		37,662.92	20,461.62	33,005.68	27,609.08	118,739.30

Amount of offer: \$78,000 (no deposit).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Nov. 2, 1962, Bergen County, N.J.; Dec. 26, 1967, Ocean
 County, N.J.; Oct. 21, 1968, New York, N.Y.; Dec. 2, 1968, Union County, N.J.

Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$78,000 payable \$63,000 within 30 days upon acceptance of the offer and the balance to be paid at the rate of \$1,250 per quarter commencing 3 months after acceptance of this offer and every 3d calendar month thereafter, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on Form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future "annual income" in excess of \$8,500 for the years 1970 to 1979, inclusive, and to a reduction in the "tax basis" of certain assets for Federal income tax purposes.
 Recommended by: Benedict R. Montanelli, offer examiner, May 11, 1970; Charles M. Kahn, reviewer, May 11, 1970.
 I recommend acceptance for the reasons embodied in the attached statement. I, R. H. Nash, Jr. For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. K. Martin Worthey, ABC, June 2, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

E.I. or S.S. No. **xxx-xx-x**
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Dan R. Wax, 443 South Oakhurst, Beverly Hills, Calif.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to April 8, 1969	Total
5703, 5706, 5709, 5712	Sept. 16, 1960	0	20,212.34	0	13,212.11	33,424.45

Amount of offer: \$2,500 plus collateral agreement (terms below).
 Kind of tax: 100 percent penalty re withholding and Federal Insurance Contribution Act Taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: December 4, 1968, Los Angeles.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$2,500 payable as follows: \$500 already paid, plus \$2,000 to be paid within 30 days after notification of acceptance of the offer together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the deferred payment from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payment is made in full, with waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on Form 656 (Rev. 2-69). In addition, Mr. Wax has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1975, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Joseph DeStefanis, Revenue Officer, Feb. 17, 1970, Harrington, reviewer, Apr. 21, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement. F. S. Schmidt.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. Richard C. Schwartz, July 30, 1970.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED JUNE 20, 1969

In re offer in compromise: Liability of Bolen and Cornelia Webb, 3523 Edgewood, Dallas, Tex
 Case No., **XXXX**; District, Dallas.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to July 9, 1969	Total
Dec. 31, 1958	Aug. 19, 1966	2,517.74	4,731.87	4,148.23	1,885.46	13,283.30
Dec. 31, 1959	do	10,101.14	5,050.57	3,845.07	2,575.79	21,572.57
Dec. 31, 1960	do	10,446.46	5,280.73	3,386.61	2,680.52	21,794.32
Dec. 31, 1961	Sept. 13, 1968	12,091.89	6,231.19	4,604.28	916.63	23,843.99
Dec. 31, 1962	Oct. 11, 1968	6,185.84	3,828.35	1,947.10	400.57	12,361.86
Total		41,343.07	25,122.71	17,931.29	8,458.97	92,856.04

Amount of offer: \$21,650 plus collateral agreement.
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Dec. 30, 1966, Dec. 3, 1968, and Jan. 7, 1969, Dallas County, Tex.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.

Footnote at end of table.

Terms of offer: The total sum of \$21,650 payable as follows: \$1,250 to be paid within 30 days from the date notice of acceptance is received, and the balance of \$20,400 to be paid in 60 payments of \$340 each on the 15th day of each month beginning the month after notice of acceptance is received with accrued interest to be paid with last installment, together with waiver of refunds and other provisions of form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayers agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1969 to 1976 inclusive.
 Recommended by: Emmet J. Schayot, revenue officer, June 9, 1969; Homan F. Davis, reviewer, June 11, 1969.

I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Ellis Campbell, Jr. June 20, 1969.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: W. B. Riley.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED OCT. 15, 1969

E.I. or S.S. No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of William H. & Leona Wheeler, 320 South 4th St., Terre Haute, Ind.
 Case No., **xxx-xx-xxxx** District, Indianapolis.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 31, 1969	Total
1949	Dec. 31, 1968	0	0	322.76	20.73	343.49
1950	Dec. 13, 1968	997.00	388.85	1,057.64	129.38	2,572.87
1951	do	3,690.44	1,424.69	3,693.47	466.42	9,275.02
1952	do	1,413.78	536.79	1,330.11	173.71	3,454.39
1953	do	1,753.46	669.28	1,544.49	210.06	4,177.29
1954	do	870.92	280.26	710.51	60.95	1,922.64
1955	do	1,471.28	475.52	1,112.02	103.08	3,161.90
1956	do	1,792.34	580.83	1,247.15	125.66	3,745.98
1957	do	1,790.21	579.15	1,138.25	125.46	3,633.17
1958	do	208.98	89.79	163.52	16.85	479.14
1959	do	2,798.67	907.89	1,443.62	199.12	5,349.30
1960	do	4,188.74	1,361.82	1,909.32	293.90	7,753.78
1961	do	1,201.41	384.68	574.54	83.98	2,145.61
1962	Nov. 20, 1968	2,800.83	906.04	940.58	210.55	4,858.00
1963	Dec. 13, 1968	5,045.84	1,640.53	1,391.75	334.42	8,412.43
1964	Dec. 13, 1968	1,162.41	370.66	250.87	87.08	1,871.02
1965	Nov. 20, 1968	881.47	309.44	160.72	68.76	1,420.39
Total		32,067.78	10,906.31	18,892.32	2,710.01	64,576.42

Amount of offer: \$5,000 plus collateral agreement (see terms below).
 Kind of tax: Income.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Feb. 20, 1969, Vigo County, Ind.; Apr. 28, 1969, Vigo County, Ind.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$5,000 payable as follows: \$1,400 to be paid on June 6, 1969, and the balance at \$100 per month starting July 6, 1969, and on the 6th of each following month, together with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date this offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full and waiver of refunds, default agreement, and other provisions on form 656 (Rev. 7/57). In addition, the taxpayers have agreed to pay a graduated percentage of their future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1969 to 1978, inclusive.
 Recommended by: Robert E. Man, revenue officer, Sept. 19, 1969; Earl J. Blough, reviewer officer, Oct. 9, 1969.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: Jasper C. Hilgenbury, acting.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted: Clarence E. Price.

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT

In re offer compromise: Liability of David P. Williams, c/o Flake L. McHaney, P.O. Box 269, Kennett, Mo.
 Case No. **xxx-xx-xxxx**; District, St. Louis.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Oct. 1, 1970	Total
June 30-57-58	June 1, 1962	1,122.84	61,668	272.02	31,531.43	94,594.29

Amount of offer: \$14,000.
 Kind of tax: Excise tax.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: May 7, 1963 Pemiscot County, Mo., July 6, 1965, Sunflower County, Indiana, Miss.
 Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.
 Terms of offer: \$2,500 paid with the offer. Balance payable within 30 days after notice of acceptance.
 Recommended by: S. Vago Reviewer, August 10, 1970.
 I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: E. C. Coyle, Jr.
 For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer should be accepted: Frank C. Conlev, Aug. 19, 1970

ABSTRACT AND STATEMENT ACCEPTED MAY 1, 1970

1970 SCHEDULE OF 100 LARGEST OFFER IN COMPROMISE CASES

E.I. or S.S. No. XXXX
 In re offer in compromise: Liability of Bernard J. Zilinsky, 1122 Westbury Rd., Jenkintown, Pa.
 Case No. 23-1672185; district, Philadelphia.
 Liability as follows:

Taxable period	Date assessed	Tax	Penalty	Interest assessed	Interest accrued to Mar. 23, 1970	Total
Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes.						
Mar. 31, 1963	Dec. 23, 1966	1,550.32	413.42	339.18	382.93	2,685.85
June 30, 1963	do	2,942.37	784.63	599.11	726.77	5,052.88
Sept. 30, 1963	do	3,021.84	805.83	569.97	746.40	5,144.04
Dec. 31, 1963	do	3,050.73	813.53	529.66	753.53	5,147.45
Mar. 31, 1964	do	1,914.31	510.48	303.96	472.83	3,201.58
June 30, 1964	do	1,955.94	521.59	280.90	483.12	3,241.55
Sept. 30, 1964	do	1,478.30	394.22	190.13	365.14	2,427.79
Dec. 31, 1964	do	964.19	257.12	109.55	238.16	1,569.02
Mar. 31, 1965	do	1,184.08	315.75	116.96	292.47	1,909.26
June 30, 1965	do	1,287.93	343.45	107.69	318.12	2,057.19
Sept. 30, 1965	do	955.87	254.90	65.59	236.10	1,512.46
Dec. 31, 1965	do	877.41	233.97	47.05	216.72	1,375.15
Mar. 31, 1966	June 23, 1967	219.48	54.87	15.14	45.27	334.76
June 30, 1966	do	163.70	40.93	8.80	33.76	247.19
Sept. 30, 1966	do	190.34	47.59	7.38	39.26	284.57
Dec. 31, 1966	do	146.55	21.98	3.49	27.81	199.83
Federal unemployment taxes.						
1963	Dec. 23, 1966	1,383.35	345.84	240.08	337.19	2,306.46
1964	do	698.76	174.69	79.35	170.32	1,123.12
1965	do	479.78	119.95	70.43	72.06	742.22
1966	June 9, 1967	64.96	16.85	2.41	14.29	98.51
Total		24,530.21	6,471.59	3,686.83	5,972.25	40,660.28

Amount of offer: \$10,800.
 Kind of tax: Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes. Federal unemployment taxes.
 Date and place notice of lien filed: Jan. 24, 1967, Montgomery County, Pa. Aug. 10, 1967, Montgomery County, Pa.

Is case pending before appellate office? No.
 Is case pending before the Tax Court? No.
 Was collection of tax barred at the time of offer? No.
 Was bond filed? No.

Terms of offer: \$150 to be paid on the 15th day of the month following notice of acceptance and \$150 to be paid on the 15th day of each month thereafter until the balance is paid in full, with interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the deferred payments from the date the offer is accepted until the respective payments are made in full, together with waiver of refunds, default agreement and other provisions on Form 656 (revised July 1957). In addition, the taxpayer has agreed to pay a graduated percentage of his future income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1970 to 1979 inclusive and to return all refunds received during this period.

Recommended by: Thomas J. Scullion, offer examiner, March 3, 1970; R. L. Wallace, March 20, 1970.

I accept for the reasons embodied in the attached statement: William Daniel, Acting District Director.

For the reasons embodied in the attached statement, I am of the opinion that the offer(s) should be accepted. Cecil H. Haas.

1 Acceptance cases involving total liabilities (including any assessed or accrued interest, additional amounts, additions to the tax, or assessable penalties) of \$500 or more, but less than \$100,000 require legal opinion signed by regional counsel prior to acceptance. Acceptance cases involving total liabilities of \$100,000 or more must be forwarded to national office for review and securing of the legal opinion from the chief counsel prior to acceptance by the Commissioner.

2 Signature is required in acceptance cases involving liabilities (including any assessed or accrued interest, additional amounts, additions to the tax, or assessable penalties) of less than \$100,000. Acceptance cases involving liabilities of \$100,000 or more must be forwarded to the national office (attention CC:GL) for review prior to acceptance by the Commissioner.

3 The district director's signature is required only in acceptance cases involving liabilities (including any assessed or accrued interest, additional amounts, additions to the tax, or assessable penalties) of less than \$100,000. Acceptance cases involving liabilities of \$100,000 or more must be forwarded to the national office (attention CC:CLC) for review prior to acceptance by the Commissioner.

4 Signature of delegated official is required in acceptance cases involving liabilities (including any assessed or accrued interest, additional amounts, additions to the tax, or assessable penalties) of less than \$100,000. Acceptance cases involving liabilities of \$100,000 or more must be forwarded to the national office (attention CC:GL) for review prior to acceptance by the Commissioner.

**BERNARD J. ZILINSKY
 COMPUTATION OF ACCRUED INTEREST**

Year or period	To—		From—		Time factor	Interest factor	Amount of liability	Accrued interest				
	Yr.	Mo.	Day	Yr.					Mo.	Day		
Mar. 31, 1963	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	\$1,963.74	\$382.93	
June 30, 1963	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	3,727.00	726.77	
Sept. 30, 1963	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	3,827.67	746.40	
Dec. 31, 1963	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	3,864.26	753.53	
Mar. 31, 1964	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	2,424.79	472.83	
June 30, 1964	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	2,477.53	483.12	
Sept. 30, 1964	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	1,872.52	365.14	
Dec. 31, 1964	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	1,221.31	238.16	
Mar. 31, 1965	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	1,499.83	292.47	
June 30, 1965	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	1,631.38	318.12	
Sept. 30, 1965	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	1,210.77	236.10	
Dec. 31, 1965	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	1,111.38	216.72	
Mar. 31, 1966	70	3	23	67	6	23	2	9	0	.165	274.35	45.27
June 30, 1966	70	3	23	67	6	23	2	9	0	.165	204.63	33.76
Sept. 30, 1966	70	3	23	67	6	23	2	9	0	.165	237.93	39.26
Dec. 31, 1966	70	3	23	67	6	23	2	9	0	.165	168.53	27.81
1963	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	1,729.19	337.19	
1964	70	3	23	66	12	23	3	0	.195	873.45	170.32	
1965	70	3	23	68	3	22	2	0	1	.12016	599.73	72.06
1966	67	8	30	67	6	09	0	21		.01345	129.19	1.74
1966	70	3	23	67	8	30	2	6	21	.15345	81.81	12.55
Total											5,972.25	

Name	Kind of tax	Liability	Offer
Ace Bonding Co., Inc.	Income	\$39,609.87	\$19,000.00
Atkinson, Richard S.	do	92,043.35	55,000.00
Axelrod, Louis	100-percent penalty	44,182.16	2,000.00
Ballard, Louis S., Jr.	Income	296,897.13	15,000.00
Barron, Orion P.	do	39,463.34	15,294.75
Bauerschmidt, John F.	Employment	34,702.04	19,800.00
Blaize, Bernard and Gwen	Income	38,852.42	15,000.00
Branamen, Kenneth Chaplain and Evamae	do	58,980.44	21,000.00
Brankovich, Mark	100-percent penalty	38,890.53	10,000.00
Bringham, Frank I. and Evelyn E.	Income	41,049.51	15,000.00
Cawman, John C. and Muriel L.	do	54,203.70	1,000.00
Chamberlain, Miriam	do	37,926.94	9,000.00
Chatterton, Virn.	do	40,863.81	6,500.00
Cluff, Ivan L. and Maurine R.	do	38,738.53	8,700.00
Coakley, Randall L.	Employment	48,447.36	36,000.00
Cohen, Leon A.	Income	253,396.82	80,000.00
Costello, James A.	do	31,670.21	2,000.00
David Lee Sportswear, Inc.	100-percent penalty	49,681.63	18,094.75
Dees, Henry L.	Excise	65,703.36	11,500.00
Dillon, Francis T. and Geraldine C.	Income	63,018.36	8,500.00
Dixon, Louise	do	121,677.29	5,053.25
Foukes, Margaret Costello	do	31,670.21	500.00
Gadel, William V., M.D.	do	105,773.84	22,000.00
Garrett, Richard D.	Employment	44,458.26	7,000.00
George, Lonnie	Excise	31,912.31	20,000.00
Gieseke, estate of August and Beatrice	do	41,321.99	15,000.00
Giumarro, John, Jr. and Angela	Employment	43,171.11	3,500.00
Hancock, William R.	100-percent penalty	32,489.82	7,500.00
Harger, Wendell M.	Employment	36,307.96	3,000.00
Higdon, Mary A.	Income	40,846.25	4,000.00
Holtzman, Herbert S. and Libby Lee	do	110,528.21	31,000.00
Jellison, Roy C.	do	52,720.00	21,100.00
Jensen, Lewis B. and Isabelle	do	123,957.87	5,040.00
Johnson, Roy H.	100-percent penalty	36,792.21	13,900.00
Kallas, Spiros W. and Victoria M.	Income	164,950.62	3,375.00
Knittel, Harold E.	do	44,401.65	2,000.00
Laidman, Daniel H. and Ben	100-percent penalty	136,671.54	51,218.40
Land, Alfred J.	do	55,459.11	27,500.00
Langenes, David W. and Frances H.	Income	34,570.60	17,330.00
Lapp, Sam	do	127,546.38	25,000.00
Lenahan, Joseph E. and Joan	do	31,415.58	1,650.00
Leroux, Robert L. and Claire S.	do	66,390.74	35,091.32
Levinson, Michael A.	do	58,436.71	12,500.00
Levy, Mary	do	48,080.05	1,250.00
Locke, Alvin T. and Marian F.	do	29,462.24	2,000.00
McCann, John D., Jr., and Jeanne T.	do	65,761.71	22,000.00
McKinney, Carlos J. and Ethel N.	do	36,321.61	4,700.00
McLamb, John A.	do	51,022.79	3,650.00
Mann, Roy W. and Lucille E.	do	488,219.35	75,000.00
Martyn, Charles P.	do	47,628.85	5,000.00
Mastrogiacomo, Vincent and Ann	do	32,373.68	4,000.00
Michael, Jules and Kathryn	do	111,026.35	10,000.00
Michels, John L. and estate of Gertrude T. Michels	do	70,579.40	7,656.50
Millner, Eli H.	do	92,911.07	12,500.00
Moller Textile Corp.	Employment	1,368.10	200.00
Moore, Merle W. and Nadja H.	Income	206,265.65	15,000.00
Moore, Merle W.	do	39,088.01	2,500.00
Moran, Richard F.	Employment	2,045.76	250.00
O'Neal, W. J.	do	29,329.64	2,350.00
Pennington, Mary H.	do	54,593.88	20,000.00
Pennick, Jack	Income	94,937.80	6,000.00
Pitzer, Charles R. and Madge	do	43,438.08	6,500.00
Player, Joseph E. and Mary C.	do	128,209.51	36,000.00
Pollins, David B.	100-percent penalty	42,829.91	9,000.00
Pratt, Albert S., Jr.	do	52,310.39	17,000.00
Pratt, Keila E.	do	40,971.05	2,500.00
Prescott, Matthew L.	do	40,971.05	2,500.00
Prough, L. D.	Income	107,367.51	50,000.00
Renna Bros., Inc.	do	78,806.62	14,039.64
Rifkin, Jack	Employment	63,686.43	26,755.24
Rindfleisch, Earl A.	100-percent penalty	80,772.65	19,000.00
Risinger, Harold O.	Income	67,908.07	6,000.00
do	do	46,744.72	2,000.00
Roberts, Wallace S.	Employment	4,231.38	400.00
Roberts, Wallace S. and Janet K.	Income	31,480.85	6,000.00
Rubin, Neal (Neil)	do	3,516.71	2,000.00
Ruppert, George J., Jr., and Barbara	100-percent penalty	56,673.98	3,000.00
Scarangella, Anthony	Income	51,829.87	10,000.00
Scarotow, Sidney J.	do	128,170.15	12,000.00
Scott, David C. and Janet	do	71,354.65	4,000.00
Selid, Ove C. and Pearl	do	65,128.45	2,000.00
Severance, Robert L.	do	55,566.10	10,000.00
Shane, Charles and Lillian	100-percent penalty	47,856.24	9,000.00
Shedesky, John and Threasa	Income	96,250.34	10,000.00
Smith, John R. and Dorothy G.	do	36,488.05	10,000.00
Stillwell, William C.	do	37,389.92	12,000.00
Stratton, Richard E., III and Louise W.	100-percent penalty	36,792.21	5,000.00
Strum, Edward C., Jr., and Dorothy L.	Income	97,627.30	7,590.00
Sturdivant, Franklin A. and Betty V.	do	47,582.14	4,000.00
Tahoe-Truckee Development, Inc.	do	131,534.84	7,457.37
Taylor, Robert M.	do	39,234.00	100.00
Townsend, Margaret M.	Employment	61,722.81	6,280.00
Traube, Jacques	Income	62,854.85	6,500.00
Travers, William J.	do	150,858.00	16,000.00
Van Buskirk, Robert H. and Violet	do	39,941.09	11,515.00
Van Buskirk, Robert H.	do	72,018.67	7,900.00
Vaux, Glenn C. and Bessie H.	Employment	8,966.55	2,100.00
Verges, Stephen F., Dr.	Income	42,332.37	21,842.00
Viscaglia, Joseph and Constance	do	42,165.62	5,000.00
Webb, Bolen and Cornelia	do	118,739.30	78,000.00
Wheeler, William H. and Leona	100-percent penalty	33,424.45	2,500.00
Williams, David P.	Income	92,856.04	21,650.00
Zilinsky, Bernard J.	do	64,576.12	5,000.00
Zilinsky, Bernard J.	Excise	94,594.29	1,000.0

WHO WILL PAY THE COSTS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we cannot help but be aware of the many sincere and impassioned pleas for ecological reform coming from all segments of American society. A spiraling gross national product and a high standard of living are no longer seen as unqualified answers to the country's problems. To the contrary, these forces, coupled with a general lack of concern, are at the base of the present environmental crisis. Unless a concerted effort is made to reverse present trends, this crisis will assume even greater proportions.

As in the case far too often, we see the bleak facts staring us in the face and know that something must be done, and then shirk our responsibility and fail to act. The problem must be dealt with—there is little disagreement on that point. The question is, How? To whom do we assign the responsibility for the future of our environment? How do we finance a program of such large dimensions?

David Rockefeller, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, has addressed himself to some of these problems in a commencement speech delivered at St. John's University. He has presented a side of the ecology question that should be brought to the attention of my colleagues:

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT:
THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS
(By David Rockefeller)

I am pleased to have the opportunity to address this commencement assembly today. I offer my heartiest congratulations not only to the graduates—who will get plenty of attention anyway—but also to their parents. As the father of six children who have participated altogether in a total of 15 commencement exercises, with another one coming up next week, I like to think that parents play at least some role in contributing to such occasions as this.

In search of bright new ideas that I might pass along to you, I questioned my offspring about the talks made at their various graduation exercises. I was immensely relieved to learn that they had difficulty recalling either the names of the speakers or the subjects of their talks. I concluded that, however painful the experience may have been at the time, at least it was short-lived.

When I asked at home what they thought I should talk about today, one of my children warned solemnly: "Anything at all—so long as it isn't a commencement address."

So I promised to avoid scaling the familiar mountains of hyperbole and peaks of platitude that commencement speakers customarily explore. Instead, I would like to share with you a few thoughts about a topic that your own generation has justifiably and effectively done most to impress on the national consciousness. I refer to the steady deterioration in the quality of our living environment.

Without any question man's adverse impact on his physical environment was insufficiently recognized until recently. This was due in part to the fact that for centuries the impact was relatively unimportant. But

with population growth and living standards increasing in geometric progression, the problem of environmental pollution has suddenly assumed critical proportions. We can no longer afford the luxury of inattention or inaction.

But before we can hope to make any truly significant impact on this problem, I believe that we are going to have to adopt a more realistic attitude toward the harsh economic realities that underlie pollution control.

In my opinion, the greatest stumbling block on the road to a solution of our environmental dilemma is the reluctance of the general public to face up to certain unpalatable, but unavoidable, choices.

Most people have not yet accepted the fact that we live in a world of unlimited desires but limited resources. Something must come first. As a people, we have not yet applied this basic economic law concerning the allocation of limited resources to the problem of pollution control. I am afraid that too many people are still looking for the easy way out. But there isn't one. And, even as they search, the problem worsens.

I will leave the scientific aspects of pollution abatement to those who are far better qualified within their specialties to discuss them. But as a banker and a student of economics, I would like to address myself specifically to the widely misunderstood cost factors.

For some time now I have been trying to explain to my own satisfaction why it is, when virtually everyone agrees that present environmental conditions are intolerable and need immediate correction, that we still seem to work at cross-purposes with one another in marshaling the necessary resources to deal with pollution effectively. I have concluded that one reason for this is that we have not been asking ourselves the right questions.

The Japanese use a somewhat different approach to problem solving which has been called "decision by consensus." In Japan when a business executive or a government official faces a challenging problem, he gives no immediate thought to what the final decision may be. Instead, he concentrates on defining the problem fully. In consulting with his colleagues, he does not seek advice on the solution. Instead, he invites careful definition of the problem.

After meticulously searching out the widest possible agreement on a precise definition, he finds that the decision is much easier. It often follows logically from the agreed definition. No lobbying for support of the final decision is required, since it has been "pre-sold" before anyone became a prisoner of his own conclusions.

This takes more time than making a snap judgment, but it avoids the wasted time of coming up with the right solutions to the wrong problems. It would be well for us to keep in mind that the most imaginative, resourceful and persuasive answer is of little use if it answers the wrong question.

Suppose we apply this approach to the subject of pollution control. The question now being asked by the general public is: "Who will pay the costs?" But if improvement of the environment is actually the high national priority that recent polls suggest, then we should expect to find a general willingness to share the cost. Regrettably, this is not the case. Upwards of 85 per cent of the Americans interviewed in one recent poll expressed the opinion that pollution is our country's No. 1 problem. But of the same sampling, fewer than one in four were realistic enough to face the clean-up cost, if any part of it had to come out of their own pockets.

When asked whether the price of a product should include the cost of its eventual pollu-

tion-free disposal, fully 25 per cent of the New Yorkers who responded said that the producer should bear the cost of disposal and not pass it along to the actual consumer. They apparently ignored the fact that this would have the effect of penalizing the socially concerned manufacturer, who has built pollution control into his product, by allowing his polluting competitor to make a larger profit and possibly drive him out of business.

Conversely, a cash-register view of pollution control tends to see only those immediate dollars-and-cents costs that are reflected in the form of higher prices or lower dividends or mounting taxes. But this ignores the substantial longer range costs in terms of the country's overall commercial and social progress.

Looked at from still another point of view, if we go about the business of solving our nation's pollution problem without regard to our competitive position in world markets, we could conceivably price ourselves out of certain important areas of world trade.

By the same token, if we impose unrealistic pollution abatement costs on industry, many of the recently initiated minority enterprises that are still struggling with heavy start-up costs and low profit margins will be among the first to suffer. Costly job opportunity and training programs throughout industry, which are now developing new jobs for minority groups, will come under critical review as environmental costs mount.

None of us wants to see this happen, but the only way to prevent it is to ask ourselves some hard questions and come up with some good answers.

If we are to remain competitive in the world marketplace, create more jobs, and have more viable minority enterprises, while simultaneously eliminating environmental pollution, it seems clear that we will be forced to step up our productivity through ever improved technology. But this runs contrary to the expressed desires of some environmentalists who would prefer to see a world with less advanced technology. Once again we are face with a dilemma and a choice.

To choose the good over the bad is easy enough. It only requires a bit of character. But choosing among several "goods" when not all of them are possible at once, is a great deal harder. It requires a careful assessment of costs and benefits. And it requires a calculated "trade-off"—giving up what may be desirable for what is imperative.

If we are to make certain that the costs of pollution abatement are kept to a minimum and allocated fairly, it is going to require a much better understanding of the economics of pollution that we now have as well as a coordinated agreement among all those involved—designers, manufacturers and consumers.

Despite the fact that popular indignation has made pollution preeminent among the nation's crises, far too many individuals still cling to the simplistic notion that "I" don't cause pollution—"they" do. Conversely, too few are prepared to make the individual sacrifices in comfort and convenience that will have to be made.

Is Father ready to drive his high-compression automobile less and occasionally walk to work by getting up twenty minutes earlier? Is Mother prepared to give up her phosphate and enzyme detergents and rearrange her workday to use the washer and other heavy appliances only during evening hours to conserve electricity? Is Son going to trade his electric guitar for a regular model and resume his chore of toting empty soda bottles back to the grocery store? Is Daughter willing to skip the insecticide and put up with a few mesquite bites at her picnic? Or start fixing her hair a half-hour earlier so it will dry naturally? Questions like these point

up the hard choices that must be confronted.

At a time when the demand for electricity is doubling every decade, air-conditioners in urban centers are accounting for up to 35 percent of the peak summer load. And yet, how many individuals on a scorching summer afternoon are going to cooperate with the power companies by setting their thermostats above 75° or turning them off altogether between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m.? The question we should all be asking is not "Who will pay the costs?" but rather, "What is my fair share?"

A second and to me even more disturbing question has been turning up with regrettable frequency lately. It appears to be an outgrowth of the environmentalists' attack on modern technology. The question is: Why not stop pollution by slowing down production?

This proposal cannot be expected to raise many cheers in economically depressed areas where the first concern, quite understandably, is to generate additional productive capacity in order to provide more employment and a higher tax base for the financing of badly needed regional development.

For example, a well-known Asian economist has calculated that it adds 30 percent to the installed cost of a power plant to remove 98 percent of the air particles emitted. For an area with limited resources it is a hard choice whether to spend the money for pollution control or for 30 percent more power. In a very real sense, a nation must be able to afford pollution controls.

I doubt seriously whether those who advocate an arbitrary stifling of our country's economic growth have considered the full ramifications. We would suffer a marked fall-off in our standard of living going well beyond the personal inconveniences and voluntary restraints that I have mentioned. Our ever increasing population would be dividing, on a diminishing per capita basis, the same quantity of goods and services, with all of the economic and social ills which that implies.

Forcing a shutdown of every factory that cannot meet strictly regulated standards of environmental purity within a limited time period might stop the smoke that comes from those particular chimneys. But it would be a Pyrrhic victory for environmentalists and for the country as a whole if in the process it resulted in what has been termed "environmental unemployment."

We sometimes tend to forget that for every benefit there is a corresponding cost. When unemployed workers get extended benefits, taxes go up. When juries award larger settlements to plaintiffs in accident cases, insurance rates go up. When society demands and gets pollution-free power generators, the electric bill goes up. The underlying economic principle here is simple. There is no such thing as a cost-free benefit. And this applies to environmental benefits as well as all others.

The secondary effects of "environmental unemployment" and halted production are equally serious. They tend to erode the community's tax base. They also deprive industry and government of the economic resources needed to research and solve a wide range of environmental and other social problems.

Enforced stagnation, in addition to being a cure that is worse than the disease, is, in my view, entirely unnecessary. It is possible for us to pay for a cleaner environment out of the proceeds of continuing economic growth itself, provided we are willing to begin putting as much emphasis on productivity as on products. Or, to turn the matter around, we can afford the kind of environment we want once you and I and all of us have agreed to work harder at our jobs. We can use the proceeds that flow from increased productivity to restore our environment only if we are willing to give up the

additional amenities that might otherwise have been purchased with the same funds.

Our Chase Manhattan economists have recently completed a study of pollution control efforts. We learned that something in the range of \$10 billion annually is now being spent on this nationwide. We anticipate that this will rise to about \$24 billion by 1975. During this same interval, our Gross National Product, the total value of goods and services produced in the nation, would normally grow at a rate of about 4½ percent a year. This would supply enough new resources to meet environmental needs. However, in view of the major leaps forward in costly social commitments now being assumed by this country, I believe that we will experience substantial difficulty in maintaining the projected growth rate without a sustained cooperative effort at greater productivity.

Certainly, a total clean-up of the environment cannot be completed in only five years. Nor can it be purchased at bargain basement rates. It will require hard choices and genuine commitments on the part of each individual.

If we really dedicate ourselves to making those efforts we can look forward to a healthy and productive economy and the better living environment that we all want. We have only to arrive at a national consensus favoring patience and persistence over panic. And we must ask the right question: How much am I willing to give up in other areas in order to give more to improving the environment?

Frankly, I am hopeful that emotional sloganeering and extravagant proposals will soon subside as more and more people come to the realization that a cleaner environment really is up to each one of us. The wish fulfillment approach, without a realistic recognition of the magnitude of the costs as well as a willingness to apportion them among all who will benefit, is no credit to anyone or to any cause—let alone a cause as vitally important as this one.

Our response to the environmental crisis in this country is being watched closely by those in less developed nations as an example of what is possible. For if we cannot solve this problem with all of our vast resources, what hope can they see for themselves? The decisions we make—whether good or bad—will set precedents reaching far beyond our own borders and our own times.

For these reasons, I feel it is doubly important that we not allow ourselves to be discouraged by the incredible complexity of the environmental problem, nor become so enthralled with our own little corner of the canvas that we fail to see the whole picture.

I am personally convinced that we are all willing to stand back and look at the situation for a moment, we will agree that intelligent progress toward a cleaner and healthier environment is possible but it can only be achieved by a careful balancing of costs against benefits.

We have heard the doomsayers describe our environment and, regrettably, much of what they say has an element of truth to it. But when they conclude that further deterioration is inevitable, and that human nature will see to it that man ultimately destroys his environment and himself, I strenuously disagree.

I find that the individuals I see around me are most invigorated, most highly motivated—in short, most alive—when they are striving for self-improvement. And I believe the same is true of human societies. History confirms that the societies of man have been most creative and most alert when they were aspiring to nobler visions.

Today, environmental pollution is one of the most critical human problems for which we are projecting a nobler vision. I am confident that we will achieve it because so many

of us are now agreed that we have no greater obligation to ourselves, to one another and to future generations than to pass on to them a quality of environment that is worth living in.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1971, there appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune this article by Mr. Robert T. Smith on the need for a drug abuse education program in the university. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAM

(By Robert T. Smith)

Before this year, University of Minnesota medical students received only 45 minutes of classroom instruction on drug abuse. There still is nothing on the subject in the regular curriculum of the pharmacology department.

By law, the College of Education must do something about it. But so far it mainly has been scattered workshops.

Dr. Gordon T. Heistad, director of the 15-month-old Drug Information and Education Program at the university, hopes to create the best drug-abuse education program in the Nation. The cost would be about \$700,000 for the next two years.

The Minnesota Legislature is considering a bill to fund the program. The Senate has passed the full amount, but the House of Representatives cut it to \$250,000. Now it goes to a House-Senate conference committee.

It was Dr. Heistad's program that started a drug-abuse course last fall for the medical school. "More than half the students signed up for it," he said. "It was second only to human sexuality."

Dr. Heistad feels there must be more drug-abuse education. "The public has given up on only law enforcement. It's a catastrophic failure. The question is what kind of education. The average student in public schools is fed up. They want information they can trust, not sermonizing."

At present, the university program includes a Drug Information Service Center for students, workshops and short courses, including two at out-state locations, and a research program. If the money comes through, eight full-time faculty members will be added to teach drug abuse and to do research at the medical school, the pharmacology department and the College of Education. It also would include full-time faculty members at the Duluth and Morris branches of the university.

"Aside from drug-abuse education, we also would step up research on drug education," said Dr. Heistad. One of the big handicaps in this field is the lack of legitimate statistics. The problem has grown at a much faster rate than the research.

Dr. Heistad wants to bring in faculty members from both public and private colleges throughout the state for one year of training in drug abuse. He also has his eyes on some federal grant money, and says: "We would be the best and could attract the best people and the best attracts grant money."

I asked whether his education program would get into any moral aspects of drug use. "I think the moral issue is the key one," he said, "but not preaching that drugs are immoral. We must give the kids alternatives to drugs."