EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL: GREATEST OF THEM ALL

HON. DAWSON MATHIS
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the death of Senator Richard Brevard Russell has brought forth tributes from Americans of all walks of life and all sections of the country.

It is well worthwhile for those who knew the Senator best to share their thoughts and impressions of this great American so that his memory will be preserved for generations yet unborn.

My good friend and constituent, Albert Riley of Thomasville, Ga., has combined his journalistic skill with his intimate recollections into a most impressive article about the late Senator. As a Washington correspondent for 10 years and as a lifelong Georgian, he followed Senator Russell's career closely.

I am pleased to share with my colleagues and all those who read the RECORD the following article which appeared in the January 22, 1971, edition of the Thomasville Times-Enterprise:

RUSSELL: SENATE HERO FROM SOUTH

(By Albert Riley)

"Richard Brevard Russell, Democrat, of Winder, Ga."

Although millions of words have been written about him, that short one line, stating his name, party affiliation and home town, is the only biography Sen. Russell would ever permit to be published in the "Congressional Directory."

Yet, this great man has to go down in history as the outstanding Senator and one of the greatest of the great leaders of our time.

It was my good fortune to spend ten exciting years in Washington, from 1956 to 1966, and to be in a position to observe at close hand the Senate leadership of Dick Russell and to know the esteem in which he was held by his colleagues and by the press.

Although he was later to assume even more power as Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the prestige of becoming the dean and President pro-tem of the Senate, by 1956 he already had achieved an unparalleled position of leadership, influence and respect.

This I know, first hand. No U.S. Senator of our time has ever been more highly respected, admired and even revered by his colleagues of the Senate and the members of the Senate press gallery than Richard Brevard Russell.

Integrity, I think, was perhaps the key word for the esteem in which he was held. As well as ability, wisdom, parliamentary skill and his unfailing courtesy.

Many so-called "liberal" Senators, like Paul Douglas of Illinois, Joe Clark of Pennsylvania, and Jacob Javits of New York, tangled often and sharply with Sen. Russell and fought him tooth and claw in bitter debates over civil rights legislation.

But he never lost their respect and seemed to command from them also a grudging admiration and even affection.

To my knowledge, he never had a personal enemy in the Senate, or anywhere else. And I never heard a newspaperman in Washington ever make a derogatory remark about Russell of Georgia.

Indeed, if Dick Russell had been from some other section of the nation outside the South, he might well have become President of the United States. Certainly, in the opinion of some of our country's top leaders, no man of our time has been better qualified to be President than Dick Russell, except for the accident of his birth having been below the Mason and Dixon Line.

Former President Lyndon Johnson, who was Russell's protege in the Senate and rose to Majority Leader of the Senate because of Russell's influence, recognized the Georgian's abilities and qualities of leadership perhaps as much as any other man.

When Johnson was Vice-President he often remarked to intimates that Russell would be the first choice for President if a majority of his colleagues were asked to name the man best equipped for the job.

Harry Truman wrote: "I believe that if Russell had been from Indiana or Missouri or Kentucky he may very well have been President."

Even Sen. Joseph Clark, the Pennsylvania "liberal" Democrat who fought Russell so bitterly on civil rights, was quoted in 1963 by "Newsweek" magazine as saying that "if Russell hadn't come from Georgia he would have had a better chance to be President than Harry Truman or John F. Kennedy. He's a political animal in the best sense of the word and a first class gentleman."

Russell was not ashamed of his birth as a Georgian but proud of it. The mantle of leadership of the Southern bloc in the Senate was thrust upon him as he became their commander in a seemingly never ending series of rear guard skirmishes with northern "liberals" over civil rights legislation that Russell genuinely believed to be wrong. It was, however, an unpopular stand nationally and a lost cause.

But Russell remained always not just a Southern hero in the Senate but a Senate hero who happened to be from the South.

In 1957, Time magazine in a cover story on Russell had this to say about the Georgian:

"With incomparable style he translates his Southern virtues and personal virtues—courage, courtesy, consistency, consideration for others, hard work and good faith, sense of history—into the equipment needed to belong to, even to dominate the Senate's influential 'Inner Club.'"

William S. White, the nationally syndicated columnist, onetime New York Timesman, author and longtime Senate observer, called Russell "the truest Senate type and most influential man on the inner life of the Senate."

As Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Russell had much to say about the defenses of this country and its foreign policy, long before he succeeded to the most powerful post of all, that of Appropriations Committee Chairman.

In both of those capabilities, Sen. Russell never forgot his home state of Georgia, nor even Thomasville in making his people the beneficiaries of his knowledge and power and influence.

But, many thousands of words are being written today about Russell of Georgia and are being moved over the wires of the Associated Press, UPI, the national TV and radio networks and other news media from their Washington bureaus.

Therefore, I will not here attempt to write Senator Russell's obituary. It would in many respects be repetitious of what the wires are carrying into this newspaper office and thousands of others all across this land.

But since I had the high honor and the rare privilege of personally knowing this great man for many years and seeing him and talking to him more often than most people ever had the opportunity, I will attempt to set forth here some personal reminiscencies.

* * * * *

The first time I ever met Dick Russell was when he was running for Governor of Georgia in 1930 and came hand-shaking through Thomasville. My daddy and I were working for Neel Brothers and running their hardware and building supply store.

This wiry, energetic, soft-spoken young man came through the back door, stuck out his hand, smiled and said, "I'm Dick Russell. I'm running for governor and I'd appreciate your vote."

Since at that time I was not quite old enough to vote, this flattered me a great deal. He was the first man to ever ask me to vote for him and it made an indelible impression on my young mind and my memory.

Years later as a political writer on The Atlanta Constitution, I was assigned to cover the Senator on a number of his trips back to Georgia. At that time he was the junior Senator from Georgia, junior to the late, great and also highly respected Walter F. George.

But even then Russell was growing in stature and had become Chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I surprised him once at his home in Winder when he had just come back home from a trip to Russia and didn't think any newspapermen knew about his arrival.

Although he was somewhat disconcerted when I showed up at his home for an interview, Sen. Russell was, as always, courteous and considerate. And I got a good story out of it. He warned then, not too many years after World War II, that Soviet Russia would be our biggest threat for many years to come.

We, of course, had developed the A-bomb and were working on the H-bomb, but Sen. Russell warned that if the Russians ever achieved superiority or even parity with us in the development of the bomb, that we would be in trouble.

When he decided to make a run for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1952, I was there that night at the Biltmore Hotel in Atlanta when he launched his campaign with a nation-wide radio (and TV in its infancy) broadcast.

It was a great occasion for Sen. Russell, but I couldn't help feeling sorry for him when the man who was to introduce him took up so much time that the Senator had to throw out page after page of his prepared text in order to finish his speech before the network time was up.

He didn't win the nomination, of course, because he was a Southerner, but his showing at the Democratic national convention was respectable, to say the least.

Once after that, my paper sent me again from Atlanta over to Winder to write a feature story on the annual Russell family reunion. Once again, I was not expected, but once again the Senator and the entire Russell clan were unfailingly courteous and hospitable.

They invited me and my wife to join the family in an outdoor barbecue, although we were the only outsiders, and so insistent were they that we accepted and spent a wonderful day. I remember sitting on the wide front porch or veranda, talking with his mother, Mrs. Ina Dillard Russell about her famous son. And I remember how all the members of this large family loved and revered their most illustrious member.

But I saw Sen. Russell most after I went to Washington as a newspaperman. He didn't

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

grant many newspaper interviews or hold many press conferences. But because I was a newspaperman from Georgia, a longtime friend and a man I think he believed he could trust, I got in to see him perhaps more often than any other reporter on Capitol Hill.

They were always cordial, pleasant meetings, and I used to love to sit and listen to the Senator talk, so long as he felt he could spare the time from his enormous Senate duties. He had a dry sense of humor, and I was always amazed by his command of the English language. He not only was a well educated man but an avid reader, a fact attested to by the great number of books lining the walls of his huge Senate office.

Sometimes he would talk to me "off the record," knowing that I would not violate his confidence and publish what he was saying. On other occasions, we seemed to have an unspoken understanding. He knew that I sensed just what was "on the record" and "off the record," without his specifically saying so, and he knew I would not embarrass him.

On occasions at the end of a day we would share a cab from the Senate Office Building downtown or to our respective apartments in northwest Washington.

In the Senate chamber itself, Russell sat on the aisle just behind then majority leader Lyndon Johnson, and later Mike Mansfield. And many times Johnson would lean back and confer with his old friend and mentor, Dick Russell, and get advice.

Although they remained close personal friends always, I somehow had the idea that Sen. Russell was hurt and disappointed at Johnson for bowing to political expediency and pushing civil rights legislation much further than Russell thought was necessary. Senator Russell never said this, but I always had the feeling he was a little sad about the course his protege had taken on that divisive issue.

Probably no man in the history of the Senate ever knew the rules of the Senate and parliamentary tactics as well as Dick Russell. He had no peer in this respect, and it was universally recognized.

Whenever he was to take the floor to speak, the press gallery inside the chamber always filled up with newsmen. No man could be more righteously indignant than Dick Russell whenever he felt the rules of the Senate, the provisions of the Constitution and the people of his Southland were about to be trampled upon.

"Why, Mr. President, I never heard of such a thing in my life," he would say with withering scorn. "I have never known such an attempt to violate one of the basic rules of the Senate nor the Constitution of the United States nor the rights and liberties of a free people from my section of the country, or any other section, be they white or black. This is an unprecedented attack on all the things we hold sacred!", he would add with an air of utter incomprehension and wounded dignity.

Vivid in my memory is one occasion during the civil rights debate of 1957 when then Vice President Richard Nixon was presiding over the Senate and was about to make a parliamentary ruling that Russell obviously believed was wrong and contrary to all of the rules of the Senate. Russell challenged the ruling.

I can't remember the details now, but the exchange between the Vice President and the righteously indignant Russell was something to see and hear. Nixon seemed quite disconcerted, had to consult the parliamentarian and seemed to realize that he was wrong.

President Eisenhower was in the White House then, and he had sent the civil rights bill up to Congress. But Russell spotted a key provision of the bill which he regarded as unconstitutional force legislation aimed at undercutting the whole principle of states' rights.

Eisenhower was a general, not a lawyer, and he didn't realize these fine points of the law and legislation. The upshot was that Russell made such an effective attack on this particular session of the bill that Ike called him to the White House for a private conference.

Russell explained the provision of the bill to the President with the result that Ike backed down and that particular section of the bill was deleted. It was for the time being a rear guard skirmish victory for Russell and his Southern forces.

I was waiting outside the White House, with others newsmen, for the Senator to emerge. He gave me and Frank van der Linden of the Nashville Banner a ride back up to Capitol Hill, with the Senator driving his old, unpretentious looking sedan. He had a grim smile of satisfaction on his face, but he was not gloating.

Sen. Russell's relationships with Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon were always good, and they all respected and admired him, as did Franklin Roosevelt before them.

He never said so publicly, but I always suspected that Sen. Russell was disappointed when then President-elect John F. Kennedy appointed his brother, Bobby, to be attorney general. The senator, I think, thought he had a commitment from Jack Kennedy not to appoint Bobby to that particular post. But I think he blamed their daddy, Joseph P. Kennedy, for forcing the appointment upon Jack.

Sen. Russell in his long career did much for Georgia and for the nation and the whole free world. And he did much for Thomasville. A great man is gone and Georgia, the nation—and Thomasville—are the poorer for this tragic loss.

As a newspaperman I covered some of the most famous and important figures of our time—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, Vice-Presidents Barkley, Nixon, Johnson and Humphrey, when he was a Senator.

I have covered or closely observed such giants of history as Konrad Adenhauer of Germany and Charles de Gaulle of France; Senate giants like Robert A. Taft and Walter George and Everett McKinley Dirksen. Visiting heads of state, like Queen Elizabeth of England; kings and potentates from all over the world. Congressional giants like Sam Rayburn of Texas.

But of all the men I have known or whose activities I have covered, Richard Brevard Russell, my friend, was the greatest of them all!

WORDS OF WISDOM FROM LEADER

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following excellent editorial from the Peabody Gazette-Herald of Peabody, Kans., which represents a candid and realistic appraisal of President Nixon's state of the Union message. The editorial follows:

[From the Peabody Gazette-Herald, Peabody, Kans.]

WORDS OF WISDOM FROM LEADER

President Nixon's "State of the Union" speech last week may be the most important public utterance by a national leader in many years—not for the accomplishments it will encourage, but for the recognition by the president of some important truths about our nation and our government.

The president put his fingers on a few of the most serious situations that bedevil the land. Moving ahead to solve the problems is something else.

In admitting that a large segment of Americans are not happy with their government, Nixon made the understatement of the decade. What he could hardly point out was that the government is in sorry repute with the public because the majority of Americans have been insisting that government undertake projects and crusades in which it has no business and in which failure is the only possible end.

One of the areas of looming failure is the national welfare program. Welfare—charity—is probably actually not a proper function of government in a free society. Thomas Jefferson, whose name is taken in vain by the Democratic party, said wisely that those the least governed are the best governed. The original American ideal was opportunity—to succeed or to fail—with the least possible interference from government. Today we are licensed, numbered, pushed about, controlled, robbed of our earnings and worse to satisfy a humanistic ideal that may well cannibalize the nations resources.

The president apparently realized this as a serious area, since he is making strong recommendations for change in the tragedy that is welfare. The most publicized change is the establishment of a "guaranteed annual income"—but more important to the future of the entire nation were his recommendations to make welfare respectable by insisting on work requirement for those who are able.

Heaven and the President knows that there is plenty to do in this land—and there are jobs which are no longer economically feasible due to minimum wages and inflation, which could be done with respect by those unable to find other employment. They would benefit in self-respect and the community and nation could benefit as well, and would be able to look at welfare costs with a bit less rancor.

The president's suggestions about reorganizing the federal government may or may not be the proper moves—but they are something. The federal bureaucracy is another of our nation scandals that needs desperately to be corrected.

One wonders, however, whether an increasingly inept congress can or will make any move to follow what could indeed be the beginning of a "New American Revolution."

THE SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF OUR DAY

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently, I had the opportunity of reading the text of an address presented at the National Conference on the Arts and the Human Environment at the Pennsylvania State University at State College, Pa.

Michael Straight, deputy chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts here in Washington made the address. It clearly defined some of the social problems in our society and at the same time offered some solutions to build a more vibrant society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY MICHAEL STRAIGHT

The arts today stand at the margin of society. We seek to help them, as they work their way back. Since imagination is limited, we can, it seems to me, look for models in past centuries, when, because art was central, the arts and society flourished.

One such model, for me, would be Siena, as it was six hundred years ago.

In 1308, the Chapter of the Siena Cathedral, commissioned Duccio to paint the Madonna in Maesta. The contract, a model provided the painter with all that he required, so that, as it stated, he had "only to supply his presence and the labor of his hands."

Three years later, the panels were completed. A contemporary document describes the day of celebration that was proclaimed.

"On the day, June 9, 1311, when the *Maesta* was brought to the Duomo, all shops were closed, and the Bishop ordained that there should be a great procession in which a goodly number of priests and holy brothers were to join, accompanied by the Nine, the notables of the Commune, and the people of Siena. And, sure enough, all the townsfolk flocked together to the *Maesta*, and, lining up, marched in good order around the Campo, as the custom is. The bells rang out a festal peal to welcome this more notable altarpiece, made by Duccio de Niccolo, painter, plying his trade in the house of the Muciatti . . ."

No one of course will suggest that we revert to the fourteenth century. But, there are elements in the model which serve as useful samples of the city of the future in which we might choose to live.

First, in Siena, at Duccios time, art, architecture and urban design are unified in a single concept of what a city can and should be.

Second, in the city of his creation, the artist is an accepted part of the social fabric. He is not an eccentric, kept by the state, or quarantined by society. In terms that would apply equally to a butcher, a tailor, a mason, he is identified as "Duccio, painter, plying his trade.'

Third, in the days of the Commune, the city is a true community; one in which the Nine and the notables, the priests and the poor, march together in the procession. And, lastly, the event which brings them together is the commemoration of a work of art.

Today, in contrast, our cities are formless; our artists are fragmented; our sense of community is eroded; art itself is no longer the means of conveying great truths to the great majority. If these are losses, where did we go wrong?

The idea of society as an organic unity had, of course lost its force by the time our nation was founded. The role of the arts had diminished. But if, in Puritan New England, theatre and dance were held to be wicked, style was honored, taste was emphasized; beauty and craftsmanship were valued in all small things. The quintessential New Englander, John Adams, in his letter to his wife, set forth the ultimate objectives of the revolution in cultural terms.

The conscious will which formed the United States was formed in towns which were, in every sense, communities. The belief that these towns should be harmonious in form, should themselves be works of art, was as Carl Feiss has noted, very much a part of the American tradition when this nation was founded. The French and Spanish settlers in Louisiana and Florida brought with them the convictions that had helped to shape Siena. In Savannah, General Oglethorpe established the Trustees Gardens as part of the planned settlements laid out in 1784. Virginia and Maryland selected seventy-seven sites for their prospective towns under their New Towne Acts, towns which, in turn were to be built in accordance with well prepared designs. William Penn laid out, not only the city of Philadelphia, but the roads, the villages and settlements that were to surround it. New England towns were developed in obedience to a unifying style; so were the frontier settlements which New Englanders founded.

The 19th Century, in contrast, saw the forced separation of commerce and art. The man of the enlightenment, deriving pleasure from beauty in all its forms, gives way to the entrepreneur, shorn of aesthetic concerns. The artist moves to the margin of society, painting the beautiful portrait, designing the beautiful building, but playing little or no part in shaping the emerging patterns of city life. The planned harmonious community that characterizes the new nation divides into two sterile extremes; the utopian community, made up of the exiles of the interior; and, the company town, the grim, impoverished expression of the new industrial slavery. In the hundred years that follow the Civil War, the nation is shaped by unplanned agglomeration, in what Feiss justly describes as "the continuing era of nondesign."

In this continuing era, the design which we follow dictates only that we must make both ends meet. There is no space for social cost in the equations of private enterprise, and, since the sense of community is lacking, little assertion of the general interest. In our schools, generation after generation of Americans enter the first grade and emerge from our universities without once being called upon to make an aesthetic judgment. For aesthetic appreciation is no part of the consensus as to what constitutes preparation for American life.

Faced with this rejection our artists in turn have tended to reject our society. We have bred a long line of distinguished exiles, from Henry James to James Baldwin. We have bred another line of rebels from Theodore Dreiser and William DuBois to LeRoi Jones and the artists of the New Left. Far more important, we have bred generations of poets, painters and musicians whose rejection of society is reflected not so much in content as in style. They have rejected the possibilities of communication in a nation in which art is equated with entertainment, and the entertainment of the majority is held in contempt.

The era of "nondesign" of alienation, has of course, produced enduring masterworks by a few great artists. They stand as isolated monuments in an age whose underlying premises have little to offer for the future. Those premises are summarized by T. S. Eliot in his *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*. He argues that education cannot be a means of transmitting culture, and that the majority is incapable of appreciating or sustaining high standards of art. He concludes that culture cannot survive in an egalitarian society, and, since culture is necessary, that society itself is doomed to fail. He calls for a "healthily stratified society" in which the privileged classes guard the culture and govern the country, and the lower classes do not interfere. He concludes with a word to those of us who hold a simple, sentimental faith in equalitarianism. If the reader, Eliot writes, "finds it shocking that culture and equalitarianism should conflict, . . . I do not ask him to change his faith. I merely ask him to stop paying lip service to culture."

Eliot's essay is surely one of the most preposterous statements written in the mid-Twentieth Century by an intelligent man. And yet its underlying viewpoint—that the arts are the province of a small minority and cannot be extended to the majority—this viewpoint endures. It is held by the editors of small arts journals who swathe the simplest of opinions in the most obscure phrases.

It is shared by the editors of great newspapers who report all cultural events on the society page. It dominates the attitudes of some board members of our performing arts organizations; it dominates equally the attitudes of many union officials who control employment practices. It is held by black separatists who draw color lines across our common heritage; and by blue collar workers who take it for granted that live arts are not for them. It is held, worst of all, by the artists themselves. It stands as a barrier to those who believe that the arts have a potentially urgent role to play in transforming our total environment. And, the barrier must come down.

In place of this barren belief in a declining elite, we can, I hope, work from the central concept of a democratic culture.

It implies that, when we speak of a new sensibility in man, we mean in all men.

There are, I think, three reasons why we have no choice:

First, we are committed to an economy of mass production and mass consumption. In this economy, the mass consumer is the arbiter of style. Save perhaps in fashion, there is no substantial area in which style is set by the acquired or inherited sensibilities of an elite. Within limits, through advertising, manufacturers may mold the tastes of the public, and also its desires. But, in a competitive economy, the limits are sharply defined. The sensibility of the majority, trained or untrained, governs in the market place.

Second, we are wholly committed in politics, to government by the people. And this is decisive at a time when substantial government support is vital to the survival of museums, of symphony orchestras, of opera companies and dance companies, of resident repertory theatres, of the small, independent institutions in which our musicians, our actors, our artists are trained. I cannot conceive of a proposition more sterile, more self-defeating, than one which asserts that the taxpayers must support the arts although the arts are not for them.

A third reason why our concern is for the development of a new sensibility in all men, is that the urban environment, which threatens us, is one in which the great majority of Americans live, and choose to live.

One hundred and forty million Americans, three out of four of us, are living in cities today. They have been, they are still, centers of intellectual excitement, of cultural creativity, of ethnic tradition. But, to use the President's term, they are suffering decay. The downtown core, in most cities, is an area of aging buildings and empty spaces. Once prosperous department stores are symbols, feeding off the income generated by branches in suburban shopping centers. Once elegant homes are overcrowded with urban immigrants. Transportation is poor, streets are choked, schools are guarded. The middle class has left, the tax base is shrinking, activity halts with the onset of darkness. Movie houses, the theatre, the symphony, the restaurants, struggle against the curfew imposed by fear and the unwillingness of the suburbanite to linger, let alone to return, when the day is done. The force that created the central cities is failing; they are, in the President's words, "the most conspicuous area of failure in American life", yet for all their failings, our metropolitan areas will gain forty million residents in the next fifteen years.

Beyond the cities, lie the suburbs; the regions Lewis Mumford called "asylums for the preservation of illusion." If the blacks who migrated to the cities in the fifties suffered a loss of identity and of community, it may be that the whites who migrated to the suburbs in the sixties will undergo the same disillusionment, for if the typical central city is decaying, the typical suburb lacks all the elements of health. It contains no center; it offers no sense of community; it has few if any parks; less and less access to open space; it caters to a wide variety of commercial activities, all fighting for maximum

visibility, easy access to automobiles, and minimum overhead costs. The pattern is one that leads to physical danger; economic waste, political confusion, social disintegration, and aesthetic squalor. Yet these suburban areas are the most dynamic in the nation, in terms of growth. Three quarters of the increase in our population will attach itself to our surburbs if present trends continue; one third to seven metropolitan centers which will take on three million new residents a piece in this decade.

This transformation of the face of America, which in many ways is threatening, has been shaped as the National Commission on Urban Growth Policy notes, by the uncontrolled workings of the marketplace. It corresponds to what the great majority of Americans have felt to be their needs. We cannot ignore it, hoping that the beautiful can be preserved in isolated enclaves. And, we cannot impose upon city and suburban dwellers, the patterns of land use, the styles of architecture, the means to culture enrichment which we think they need. Planners such as Edward Logue, designers such as Lawrence Halprin, have shown that the way to start in urban development is to bring urban dwellers together to determine what they want. The answers however, are rarely cohesive and clear. The tragedy of the past thirty years is that Americans have settled for so little. Only through a heightened sensibility will they seek and get more.

If we center our hopes in the heightened sensibility of the majority, how is that sensibility to be raised? Eliot asserted flatly that culture could not be transmitted through education. We can, I think, answer with equal emphasis, that he is wrong; we can say this because the evidence is in. In Evanston, in St. Louis, in Atlanta, in Providence, in many other towns and cities, our musicians, our poets, our artists, our actors, our dancers, our sculptors, have been at work in the classrooms. They have made the arts live experiences for our children, and they have shown that in each child there is a painter, a dancer, musician, a poet, an actor, imprisoned and needing only to be released. They have so far engaged only a fraction of our schools; they have not yet cracked the junior high schools in which, in the interest of a rigidly structured syllabus, imagination is stunted, and creativity curbed. But, a start has been made, and the participating artists themselves are excited about it. In *Wishes, Lies and Dreams*, an account of his experiences in working with school children in culturally deprived areas, Kenneth Koch makes two points which, I believe bear closely and hopefully on our discussions:

First: "of the children I taught, every one had the capability to write poetry well enough to enjoy it himself and usually well enough to give pleasure to others, whether it was entire poems or surprising and beautiful images, lines or combinations of words. . ." and second: "Writing poetry makes children feel happy, capable and creative. It makes them feel more open to understanding and appreciating what others have done (literature). It even makes them want to know how to spell and say things correctly (grammar). Once (the) students were excited about words, they were dying to know how to spell them. Learning becomes part of an activity they enjoy."

Towards the end of our conference, we will be considering "Citizens strategies for Strengthening the Role of the Arts in the Human Environment." So the question is raised: what is the place of government in a democratic culture; what contribution can the government make in support of the arts, and of a better environment?

In the urbanization of America, the National Commission on Urban Growth Policy notes "The marketplace determined where development would take place" the Commission reports, "public investment followed." Yet, public investment is critically important in determining land value and land use. Fifty billion dollars have gone into federal support of highways that have made commuting possible. Twenty two billion dollars are set aside in this year's federal budget for aid to the states and localities in growth-related expenditures. City, county and state authorities adopt and enforce the zoning regulations, the building codes, the tax benefits and penalties that shape urban growth; the federal government underwrote the mortgages that built the suburbs, it supports the construction of the roads, the sewer and water lines, on which private development rests.

"By and large", as Daniel Moynihan wrote, "the Federal Government set the conditions which have determined the disastrous designs of the past two decades."

The President of the United States has committed the government to improve the environment and to strengthen the arts. The government is not yet able to place all of its activities in the service of these aims. One fifth of the nation is held by the government today, but to take one example, there is in the agency of government responsible for operating its properties, no department of architecture or of design. The reason, I believe lies in all that I have said about our inheritance in which the artist finds himself on the margin of society. It seems clear to me that now, as in the Thirties, the question is not what can government do for the arts, but what can the arts do for the government? I believe that with government backing, teams of artists, sculptors, architects and landscape designers can go into our cities, and acting in accordance with the expressed desires of city dwellers, help to create within them, communities which have their physical demarcations, their cultural centers, as well as their social and ethnic characteristics. I believe that, in its current endeavor, of placing thirty million of the next one hundred million Americans in new communities, the government can, by adding to the plans of commercial developers, the vital, non-commercial aspects of life by which a community comes into being, help our artists to make an immense contribution to the shape of our nation in the future. I know, from the actions of the National Endowment for the Arts, that the government is doing what it can to bring artists into our schools. But, these activities will gain momentum only if the artists, who have learned over many generations to see democratic government as alien and democratic politics as corrupting, see in public patronage, opportunities to be grasped.

So I come, in conclusion, to the question which I raised and ducked: the demands which a receptive nation may make upon the arts.

We hold that the artist, by his nature and his calling has a heightened sensitivity, a deeper perception, a sounder sense of values than some other men. We feel that the artist should play a greater role in our national life. But, in our competitive society, nothing is given, everything is earned.

There are, in the artistic community, many men who have not touched the public in their work, but who maintain nonetheless that because of their special insights, their views on the management of the state should be given exceptional weight. They seem to me to be misguided. "Politics among artists", Harold Rosenberg has argued, "has consisted of accepting a package of ready-made issues—peace, civil rights—while renouncing the ability to contribute to an inaginative grasp of the epoch . . . The separation of art from social realities" he adds, "threatens the survival of painting as a serious activity." He concludes: "Abstract expressionism liberated painting from the social-consciousness dogma of the Thirties; it is time now to liberate it from the ban on social consciousness." To these words, I can, as a public servant, only add my silent *amen*.

We believe, I am sure, that the arts can enrich the majority. We believe also, I hope, that in reaching toward the majority the arts themselves will be enriched. Through that effort, the time will come again, when the completion of a great work of art will be an occasion for a national holiday, a time for joining in celebration, as it was in Siena six hundred years ago.

POETS HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF COLORADO

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the colorful State of Colorado has afforded many opportunities for those who are desirous to portray the beauty and grandeur of its past. I am inserting the poems of Mrs. Eula Baughman of Grand Junction, Colo. who has portrayed a part of the past in majestic poetic style, in the RECORD:

SUNSET IN THE ROCKIES

In the late afternoon, in the summer,
When the day was almost at an end,
We turned from our trail through the forest,
A zigzag path to ascend
Which led to the top of the rimrock,
Whence the view of the mountain-side
Had been a long-coveted pleasure,
And the aim of a long day's ride.

Our ponies were left as the cow-boy's,
Tethered with reins hanging down,
As with weary steps, and unsteady,
We climbed to the mountain's crown.
The loose stones often slipped in the dust
Under feet both careful and slow,
How different this from the moss-paths,
Just down in the valley below!

Far in the west, on the mountain,
A golden sun hung low
Whose soft yellow shine and sunbeams
Were all gathered by the snow
That lay on the great Uncompahgres
Distant a hundred miles or so.
While between us and that range of the Rockies
Was the great, green region below.

Far away in the depths of the valley,
Were forests of aspen and pine,
Encircling glistening lakes
Which numbered near ten and nine.
There were grasses tall, and wild flowers,
And trees both young and old.
And the glittering shimmer of silver and green
Was softened with purple and gold.

Low in the east, near the mountain,
Swung a glorious star that night,
In the deep blue of evening sky,
'Twas the first that came into sight.
In the west, the brilliant sunset
Had all darkened to purplish gray,
And the fragrance of June in the air,
Was sweet at the death of the day.

Then over the vast panorama
Our hungry eyes gazed once more.
How changed in the gathering darkness!
The forests more black than before,
But the lakes still shone through the pine trees,
Glistening, and silvery and bright.
And across on the great Uncompahgres,
Lay the snow all cold and white.

HOW PEACE CAME TO COLORADO

In early days there was a name,
A name akin to terror,
Unless you lived then in the west
You could not understand.

One winter day, a good old man,
While panning gold in Clear Creek
Was stabbed and left for friends to find
And whisper, "Espinosa!"

A summer day, two children played
Nearby their home in Como,
Their throats were cut, and all there knew
The work was Espinosa's.

Month after month the horror grew,
Hundreds of miles were threatened,
No way to know, where, when or how—
Who next for Espinosas!

Ransom notes were posted
From Blackhawk down to Rye
"A thousand dollars, dead or alive!"
Get those crazed Espinosas!

One thing was known, the Spaniards' hats,
Ornately trimmed sombreros,
They had been seen, had been described,
But none saw Espinosas.

There came a day the Governor called
Tom Tobin in and said, "Tom,
Take all the men and gear you need
But get those Espinosas!"

"Yes, sir," said Tom. "I'll take one man,
Give me Gus Bartlett—we'll do our best
To find those Espinosas."

Tedious, cautious days and nights,
They dared not light a fire,
They knew their scouting lore full well,
So did the Espinosas!

Some weeks of ceaseless hunting,
Through Rocky Mountain wilds, then,
On the east side of Mt. Blanca,
Near the old Trinchera Ranch,
A wisp of smoke revealed the two,
Two violent Espinosas.

Two shots split the silence
And two Spaniards were dead.
In silence the men were covered,
In silence, the scouts rode home,
Taking two gaudy sombreros
To attest the mission done.

Peace came to Colorado, deliverance from fear,
When two scouts did their duty
But no one dared insult them, then,
By mentioning reward.

(NOTE.—This is a true story. Gus Bartlett was my grandfather. Many other stories have been told about this, but I am certain this is true. Long afterward, Tom Tobin claimed and received $1,000 reward.)

AIRLINES IN DIRE FINANCIAL STRAITS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly obvious that what the Nation's airlines have been claiming—that they are in dire financial straits—is indeed the case. I think it is time that we took a realistic look at the state of the airlines today, and what needs to be done to bail them out of their economic tailspin.

Estimates vary, but it now appears that the total U.S. scheduled-airline industry will end up the year with a net loss of up to $200 million. There are many reasons for this predicament. A soft economy has halted the industry's steady growth in traffic; big new planes ordered several years ago when traffic was booming and forecast to continue booming, today are flying half empty; strikes and lack of airway capacity have extracted millions from airline revenues.

But the primary cause of the airlines' economic plight is simply that costs have far outstripped revenues.

Two items account for nearly half of airline cash operating expenses. These are labor and landing fees. Yet, in 1970, it is estimated by the Air Transport Association, that wages for the average airline employee will go up by 11 percent, and the average charge each time that a plane touches down at a U.S. airport will jump by 15 percent.

In addition to airline costs, capital expenditures have grown tremendously. Since the start of the jet age in 1959, for example, the 12 major U.S. airlines have invested more than $16 billion for new aircraft and ground facilities. With super jets like the Boeing 747 costing some $23 million each and the upcoming Lockheed 1011 and McDonnell-Douglas DC-10 about $16 million each, plus multimillion-dollar expansions underway or planned to improve terminals all over the country, the airlines are committed to billions more in capital expenditures in the years immediately ahead.

Yet, while costs have skyrocketed and prices for other modes of transportation have steadily and substantially increased air fares during the jet age have for the most part actually declined, or gone up only marginally.

For example, in 1962 the economy fare without tax for a one-way ticket between Los Angeles and New York was $145.10; today it is $142.59. With discount fares and revenue-sharing with connecting carriers, average revenue for a New York-Los Angeles passenger today is only $112.65, or $90.23 in 1962 dollars.

Obviously, the airlines are long overdue for the kind of price increases granted to other carriers and required to meet their financial requirements. A fare increase of adequate size is desperately needed now.

FORESTRY PRACTICES

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on November 18, I presented to my colleagues a report on forestry practices in the Bitterroot Valley in Montana. Inasmuch as this report dealt with customary and routine operations in a timbered western valley, it had an effect beyond the actual territory studied.

The report, prepared under the leadership of Dean Arnold Bolle of the School of Forestry of the University of Montana, has caused considerable discussion in forestry and conservation circles and is already familiarly known as the "Bolle Report." The February 1971 issue of American Forests calls it a "blockbuster."

A thoughtful editorial from the American Forests and the article from the same magazine describing the report are here printed for the convenience of my colleagues.

Mr. Neal Rahm, regional forester, discussed some of these same issues in American Forests.

An airing of these problems is helpful. Mutual understanding is necessary. It may be that complete reevaluation is necessary. In the view of the experts on the Bolle committee, some reconsideration is imperative.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BITTER TEA IN THE BITTERROOT

Foresters may find some solace in the fact that foresters did it—but probably not much. A select committee of professionals from the University of Montana has now decreed something the little people—the ranchers, recreationists, sportsmen, small merchants and homeowners have been saying right along—that the Forest Service is doing a poor job of managing the Bitterroot National Forest in Montana.

The findings of the select committee will not be easily dismissed backed up as they are by the common sense of many people in Montana. The specifics of the case deal only with one forest in Montana but the ramifications of it are nationwide and will shake forestry to its foundations. The explosive package is certain to wind up on the doorsteps of the Congress and of every forestry school in the nation.

It all started when citizens in Montana's "Big Sky" country started to criticize management functions on the Bitterroot and contended citizens were being ignored in decisions being made. This dissatisfaction made itself felt in Washington. As a result, Senator Lee Metcalf, of the Montana delegation, asked Dr. Arnold W. Bolle, Dean, School of Forestry, University of Montana, to head up an investigation of Bitterroot management practices. Montana's forestry department is one of the best in a good school. Bolle recruited three forestry professors, a wildlife professor, and a professor of political science. All served without pay.

Their report, released by Senator Metcalf on November 18, is a blockbuster. Multiple use on the Bitterroot is a myth, the committee reports. Multiple use management, in fact, does not exist on the Bitterroot. Consideration of recreation, watershed, wildlife and grazing appear as afterthoughts. The Forest Service management sequence of clearcutting-terracing-planting cannot be justified. A clear distinction must be made between timber *management* and timber *mining*. Thus the indictment.

To learn that multiple use on the forest is nonexistent is jolt enough. To learn that forest management practices and economics are equally suspect really cuts it. At least we thought we were good at *that*. Bolle's team contends the forest is turning out logs, yes, but it isn't practicing good forestry. The blunt truth is many physicians and lawyers and others now engaged in forest management on three or four hundred acres wouldn't be caught dead doing some of the things the Forest Service is doing on the Bitterroot, if Bolle is right. If they did they would lose their shirts. Dogma is the villain according to Bolle—the ancient dogma being that the prime goal of a forester is to cut more trees to make more money to hire more timber managers to cut trees. Any connection with other uses or needs of the forest are purely coincidental.

Indulging in a form of whimsical irony the Bolle team suggests we stop calling Bitterroot management practices "management" and honestly call it "mining", a concept that could be justified under a "whole forest" philosophy under which everything, including scraggly trees and dwarf mistletoe, is pre-

sumed to have some use and should be used. The Forest Service is aghast at that idea. "That wouldn't be multiple use," it contends, multiple use being something of which they have nothing of already on the Bitterroot, according to the Select Committee.

It is almost unbelievable. If this is a fair example of what is really going on in our national forests—and the uproar in West Virginia doesn't exactly quiet one's fears—forest conservation is heading into a crucial period. First comes the Public Land Law Review Commission, a group of very hard-nosed people, who say multiple use is an imprecise concept that means all things to all people. Now comes Dean Bolle and his committee who indicate that the Public Land Law Review Commission is imprecise itself since multiple use does not even exist in the first place. Moreover, the PLLRC's proposed "dominant use" should also be relegated to a similar state of nonexistence.

It seems increasingly clear we are immersed in a welter of meaningless professional clichés while at least some of our forest managers follow the lines of least resistance on our forests. Call it multiple use, call it balance use, call it what you will, the time has come for a very firm hand on the public forest management throttle and the hand is likely to be that of the Congress of the United States, which may be what Representative Aspinall, Chairman of the PLLRC, has had in mind all along.

We can't go on like this. For lack of a better phrase, let's admit our goal is "balanced use" with a "fair deal" for all, as one Yankee said in Boston a few weeks ago. Let's admit we are going to grow and harvest some trees as well as we know how, that we are going to manage our grazing lands as well as we can for as much as we can afford, that we will set up and maintain more recreation areas, that more wilderness will be set aside where advisable, that we will not lose sight of water needs, fish and wildlife will be given consideration in all decisions, that the public will be truly consulted on these decisions, and finally that research will be given a big boost since only that can provide us the answers we do not have.

It is the uncertainty about management functions that is raising so much havoc with us. Someone has got to decide. Managers can help. So can the courts up to a point. But the ultimate decisions will be up to Congress because its members are our representatives from all the states. Admittedly some of their decisions will make some of us very unhappy. But one thing is certain. The climate is right for some strong action. Increasingly, people are of the mind if we are going to do something with public lands, let's do it *well*—and *soon*.

MONTANA'S SELECT COMMITTEE

(By James B. Craig)

In December, 1969, Senator Lee Metcalf, of Montana, wrote a letter with enclosures to Dr. Arnold Bolle, Dean of the School of Forestry, of the University of Montana. The enclosures consisted of letters from the Senator's constituents expressing "growing concern" over Forest Service management practices within the Bitterroot National Forest, and elsewhere. Senator Metcalf said that he personally, like his constituents, was concerned "over the long-range effects of clear-cutting, and the dominant role of timber production in Forest Service policy, to the detriment of other uses of these natural resources." The Senator expressed the conviction that a study of Forest Service policy by an outside professional group would prove beneficial to the Montana Congressional delegation and to the entire Congress, especially the Senate and House Interior Committees. The Bitterroot, he said, "is a typical mountain timbered valley and the results of such a study might well be extended to recommendations national in scope." He urged that the appropriate faculty members make such a study.

The Select Committee set up by Dean Bolle consisted of: Richard W. Behan, Associate Professor of Forestry; W. Leslie Pengelly, Professor of Wildlife; Robert F. Wambach, Associate Professor of Forestry and Associate Dean; Gordon Browder, Professor of Sociology; Thomas Payne, Professor of Political Science; and Richard E. Shannon, Professor of Economics and Forestry. Dean Bolle served as Chairman. On November 18, 1970, they submitted their report to Senator Metcalf who released it to his colleagues and the public.

The report released by the Select Committee consisted of fifteen principle findings. They are:

1. Multiple use management, in fact, does not exist as the governing principle on the Bitterroot National Forest.

2. Quality timber management and harvest practices are missing. Consideration of recreation, watershed, wildlife and grazing appear as afterthoughts.

3. The management sequence of clear-cutting-terracing-planting cannot be justified as an investment for producing timber on the BNF. It is doubtful that the Bitterroot National Forest can continue to produce timber at the present harvest level.

4. Clearcutting and planting is an expensive operation. Its use should bear some relationship to the capability of the site to return the cost invested.

5. The practice of terracing on the BNF should be stopped. Existing terraced areas should be dedicated for research.

6. A clear distinction must be made between timber management and timber mining. Timber management, i.e., continuous production of timber crops, is rational only on highly productive sites, where an appropriate rate of return on invested capital can be expected. All other timber cutting activities must be considered as timber mining.

7. Where timber mining, i.e., removing residual old growth timber from sites uneconomical to manage, is to be practiced, all other onsite values must be retained. Hydrologic, habitat, and esthetic values must be preserved by single-tree selection cutting, a minimum disturbance of all residual vegetation, and the use of a minimum standard, one-time temporary road.

8. The research basis for management of the BNF is too weak to support the management practices used on the forest.

9. Unless the job of total quality management is recognized by the agency leadership, the necessary financing for the complete task will not be aggressively sought.

10. Manpower and budget limitations of public resource agencies do not at present allow for essential staffing and for integrated multiple-use planning.

11. Present manpower ceilings prevent adequate staffing on the BNF. Adequate staffing requires people professionally trained and qualified through experience.

12. The quantitative shortage of staff specialists will never be resolved unless the qualitative issue with respect to such specialists is first resolved.

13. We find the bureaucratic line structure as it operates, archaic, undesirable and subject to change. The manager on the ground should be much nearer the top of the career ladder.

14. The Forest Service as an effective and efficient bureaucracy needs to be reconstructed so that substantial, responsible, local public participation in the processes of policy-formation and decision-making can naturally take place.

15. It appears inconceivable and incongruous to us that at this time, with the great emphasis upon a broad multiple-use approach to our natural resources—especially those remaining in public ownership—that any representative group or institution in our society would advocate a dominant-use philosophy with respect to our natural resources. Yet it is our judgment that this is precisely what is occurring through the federal appropriation process, via executive order and in the Public Land Law Review Commission's Report. It would appear to us that at this time any approach to public land management which would de-emphasize a broad multiple-use philosophy, a broad environmental approach, a broad open-access approach, or which would reduce the production of our public land resources in the long run is completely out of step with the interests and desires of the American people. What is needed is a fully funded program of action for quality management of all of our public lands.

In an address in the Senate on November 19, Senator Metcalf lauded the Select Committee—the members of which served without compensation—and the people of Montana, and said the report "embodies the finest example of public interest and involvement in an environmental issue." The Senator bore down on four of the astounding revelations in the report, namely; 1) that multiple use management, in fact, does not exist; 2) consideration of recreation, watershed, wildlife, and grazing appear as afterthoughts; 3) the management sequence of clearcutting-terracing-planting cannot be justified, and 4) a clear distinction must be made between timber *management* and timber *mining*.

In summing up its findings, the Select Committee also jabbed at the so-called dominant use philosophy as outlined in the earlier report of the Public Land Law Review Commission and which has been criticized in many parts of the country, most recently at a New England meeting in Boston. The Montana committee said, "It appears inconceivable and incongruous to us that at this time, with the great emphasis on a broad multiple use approach to our natural resources—especially those remaining in public ownership—that any representative group or institution in our society would advocate a dominant use philosophy with respect to our natural resources. Yet it is our judgment that this is precisely what is occurring through the federal appropriation process, via executive order and in the Public Land Law Review Commission's report. It would appear to us that at this time any approach to public land management which would de-emphasize a broad open-access approach, or which would reduce the production of our public land resources in the long run is completely out of step with the interests and desires of the American people. What is needed is a fully funded program of action for quality management of all the public lands."

At a Boston PLLRC meeting sponsored by the New England Council and the New England Natural Resources Council, New Englanders had expressed sympathy for the land problems of westerners as expressed in the PLLRC Report, indicated they favored the in lieu of taxes concept of remuneration from public lands both in the east and west, scored the findings of the Commission as regards the Continental Shelf as next to useless, and expressed concern about any dominant use that would give any special interest a dominant use of or vested right in public lands.

While some stalwarts in the PLLRC are charging the public is misconstruing the dominant use language in their report, some New Englanders had gone to the trouble of looking the word up in the dictionary. Webster's International gives it 3¼ inches. It means, "ruling, governing, prevailing, controlling, predominant as the predominant party, church, spirit or power." In music, it means the "dominant chord." In forestry it means "overtopping trees—which overlap the undergrowth and arrest its development." In short, the word means power.

Dr. Maurice K. Goddard, a member of the PLLR Commission, indicated the public is

placing the wrong interpretation on the word. Parks and wilderness areas have a dominant use, he said. It therefore follows that some public land, if the system is equitable, could have a forestry dominant use, or a grazing dominant use, or a recreation dominant use all withtin the framework of multiple use.

But some of the New Englanders were skeptical. Why not call it "balanced" use, some suggested. Paul Bofinger, of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, said he was worried about special privileges to users as regards the timber corporation idea for the national forests under the dominant use approach. Director Milton Pearl, of PLLRC, retorted, "If you are going to be in business, why not use big business methods. In fact, you have to or get out. That's what we proposed. If there's a better way to do it I'm sure Congress would like to hear from you."

Some Yankees, who did not care for this answer, said that indeed Congress was going to hear from them. Bernard L. Orrell, a member of the PLLRC Advisory Committee, said that in view of all the fuss about one word he favored dropping it and discarding it from further consideration. The report is too good to be ruined by one word, he indicated. Charles H. W. Forester, Chairman of the Board of the New England Natural Resources Center, said northeast people want to see westerners get a "fair deal" but they feel the public lands belong to all the people and no one group should have a dominant role in the system. Mr. Foster served notice New Englanders will take a pragmatic approach to the PLLRC report and intend to read the fine print in all bills that propose to implement it.

New England conservationists, he said, will look to the national conservation organizations for guidance and to "What's Ahead for Our Public Lands" published by the Natural Resources Council of America.

To tie in a New England leadership meeting with the report of the Montana Select Committee might appear confusing at first glance. It is done to show what people are talking about in resource affairs. Both in the Montana Report and in Boston the word "dominant" is a source of concern. At yet another meeting at Syracuse University several weeks later, AFA Executive Vice President William E. Towell was among those who attempted to bury "dominant use" once and for all.

In any event, the timeliness of the Montana Select Committee Report can scarcely be questioned as it applies specifically to one national forest and more generally to others, in view of the national dialogue that is now shaping up. The Public Land Law Review Commission took a decidedly dim view of "multiple use" in its report and found it imprecise. But to the man on the street the whole dialogue is beginning to shake down in terms of "dominant use" versus "multiple use." And we have precious little of the latter on Bitterroot according to Montana.

Much of the Select Committee's Report consisted of an examination of a Forest Service study of Management Practices on the Bitterroot National Forest. In general, the committee believes the Forest Service did a commendable job and that errors therein were due to the methodology involved plus the committee's belief it is a psychological impossibility to evaluate one's own efforts objectively.

The Forest Service found an "implicit attitude among many people on the staff of the Bitterroot that resource production goals come first and that land management goals considerations take second place." The Select Committee stated this is not a peculiarity of the Bitterroot—that the attitude "is widespread throughout the Forest Service, especially with respect to timber production, in a sense that getting the logs out comes first." High quality, professional management of the timber resources is all too rare, the committee added. This is scarcely surprising in view of constant industry pressure for more wood plus efforts to produce timber faster by Presidential proclamation without corresponding increases in funds for reforestation and timber stand improvement. The Congress has got to do more, the Select Committee said.

But increased funds alone will not solve the problem either. In order to provide quality management the agencies concerned must be both broadly and adequately staffed. More, a reevaluation of lines of authority and career ladders of the Forest Service is essential. The position of the on-the-ground land manager should be substantially upgraded and be nearer the top of the career ladder than at present, for that is where the decisions are being made. One clause in the Forest Service report received fervent support from the Select Committee, namely, that "multiple use plans in the Bitterroot must become the controlling documents *in fact as well as in principle.*" One member of the Select Committee later told a reporter that when he asked one supervisor for his multiple use plan he was told, "Yes, we have one around here somewhere if I can find it; I intend to read it some day when I have the time." Admitting the possibility the officer may have been irked by the manner in which the question was asked, it seems like a strange answer under the circumstances. As the report states, multiple use planning must precede management commitment of land to known or expected production goals. It should also involve public participation.

Highlights of the Montana Select Committee Report follows:

The problem arises from public dissatisfaction with the Bitterroot National Forest's overriding concern for sawtimber production. It is compounded by an apparent insensitivity to the related forest uses and to the local public's interest in environmental values.

In a federal agency which measures success primarily by the quantity of timber produced weekly, monthly, and annually, the staff of the Bitterroot National Forest finds itself unable to change its course, to give anything but token recognition to related values, or to involve most of the local public in any way but as antagonists.

The heavy timber orientation is built in by legislative action and control, by executive direction and by budgetary restriction. It is further reinforced by the agency's own hiring and promotion policies and it is rationalized in the doctrines of its professional expertise.

This rigid system developed during the expanded effort to meet national housing needs during the post-war boom. It continues to exist in the face of a considerable change in our value system—a rising public concern with environmental quality. While the national demand for timber has abated considerably, the major emphasis on timber production continues.

The committee found that the controversy surrounding the Bitterroot is both substantial and legitimate. While it is true that in a good many areas the conflict has been expressed in highly emotional and charged terms with many inaccuracies, still it is the opinion of the committee that the Bitterroot controversy is a very real problem situation. It is a serious local problem of the Bitterroot Valley and Western Montana, and for the United States as a society in general. The controversy contains many elements. A partial listing of these elements will help to elucidate the complexity of the controversy.

1. Over the past few years management decisions and policies have frequently resulted in situations that have disappointed virtually all the publics that make use of the Bitterroot National Forest.

2. Until relatively recently, timber management of the Bitterroot National Forest was handled entirely by nature, primarily through wild forest fires. Such management (accidentally) led to "even-aged" stands of timber particularly in the back country. Quite logically, Forest Service policy has developed to continue deliberately such even-aged timber management. Many of the practices of even-aged management are essential elements in the controversy (i.e. clearcutting, regeneration practices, road construction for such sales, clean-up methods, and logging practices).

3. Much of the Bitterroot National Forest is fairly steep to rugged terrain. As a consequence, results of timber management practices are clearly visible from areas prized for recreational and esthetic values and more recently by real estate development interests within the Bitterroot Valley.

4. An error in the calculations of the allowable cut for ponderosa pine occurred in the Bitterroot National Forest. As a result an over-cut of pine has taken place in recent years. Mills within the area attempted expansion on the basis of the anticipated cut and the change in sales patterns led to public controversy and major skepticism over Bitterroot National Forest management in general.

5. As a result of changed technology and changing markets, species not formerly salable from public lands have had markets develop. Consequently species not formerly cut, e.g. lodgepole pine, have been sold and cut. Harvesting lodgepole pine involves clearcutting and to promote regeneration serve slash burning of the entire cut and exposure of the mineral soil. The severe land treatment involved in such harvest comes under increasing public condemnation not only in the Bitterroot, but quite generally throughout the United States.

6. A decision to stop clearcutting as a cutting practice may be a decision not to cut most mature lodgepole pine on the Bitterroot National Forest. The lumber industry, together with some members of the Congress and elements of the executive branch oppose reducing the amount of merchantable timber harvested.

7. Throughout our society major changes are taking place with respect to public involvement in the decision, formulation and policymaking processes in all areas. The various groups involved locally (and across the country) in the Bitterroot controversy are a reflection of the nature of these changes. Traditional complex bureaucratic structures such as the Forest Service are only beginning to feel the tactics and devices employed by this new spirit of public involvement.

8. Local residents who are familiar with the systems of cutting used earlier are disturbed with the change, do not understand the reasons for the difference and doubt that the forest can continue to produce at the present level continuously.

9. There is a great deal of waste material left on the ground after clearcutting. People see many logs that they consider merchantable. Brush is scattered throughout the area. The soil has been sacrificed by bulldozers, there are great windows of material piled up. They protest both the ugliness of the area and the considerable waste they see in unused materials.

10. Bitterroot residents have a deepseated love for their valley. Their view of the landscape is precious to them.

11. The population has and is being rapidly augmented by new residents who are attracted by the beauty of the valley. Many of these new residents are intelligent, vocal and well-informed in ramifications of the environmental movement. They feel strongly that the social and esthetic values of the forest community are being given short shrift.

12. There is concern among some people in the logging industry and woods workers as well as other local people that the present rate of cut on the Bitterroot National Forest

is too heavy and that future employment and income are threatened.

A section in the Forest Service report on multiple use was so weak it should have been left out completely, the Select Committee said. Section on wildlife range, esthetics and recreation were found to be superficial both in terms of planning and of funding.

Under the circumstances, one might assume the timber management on the Bitterroot would be topflight and in a very favorable priority category but the Select Committee reports it is far from satisfactory and that on the basis of an investment alone the public is losing money on it. Clearcutting and terracing programs cannot be justified as an investment for producing timber on the Bitterroot, the committee said. There are better and much more economical ways to provide for the nation's timber needs. The committee strongly resented calling the clear-cut-terracing program on the forest professional forestry and said it would be far better to call it what it is, timber mining, and lump it into a "whole forest" concept in which it is admitted that everything in the forest, even dwarf mistletoe, probably has some use. This, of course, is contrary to accepted forestry dogma and the Forest Service has already opposed the timber "mining" idea but the committee contends that "dogma" is the reason the Bitterroot management is in its present precarious condition.

An admittedly explosive report, the Select Committee in effect is telling the Forest Service to reexamine its dogma in terms of today's environmental awakening, get off the exclusive forestry kick, accent research to the utmost and above all give the people a chance to participate in forest decisions. The dilemma is seen as "the need for more economic growth and development, but a strong desire to maintain or preserve a high quality natural environment. We need more wood products, but we want clean air and beautiful vistas. But, here also is an opportunity and a challenge."

There is no reason to assume that economic development and environmental quality are mutually exclusive or irreconcilable, the committee says. Trees can be cut without leaving an unsightly mess. Roads can be built so that they complement the natural beauty of the countryside. Disturbed areas can be rehabilitated. Moreover, there is still enough to leave some of it just the way it is now. The great research problem of the decade, the report concludes, is "how can we use these wildland resources without having a deleterious effect on the natural environment?"

This knowledge in the final analysis must come from research. Empirics will not suffice. Neither will experieince alone. Most certainly the final answers will not be provided by intuition. Balanced multiple use, more real authority at the ranger and supervisor level, public participation and most of all, research, are the ingredients that are most desperately needed.

A REGIONAL FORESTER BITES THE BULLET

(By Neal M. Rahm)

About two years ago I began to hear mounting criticism concerning land management practices in the Bitterroot National Forest. The situation came to a head when the Ravalli County Resource Conservation and Development Committee requested an investigation of those practices.

A Task Force was formed to make such an investigation. In organizing this Task Force, I chose three top men from my own administrative staff. All have demonstrated outstanding competence over the years. They are Robert H. Cron, S. C. Trotter, and William A. Worf, who served as chairman.

I asked Director Joseph F. Pechanec, of the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, to provide three men from his staff so that this review of management practices would benefit from their research positions and their counsel as scientists. He assigned three Assistant Directors from the Experiment Station—each one a top scientist, nationally recognized in his field: Otis L. Copeland, S. Blair Hutchison, and Charles A. Wellner.

My instructions to this Task Force were simple. They were to listen to the critics and study the situations being criticized. They were to take a careful look at management practices on the Bitterroot National Forest and analyze them in terms of the overall purposes of National Forest management. They were to prepare a detailed report on the situation as they saw it, presenting their conclusions and recommendations without concern as to how critical their report might be.

The Task Force completed its report in early May 1970. I distributed it widely to the public inviting comments for guidance on which recommendations should be adopted. Copies are still available from the U.S. Forest Service, Federal Building, Missoula, Montana, 59801.

The Task Force report is 100 pages long but the main findings are indicated in the excerpts from the chapter, "Overall Observations and General Recommendations:"

"The Montana portion of the Bitterroot National Forest covers more than one million acres, encompassing a multitude of situations and problems. . . .

"As the tempo of activity has mounted on the Bitterroot National Forest in recent years, the land management issues have begun to come into sharper focus. . . . The issue of esthetics is one of them. Watershed protection is another. These constitute a particular challenge. . . ."

* * * * *

"The Task Force agrees that scenic quality has been substantially impaired in many places at the very least for a period of years. We believe, however, that it is possible to harvest the timber resource with much less impact on esthetics if the quality of land management is substantially improved.

"We have not been able to substantiate the claims of widespread watershed damage due to logging, roadbuilding, and terracing. We agree, however, that there are instances of serious local damage and that certain management practices have set up the potential for watershed damage in other places where rare and unusually severe storm conditions occur. There is no question that the requirements for logging, roadbuilding, and site preparation should be tightened for the sake of environmental quality.

"We cannot support the claim that the approved allowable cut for the Forest is too high. However, the actual cut of ponderosa pine during the past few years has been too heavy because the allowable cut calculations for that species were misinterpreted. Moreover, the total cut of all species has been slightly above the approved allowable cut. In the light of environmental concerns today, other uses were not adequately considered when allowable cut calculations were made in the past."

* * * * *

"As the agency responsible for administering the National Forests, the Forest Service must accept responsibility for past mistakes in management and exercise full leadership in bringing about desirable changes.

"The public must also recognize its responsibilities. The first of these is to express a sense of value—how much does the public desire that it is willing to pay for. The second is to provide moral and financial support for the programs it feels are desirable. Hopefully, these include the goal of quality in land management.

"Following are general observations and recommendations for reaching that goal.

"There is an implicit attitude among many people on the staff of the Bitterroot National Forest that resource production goals come first and that land management considerations take second place."

* * * * *

"Communications with the public and other interested agencies have been seriously inadequate."

* * * * *

"Multiple use planning on the Bitterroot National Forest has not advanced far enough to provide the firm management direction necessary to insure quality land management and, at the same time, to provide all segments of the public with a clear picture of long-range objectives.

". . . The principal single fault this Task Force finds with the management of the Bitterroot National Forest is that its multiple use planning is not far enough advanced. . . ."

* * * * *

"In several instances the land management has been substandard because of slips or lapses in quality control.

"The man on the ground who is assigned such specific production goals as miles of road to build or millions of board feet to cut . . . there is a consequent sacrifice of quality at times. This has been a large part of the problem on the Bitterroot National Forest."

* * * * *

"The Bitterroot National Forest has a substantial timber producing capacity that can and should be utilized to help meet the nation's growing need for wood and to help support a stable economy in western Montana.

". . . The Task Force found that much of the timberland on the Forest was very productive and that the soils and topography were fully compatible with timber growing and harvesting activities. In some instances, esthetic considerations will set limits of output from the land and the physical manipulation of it. . . . In fact, we believe that the longrun output of timber from this National Forest can be increased with intensified forestry. More care and more manpower will be required. . . ."

* * * * *

"The Forest Service [i.e. Northern Region] has been remiss in not determining how much it would cost to do a balanced job of resource management and aggressively seeking the necessary finances for the total job."

* * * * *

"Budget requests for timber management funds are based on careful analyses of the various technical jobs involved: sale-area selection, cruising, sale preparation, and sale administration. . . .

"However, the impact or potential impact of timber management and harvesting activities requires [the services of] . . . soil scientists, geologists, hydrologists, wildlife biologists, fisheries experts, and landscape architects. The necessary funds for these services have not been included in the estimated costs. . . ."

* * * * *

"Increased funds alone will not solve present problems.

"The need is for more and better long-range planning, based on more and better data about each resource and about ecological relationships. This must be followed by better supervision to insure quality in the application of these plans. These jobs require people—competent professionals and technicians. . . ."

* * * * *

"The public should not expect that new management direction will appear instantly and completely in all activities."

* * * * *

"The management of a National Forest is a dynamic long-rang process. Many activi-

ties which will take place on the ground in 1970 were actually set in motion two to five years ago. . . ."

* * * * *

"The information base for decision-making should be enlarged.

"Repeatedly, in the course of this study, the Task Force has been confronted with the fact that there is much that we don't know. In some cases, the unknowns are critically important. . . ."

* * * * *

"Of all the points touched upon in this Task Force review of management on the Bitterroot National Forest, we feel obliged to restate four with all the emphasis at our command:

"Any lingering thought that production goals hold priority over quality of environment must be erased.

"Multiple use planning must be developed into a definitive, specific, and current decisionmaking process that it is not today.

"Quality control must be emphasized and reemphasized until it becomes the byword of management.

"The public must be involved more deeply than ever before in developing goals and criteria for management.

"Following are the overall recommendations that the Task Force feels must be implemented to correct deficiencies observed. . . .

"1. The Regional Forester should emphasize that the overriding purpose of National Forest management is to maintain quality of environment under use.

"2. Multiple use plans on the Bitterroot National Forest must become the controlling management documents in fact as well as in principle. This will require strengthening these multiple use plans so they clearly establish goals and direction of management on individual areas.

"3. The Bitterroot National Forest should seek better ways to involve the public in its multiple use planning and in developing subsequent resource plans. The process of sounding out public attitudes and preferences requires not only that the public understand the direction of management proposed for an area but also the implication of each alternative of management. (For example, what loss of timber yield and community income would result from the decision to restrict cutting on an area in the interest of recreation use?)

"4. The total cost and manpower requirements for a complete and balanced program of management on the Bitterroot National Forest should be estimated and made available to the Chief of the Forest Service and to the public.

"5. The Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station should accelerate its efforts to develop a fully relevant research program that coordinates the efforts of a group of research skills on the ecosystem problems. Such efforts, as well as supplemental research by the universities, must be expanded to meet the critical need for information."

The Task Force report was submitted as a draft environmental statement to the Council on Environmental Quality. Comments on the report have been received from many people, and from universities and organizations with a wide range of interests from a broad geographical area. All of these comments are under consideration and will be used in preparing a final environmental statement and in preparing management direction to Bitterroot National Forest Supervisor Orville Daniels.

Although trying, the Bitterroot controversy has some very positive aspects. There has been much productive dialogue with interested publics and I believe the base has been established on which future communications can be improved.

The purpose of National Forest management is to serve the goals of our society in the best way possible. To do this we need comment, advice, and criticism from the American people. And we also need their support.

EDUCATION TAX CREDITS MAKE SENSE FOR COUNTRY

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill that is a prudent and reasonable effort at helping parents, especially the lower- and middle-income taxpayers, to meet the escalating costs of higher education for their children.

This measure, which would establish tax credits for higher education expenses, is cosponsored by 94 of my colleagues from 32 States. I am particularly proud of the fact that their sponsorship represents so broadscale a range of Congressmen—both parties, both sexes, cities, suburbs, rural areas, and all geographic sections of the Nation.

I think all of us as sponsors are agreed that the time long has passed when the Federal Government can pay lipservice to the cause of higher education without providing some aid for the citizens to use their own funds in educating their children.

This bill would provide a tax credit of 100 percent for the first $200 spent on higher education; 25 percent of expenses from $200 to $500, and 5 percent of expenses from $500 but not to exceed $1,500. By making this a tax credit, it would enable eligible taxpayers to apply the credit amount directly to reducing their yearly income tax. It is far more just than our present system which does not even provide for deductions of costs of higher education while providing for deductions for everything from yachts—for business purposes, of course—to champagne dinners—for business purposes, of course.

Maximum tax credits would be provided up to $325 to those taxpayers whose adjusted gross income is $18,000 a year or less. The tax credit would be reduced by an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross income for the taxable year exceeds $18,000.

Credits provided by the bill would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1971. In addition to colleges and universities, provisions would cover business, trade, technical, and vocational institutions that meet Federal and State standards.

Bills similar to this one were passed by the U.S. Senate in the past two terms of the Congress, but were killed later in House-Senate conferences. I respectfully suggest that it is time that all of us in the Congress carefully reexamine our thinking on bills such as these and recognize, not just the desires of our people, but their needs.

I fully realize that one of the first questions asked is what the revenue loss will be for the U.S. Treasury if this bill is enacted. I ask what will be the loss to the country if we do not encourage our citizens to educate their children by means of a bill such as this.

Frankly, I have not cited the alleged revenue loss under the bill, because figures have a certain way of being inflated when a case against a new proposal is being made. I will point out, however, that so-called tax aids for other purposes—tax aids being credits, special exemptions, and deductions—are costing the Federal Government almost $46 billion yearly.

If, indeed, we should weigh monetary considerations first, then I think that Department of Commerce figures for 1968 help make my case. College graduates in their lifetime earn an average of $213,000 more than high school graduates, and earn an average of $371,000 more than those with 8 years of education or less. Even on this monetary basis, I feel that the country, in the long run, will be far the better for encouraging and assisting parents to send their children to colleges and other institutions of higher learning. The impact on tax revenues and the country's economy would be profound with better-educated citizens earning higher amounts of money.

Through this bill, we also would be recognizing the desirability of promoting education through private institutions rather than pushing students to tax-supported colleges and pouring ever-increasing amounts of Government money into them as a result.

Obviously our people and our country are the better for Government tax policies that encourage, rather than discourage, private higher education. This bill, as I have stated, is a reasonable and prudent effort to make this principle a living fact rather than abstract rhetoric.

I think that most Americans, as I am, are fed up with excuses of monetary expediency that penalize the workingman and his family. There can be no doubt whatsoever that something must be done to help parents provide their children with a higher education. Soaring tuition rates on top of continuing inflation are making it unbearable and, in some cases impossible, for parents to send their children to college.

I believe that Congress must exert leadership in this field by casting aside the shibboleths of antiquated tax policy and meeting the challenge of providing the most education for the most people. My bill would help do this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues who joined me in sponsoring this vital legislation and I insert a list of their names in the RECORD:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat, of New York.
John B. Anderson, Republican, of Illinois.
Mark Andrews, Republican, of North Dakota.
Bill Archer, Republican, of Texas.
Walter S. Baring, Democrat, of Nevada.
Alphonso Bell, Republican, of California.
Tom Bevill, Democrat, of Alabama.
Mario Biaggi, Democrat, of New York.
Edward G. Biester, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Ben Blackburn, Republican, of Georgia.
Frank T. Bow, Republican, of Ohio.
Frank J. Brasco, Democrat, of New York.

Clarence J. Brown, Republican, of Ohio.
James A. Byrne, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
John N. Happy Camp, Republican, of Oklahoma.
Tim Lee Carter, Republican, of Kentucky.
Elford A. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan.
Bill Chappell, Democrat, of Florida.
Shirley Chisholm, Democrat, of New York.
Frank M. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Don H. Clausen, Republican, of California.
James C. Cleveland, Republican, of New Hampshire.
Silvio O. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts.
Robert J. Corbett, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
John W. Davis, Democrat, of Georgia.
David W. Dennis, Republican, of Indiana.
William L. Dickinson, Republican, of Alabama.
Harold D. Donohue, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn, Democrat, of South Carolina.
Robert F. Drinan, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
John J. Duncan, Republican, of Tennessee.
Florence P. Dwyer, Republican, of New Jersey.
Edwin W. Edwards, Democrat, of Louisiana.
Joshua Eilberg, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Edwin D. Eshleman, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Dante B. Fascell, Democrat, of Florida.
O. C. Fisher, Democrat, of Texas.
Daniel J. Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Walter Flowers, Democrat, of Alabama.
Edwin B. Forsythe, Republican, of New Jersey.
Bill Frenzel, Republican, of Minnesota.
James G. Fulton, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
George A. Goodling, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Ella T. Grasso, Democrat, of Connecticut.
Kenneth J. Gray, Democrat, of Illinois.
Gilbert Gude, Republican, of Maryland.
Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York.
Orval Hansen, Republican, of Idaho.
Michael Harrington, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
James F. Hastings, Republican, of New York.
Ken Hechler, Democrat, of West Virginia.
Margaret M. Heckler, Republican, of Massachusetts.
Louise Day Hicks, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
Craig Hosmer, Republican, of California.
John E. Hunt, Republican, of New Jersey.
Albert W. Johnson, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Ed Jones, Democrat, of Tennessee.
William J. Keating, Republican, of Ohio.
Jack F. Kemp, Republican, of New York.
John C. Kluczynski, Democrat, of Illinois.
Dan Kuykendall, Republican, of Tennessee.
Norman F. Lent, Republican, of New York.
Manuel Lujan, Jr., Republican, of New Mexico.
Robert McClory, Republican, of Illinois.
Stewart B. McKinney, Republican, of Connecticut.
James R. Mann, Democrat, of South Carolina.
Robert Michel, Republican, of Illinois.
Clarence E. Miller, Republican, of Ohio.
F. Bradford Morse, Republican, of Massachusetts.
Bertram L. Podell, Democrat, of New York.
Walter E. Powell, Republican, of Ohio.
Robert Price, Republican, of Texas.
Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat, of Illinois.
Tom Railsback, Republican, of Illinois.
Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Republican, of Michigan.
Howard W. Robison, Republican, of New York.
Teno Roncalio, Democrat, of Wyoming.
Dan Rostenkowski, Democrat, of Illinois.
Edward R. Roybal, Democrat, of California.
John G. Schmitz, Republican, of California.
William Lloyd Scott, Republican, of Virginia.
J. William Stanton, Republican, of Ohio.
James V. Stanton, Democrat, of Ohio.
Sam Steiger, Republican, or Arizona.
John Terry, Republican, of New York.
Charles Thone, Republican, of Nebraska.
Robert O. Tiernan, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
Joe D. Waggonner, Democrat, of Louisiana.
William C. Wampler, Republican, of Virginia.
G. William Whitehurst, Republican, of Virginia.
Lawrence G. Williams, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Jim Wright, Democrat, of Texas.
Gus Yatron, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Roger H. Zion, Republican, of Indiana.

DR. LEON H. SULLIVAN: "HE IS HARDLY A YES MAN"

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a distinguished American was recently elected to the board of directors of the General Motors Corp. This was no routine corporate action, to be mentioned briefly in the columns of the business pages of America's newspapers.

Rather, it marked a precedent for the world's largest manufacturing corporation—the election of the first black American to sit in GM's board room.

The new director is the Reverend Dr. Leon H. Sullivan, the dynamic Philadelphia minister who created the Opportunities Industralization Centers program and one of our Nation's most articulate advocates for Negro self-help programs.

Some commentators characterized Dr. Sullivan's selection as an attempt by General Motors to lessen recent criticism of the company. They do not know Dr. Sullivan. Dr. Sullivan's voice will be one that is aggressive and articulate. As an editorial in the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal observed:

He is hardly a yes man.

Dr. Sullivan testified last year before the Senate Subcommittee of Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. His plea was for legislation to extend Federal financial assistance to the Nation's OIC's I consider myself as fortunate indeed to have been among those to witness his stirring testimony.

To give a fuller understanding of this great American and this precedent-setting corporate vote, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial I mentioned from the Wilmington Evening Journal be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

GENERAL MOTORS ELECTS TO MEET CRITICISM

When you are as big and influential and rich as General Motors, it is difficult to do anything that pleases everyone.

After a few attempts, G.M. management might be forgiven a feeling of frustration. Everyone has a gripe with General Motors and more often than not, settling one gripe gives birth to two new ones.

But before the cynics can dismiss General Motor's latest effort to please the public as nothing but a blatant exercise in tokenism, let them ask themselves what in good faith they would have General Motors do. The election of the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, Philadelphia minister and pioneer in black training and self-help programs, to the board of directors of General Motors cannot be so lightly dismissed.

The nation's largest manufacturer is awakening to its public relations problems and making real efforts to solve them. No one can expect a company the size of General Motors to move precipitously on any matter. The consequences of any decision are too great. So while we may be impatient at the slowness with which the company reacts to complaints about customer neglect and the defensive attitude it takes when charged with pollution or manufacturing unsafe automobiles, when the company does take a positive step, it makes no sense to react by criticizing its motivation.

Were General Motors intent upon playing the tokenism game in electing the company's first black director, the firm surely could have found an equally distinguished and considerably more sympathetic representative than Mr. Sullivan. His past performance has proven Mr. Sullivan to be his own man, not easily awed by great power and quick to express his opinion when he felt it might count for something. He is hardly a yes man.

The election was a good one, and, one guesses, a step not easily taken by the board members. The results of that election may be even better. Before giving up on General Motors' ability or willingness to respond to public criticism, perhaps the public should give the company the benefit of the doubt—and maybe a little time.

A REPLY TO LIFE'S EDITORIAL ON NIXON BY SECRETARY GEORGE ROMNEY

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, recently Life magazine commented editorially on the Presidency of Richard M. Nixon in a manner that was manifestly unfair. Now, to Life's credit, the editors of that magazine have published a reply by Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney. Secretary Romney simply cites the facts regarding Nixon administration accomplishments—and the net results is a thorough-going rebuttal of the Life editorial. I commend a reading of the Romney article to my colleagues in the House:

A REPLY TO LIFE'S EDITORIAL ON NIXON

President Lincoln once said he could not answer all the attacks against him, as it would involve him in a "perpetual flea hunt."

Two weeks ago, Life meticulously published so many "fleas" about Mr. Nixon and his Presidency—I ask this opportunity to bag the legal limit.

FOREIGN POLICY

Though conceding him high marks in foreign policy, Life skates over—in two sentences—the President's historic arms control proposals, Soviet policy, the new footing to-

ward Communist China, the peace initiatives in the Middle East. Instead Life zeroed in on Cambodia.

Nowhere was credit conceded for the accomplishments of Cambodia: the new American troop withdrawals; the greatly improved chance freedom in South Vietnam will survive; the dramatic decline in American war dead.

Who would have predicted 24 months ago that by the spring of 1971 almost half of America's troops would be either home or on the way?

Had this President been of a different political philosophy, those dismissing his achievements with faint praise might well be alto sopranos in the Nixon choir.

ECONOMIC POLICY

Ernest Hemingway wrote that two evils inevitably brought nations "temporary prosperity . . . permanent ruin." They are inflation and war; Mr. Nixon inherited them both.

It required both political courage and statesmanship to move away from war and inflation, up onto the high road to peacetime prosperity. Almost two million defense-related jobs had to be eliminated in the transition.

But Life's gloomy assessment notwithstanding, unemployment for 1970 was lower than any peacetime year in the '60s. Last year's downturn was the mildest in 25 years. Interest rates have declined. Price rises have dropped 25% in six months. Housing starts are moving up. Food prices have stabilized. The stock market has rocketed 200 points in eight months. Public confidence is everywhere on the upswing. A business recovery is at hand.

SOCIAL POLICY

Doing its bit to "bring us together," Life notifies 22 million black Americans that, under President Nixon, you must "be content with the ongoing progress . . . under laws on the books."

Yet, largely through this President's initiatives, millions of poor, many of them black, are exempted from income taxes; the number of Americans getting food stamps has tripled to 10 million; the number getting food assistance nearly doubled to 12 million; "black capitalism" loans to minority business have shot up to $135,000,000. These tremendous gains are not even hinted at in the Life editorial.

"Nixon has fought *only* [emphasis added] for welfare reform . . ." claims Life. Only for welfare reform!

Where have LIFE's editors misplaced the clippings on the 37-point environmental program; the revenue-sharing bill; postal reform; the all-volunteer Army proposal; extension of unemployment insurance to five million Americans; the D.C. crime law and the billion dollars to combat crime; the proposals to stop the flow of smut to children; the higher education bill; the mass transit bill; Social Security reforms; coal mine safety; consumer proposals; the occupational health and safety law; veterans' programs; manpower training and a dozen others?

THE NIXON STYLE

Clearly, from LIFE's inventory, the Nixon "style" is being weighed in the balance with the style of the retinue that arrived in Washington in 1961. But let us broaden the judgment beyond comparative styles to comparative accomplishments. In my book, substance counts more than style.

The men of style who departed government in 1969 left behind a bitter legacy—a division in the country, disruption on the campuses, inflation in the economy, cost overruns in a bloated defense budget, crime in our cities, powderkegs in the ghettos, backlash in the suburbs—and two hundred coffins being ferried home each week from Southeast Asia.

What a price America paid for the overblown rhetoric of the sixties. And what did it all accomplish?

The day the men of style departed Washington—15 years after Brown *vs.* Board of Education—one in 16 Negro children in the South attended school in legally desegregated districts.

It was not they, but Richard Nixon, who presided quietly over the dismantling of the dual school system. He placed his faith, not in pompous rhetoric or federal power, but in the basic goodwill and dedication to law of the people of the South.

The President did not barnstorm the country promising an "end to poverty in 1976." But calmly, articulately, forcefully he proposed to the nation the most far-reaching program in 35 years to eliminate poverty from American life. He has gone to the people: to rally them at the time of the massive street demonstrations—to argue the case for a missile defense—to justify his decision to a nation alarmed over Cambodia—to explain the economic necessity for his veto of a popular health and education bill.

But, if the President truly seemed, in these appearances, a "calculating lawyer"—why, then, almost without exception have they enhanced the President's standing and rallied support for his causes?

If his appearances disappoint, why do networks and Democrats anguish aloud that the President's televised addresses give him too great a power over national opinion? Hopefully, in 1971 the American people are more interested in performance than theatrics.

Were the President genuinely "isolated," how could an informed critic like Eric Sevareid walk away from an hour's live television interview praising the President's mastery of the matters of government?

From my experience, Richard Nixon's severest critics are the pundits who know him least; his staunchest advocates those who know him best.

When the elite of the intellectual community, the media and the capital deserted President Johnson, his Presidency did not survive. But President Nixon can survive and endure their opposition—for never in his career has he had their support.

If the editorialist cannot fathom the nature and depth of Mr Nixon's support, perhaps it is because he does not understand the American people.

On Jan. 20, 1969, America was most deeply concerned with a tragic war in Asia, campus crises, mob violence in her cities, crime on her streets. If the day Mr. Nixon departs the Presidency, America's concerns have turned to saving the environment, making government more responsive, maintaining peaceful prosperity—then history will not dwell long on comparative styles. History, rather, will write that Richard Nixon guided America through a dark night of the American spirit into the bright calm of a new day, and was, therefore, a great President.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION ON BEHALF OF MINORITY GROUPS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, yesterday's Philadelphia Inquirer printed what I believe is an excellent, and badly needed, editorial column clearly presenting some of the accomplishments of this administration on behalf of minority groups.

First, Mr. President, before I seek consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD, I want to make a few comments of my own. The Nixon administration has been doing much in the area of aiding minority groups. It is not the posture of the Nixon administration to single out any one group and ballyhoo what is being done. It is the policy of the Nixon administration to treat everyone equal and to offer the fullest opportunity in this great land to all persons who live among us.

In the Philadelphia Inquirer editorial column by Don Bacon, it is said:

The predominantly black schools are now getting more than $130 million in aid in comparison with just a few million two years ago.

Twice as many blacks are going to white schools in the South than two years ago.

Low income housing has been more than doubled during the last two years.

To offer more housing the Justice Department has filed suits in 22 states.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks this article by Don Bacon entitled, "Black Congressmen Should Study Record."

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

BLACK CONGRESSMEN SHOULD STUDY RECORD

(By Don Bacon)

WASHINGTON.—For a year, President Nixon has refused to see a group of Democratic congressmen, who call themselves the "Black Caucus" and who want to come to the White House to discuss shortcomings in the administration's racial policies.

The black congressmen have made much ado over the Presidential snub. They have held press conferences in which they castigated the President. They boycotted his State of the Union speech last week and demanded equal TV time to present their own version of the "State of the Union." They have written public letters to the President.

To persons with a visceral doubt about the Nixon Administration's commitment to black equality, the President's apparent attitude in this case seemed to confirm their darkest suspicions.

Inexplicably, the White House has declined to comment on the charges of the dozen black Congressmen. Presidential Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler cuts off questions with a curt: "I'll have no comment on that subject."

And the myth that Nixon doesn't care about black problems continues to grow.

The true reason Nixon has refused to meet with the 12 Congressmen is not because of their blackness, but because they are asking him to recognize them as "black representatives" in Congress, that is, an ethnic faction separate from the whole Congress. The President feels strongly that such distinctions in Congress are wrong.

As for his being out of touch with black thinking, it is a fact that Nixon has met over the last two years with more than 30 black groups and individuals, the most recent being Whitney Young, of the Urban League.

In these meetings, Nixon has proved to be a good listener, and, in many cases, has been quick to act on their complaints and problems. After hearing a group of black college presidents tell of the financial plight of their schools, for instance, he promised to direct more Federal funds their way—and he has. The predominantly black schools are now getting more than $130 million in Federal money, compared with just a few million two years ago.

In truth the Nixon two-year record in Civil Rights, after some initial uncertainty

and ineptitude, has turned out to be not bad. It might even be called impressive.

Even by the two most sensitive yardsticks of racial advancement—school desegregation and fair housing—Nixon has made a creditable showing. In 1970, after Nixon, complying with the Supreme Court, ordered a complete shutdown of the Southern dual school system, 38.1 percent of Southern blacks were going to predominantly white schools, compared with 18.4 percent in 1968.

In housing, the units available to blacks and other low income minorities more than doubled since 1968. To open up more housing to blacks, the Justice Department has filed suits under the Fair Housing Act, in no fewer than 22 states.

Stressing the need for black economic independence, Nixon has achieved major breakthroughs in getting more blacks into high-paying labor unions, setting up blacks in private business, funneling more government contracts (up 300 percent in two years) to minority business, increasing small business administration loans to blacks, and expanding the training of hard core unemployed. It is progress.

WILLIAMS BROTHERS SALUTE THE OPENING OF MUSKOGEE PORT

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it was a great privilege to attend the recent dedication of the Muskogee, Okla., port on the Arkansas River, and to hear the remarks of Joseph Williams, president of Williams Brothers Co., and also those of his brother, Charles Williams, vice chairman of the company's board of directors.

The Williams brothers were among the first to recognize the great development potential of Muskogee's port, and the tremendous commercial benefits to be derived from barge transportation along the river. The company has worked hand in hand with the Corps of Engineers and local civic groups in pushing for completion of the port, and they are to be commended for their part in making Muskogee the port city it is today.

The remarks of both brothers at the dedication were most timely, for they told the story of how the Muskogee Port finally became a reality.

The story is also told, graphically and eloquently, of the impressive opportunities and benefits now available at the Port of Muskogee, and all along the great new waterway on which it is located, for American industry.

I request that the remarks of both Joseph and Charles Williams be included in the RECORD at this point:

COMMENTS BY JOSEPH H. WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT, WILLIAMS BROTHERS CO., AT MUSKOGEE PORT DEDICATION, JANUARY 22, 1971

Thank you congressman Edmondson. I sincerely appreciate having this opportunity to say a few words on this occasion that is momentous for Muskogee . . . for Oklahoma . . . and for our nation.

Completion of this port opens new channels of commerce for productive wealth of a large and previously landlocked area . . . an area that is sure to benefit because of its many plusses for shippers . . . because of the enthusiasm . . . and competence of members of the port commission and in fact, all people here.

Williams Brothers Company is happy to be associated with such a vigorous group of people.

We're enthusiastic, too, and we predict a bright future for the Port of Muskogee. There's no doubt in the minds of our market researchers that this new port will influence desirable industries . . . and their accompanying prosperity . . . to locate near Muskogee. In fact, we believe in the port so strongly that one of our subsidiary companies has already initiated feasibility studies for several industries that could locate here. Whether these studies will produce quick results, I don't know. But I do know that we will keep selling the Port of Muskogee at every opportunity.

The enthusiasm of everyone connected with the port is paying off. Activity has been good to date. We intend to keep activity high here. This is evidenced by the fact that next month Williams Brothers Company will ship in 10,000 tons of pipe that will be used in the construction of one of our new pipelines. We're shipping the pipe into Muskogee by water because we can recognize a good deal—and we predict that many other shippers will also follow suit.

Thank you.

CHARLES P. WILLIAMS, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, WILLIAMS BROTHERS COMPANY—PRESENTATION TO MUSKOGEE PORT DEDICATION, JANUARY 22, 1971

Thank you, Senator Bellmon, Congressman Camp, Mayor Madewell, Mrs. Madewell, distinguished guests . . . ladies and gentlemen.

Before I begin . . . I want to say . . . that when I accepted your kind invitation to speak here tonight . . . nobody told me that I would be competing with the President of the United States . . . who, at this very moment, is delivering his state of the Union Message . . . So I not only thank you for inviting me to speak to you on this momentous occasion . . . I also thank you all for being here. This is a momentous occasion for Muskogee . . . our State . . . and our Nation.

During the dedication ceremony this afternoon . . . I was reminded of an interesting article I read recently . . . it went something like this. . . "Do they let strangers see that port everyday . . . or only on Sundays? I wanted to see that port . . . even if I had to employ a detective agency to hunt it up. I knew it was concealed somewhere. The seaport is said to be of a very inconvenient size . . . not quite narrow enough to jump over . . . and a little too deep to wade through when you take off your shoes."

Does this sound familiar?

Well . . . the learned author was questioning the advisability of digging a fifty-mile channel . . . . that resulted in the third largest seaport in the U.S. . . . . Houston, Texas.

As we search for answers to our economic problems . . . . one of the strangest paradoxes is . . . . that there is never sufficient appreciation of the enormous and long-lasting influence . . . . that waterway development can have on economic growth.

What would Houston be today . . . . without the man-made channel to its port . . . through which to import and export vital goods. Not only at Houston . . . . but from the Rhine to the Mississippi . . . . the contribution of waterways to the forward thrust of a region . . . . is a matter of historical record.

It is also a matter of record . . . . that many men have always been shortsighted and skeptical about their life-giving rivers. Perhaps we are always looking for a quick profit . . . . or an immediate return on investment . . . . rather than the long-term benefits.

When farsighted and enthusiastic Muskogee citizens voted ten to one in favor of the port bond issue in 1967 . . . they were showing unusual foresight. They knew that water transportation and vitality of a city . . . go hand in hand . . . and Muskogee hasn't stopped there. Forward-looking members of the community are working for the betterment of the port. Projects . . . such as the four million dollar marina proposed by Phillips Petroleum Company . . . indicate what lies in store for this port.

Williams Brothers Company shares this enthusiasm with Muskogee. We signed a contract to operate and develop the Port of Muskogee . . . because we believe in the short- as well as the long-term benefits . . . which will accrue to Muskogee, the State of Oklahoma, and the whole surrounding area.

Look at the record!

It was anticipated that seven hundred thousand tons of commerce . . . would be transported the first year the river was opened to Little Rock. But when the figures for the first ten months were tallied . . . the total commerce moved was in excess of two point six million tons.

Can we really expect such results over the entire system?

It is estimated . . . that the Arkansas River Waterway will carry thirteen million tons annually. The Ohio River System was also built to carry thirteen million tons of commerce annually . . . but today . . . that system carries well over one hundred million tons. Will our system go higher than its projected thirteen million tons? I think so.

Just last week . . . the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released figures indicating . . . that 1970 cargo on the Arkansas River totalled three point four million tons . . . up sharply from two point four million tons in 1969.

And use of the waterway increased every month during 1970.

Less than a million tons of commerce moved on the Tennessee River in the mid-1930's. 1969 shipments exceeded twenty-four million tons.

And since the 1930's . . . almost two billion dollars have been invested in privately-owned manufacturing plants . . . terminals . . . and distribution facilities on the Tennessee River . . . facilities that provide direct employment for thirty-seven thousand people. I can remember when wise men said flatly . . . that pioneering plans for multipurpose use of the Tennessee were a pipe dream . . . and that it was impossible to develop a major river for navigation . . . flood control . . . and power production.

Contrary to a common supposition in this jet age . . . water transportation is not outmoded . . . nor is it declining. It is growing! And commerce on waterways has increased five-fold since World War II. In the next fifty years . . . predictions are that it will increase six times. Today our nineteen thousand miles of active commercial inland waterways . . . exclusive of the Great Lakes . . . move some one hundred and fifty billion ton-miles annually . . . one-sixth of the nation's total inter-city commerce.

Waterways and economic growth . . . go hand in hand. Now that we have a navigable waterway . . . the future looks brighter. Facts bear out this prediction.

It is a fact . . . that only twenty percent of the nation's counties lie along inland waterways. And that as early as 1958 . . . this twenty percent of the counties . . . accounted for fifty-eight percent of the value . . . added to the nation's goods by manufacturing . . . fifty-five percent of its manufacturing employees . . . and fifty-seven percent of its capital investment in new facilities. These same counties in the 1960 census . . . gained twenty-one percent in population . . . while the eighty percent non-waterfront counties gained only three and one-half percent. Their median incomes were five hundred dollars higher . . . than those in non-waterfront counties.

Government policy is shifting to a more expansionary basis . . . after the inflationary clampdown of the past few months. Economists say . . . that business outlays

will start slowly and accelerate later in the year. Growth is expected in private construction and investment in plant equipment. They foresee growth in almost every economic indicator . . . except unemployment. That will go down.

We are in the right place . . . at the right time . . . with the right product. So the future is unlimited.

But let's come down to earth!

Take a brief look at what Muskogee has to offer.

The port is at the hub of three great rivers . . . the Arkansas . . . the Grand . . . and the Verdigris.

There is abundant pure water . . . at the present time daily filtration is twenty-two million gallons . . . well above the present usage of nine million gallons . . . and the daily intake of water can be raised to over eighty-five million gallons.

There is ample willing and competent labor available.

There is abundant natural gas . . . reasonably-priced electric power . . . and massive quantities of petroleum . . . coal . . . minerals . . . salt . . . gypsum . . . and other raw materials. Shouldn't manufacturers locate here? There is no doubt in my mind that they will!

Excellent railway and highway connections spoke out from Muskogee . . . to markets all over the nation. Our state is in the center of the nation . . . encompassing within a six hundred mile diameter circle . . . over fifty million consumers. Shouldn't Muskogee logically become a distribution center? I predict that it will!

Why shouldn't Muskogee become a big manufacturing area . . . perhaps first producing intermediates . . . and then finished products. Couldn't the seventy-seven-mile stretch from Webbers Fall to Tulsa . . . with Muskogee as the hub . . . become an area dotted with manufacturing plants like the Houston ship channel . . . or if we look ahead . . . like the great Ruhr Valley in Germany? Neither of those areas has the variety of resources as close at hand as we do.

Of course we have raw material to ship . . . coal reserves in excess of one billion tons of recoverable product . . . beds of gypsum ten to one hundred feet thick that extend for miles and could yield twenty-five to fifty million tons per section of land . . . statewide reserves of salt estimated at about twenty trillion tons . . . and billions of tons of limestone . . . gravel . . . stone . . . and other useful raw materials. In the past . . . none of this valuable material has left Oklahoma by the most economical means of transportation . . . namely, water.

We know we can ship our volumes of raw material . . . that will give us tonnage but not the prosperity brought by manufacturing (which we are seeking for Muskogee . . . and for that matter all of Oklahoma) . . . the jobs . . . increased personal income . . . and a better standard of living for everyone. We must break the tradition that big, clumsy items go by water . . . and finished products by rail and truck.

Whether wheat . . . steel . . . and other products will move by barge . . . depends on the cost of transportation. Shippers are smart . . . they'll quickly choose the cheapest transportation . . . and right now . . . wheat can be shipped by water from Muskogee to New Orleans . . . 9.3 cents a bushel cheaper than by rail. We can bring steel from Pittsburgh to Muskogee . . . ten to fifteen dollars a ton cheaper by water than by rail. Cities Service Gas Company and Republic Steel Corporation know the value of our port. . . . They have already shipped in fourteen thousand tons of line pipe. And soon . . . Williams Brothers Company will ship in another ten thousand tons of pipe . . . to be used in construction of one of its new pipelines.

But, we must be ever alert and prepared for competition.

During the past twenty years . . . the dreams of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr . . . and perhaps the majority of the people in the State of Oklahoma . . . have been focused in part on the growth and benefits to be enjoyed . . . from the completion of the Arkansas River Navigational Program.

Many times it has been stated . . . that those within the area serviced by the port . . . will enjoy benefits almost too great . . . for our minds to comprehend. However . . . a word of caution and practical realism must be said here tonight!

The reason for the word of caution is simply this:

I have heard . . . that at the present time . . . legislation is being prepared . . . that would result in a user tax on this and other waterways. This tax would increase the cost of waterway transportation . . . and thus make railroads more competitive in price.

Statistics released by the Department of Transportation indicate . . . that within the next two years . . . railroads must greatly increase their present freight rates . . . to achieve a break-even point.

To those manufacturers shipping only by railroad . . . this increased cost could be critical, especially to those manufacturers competing with the present low cost of water transportation.

Now is the time . . . for the leadership of this area to be heard! We must not let legislation interfere with the benefits we have worked so hard to achieve.

We must also meet competition. Here in the Oklahoma-Arkansas area . . . even before its completion . . . the new waterway has led to a rail reduction of seven cents a bushel . . . on what shipments to the Gulf Coast.

(If I may digress a moment . . . this shows the value of waterways . . . with the cost of transportation down . . . the farmer gets a little more for his product; and if we want to carry on the story . . . the housewife pays a little less for the bread she buys at the corner grocery store.)

Completion of this 440-mile waterway opens new channels of commerce for productive wealth . . . of a vast . . . previously landlocked region. It provides access to the hydrocarbon-rich area of the Arkansas Valley . . . and creates a new gateway to the mineral-rich west. The door is open from Muskogee to the Gulf of Mexico . . . and ports all over the world. It is easy to conjure up mental pictures of barges . . . (bulging with grain . . . cotton . . . intermediates . . . and finished products) . . . moving out of Muskogee . . . and returning with machinery and other items for distribution . . . from this natural hub to fifty million consumers.

Waterway development historically has meant related industrial development of importance. But nobody is going to give us anything. We will all have to work hard to reach our objectives.

The challenge is ours! Here we can provide relief for manufacturers from the crowded . . . expensive . . . polluted environment of the chemical centers of the east. Here we have a chance to build the chemical industry of the future . . . with minimal contamination of our streams and air.

Here we can provide opportunity for employees to live in open lake country . . . in a vacation atmosphere . . . in a state with a stable government and a favorable tax structure.

Also a chance to help our country! Economists predict . . . that our country's population will double . . . and our personal consumption will increase five times . . . in the next fifty years. If the present trend continues . . . eighty-five percent of the nation's people will be cramped in urban areas by the end of this century. Many of them will be crowded together in gigantic clusters composed of extensions of today's already crowded metropolitan areas . . . an accumulation of homes . . . roads . . . factories . . . power lines . . . and other facilities that will make solutions to today's environmental problems seem tame by comparison. We have a lot going for us . . . so let's take advantage of our many plusses.

In closing . . . I want to take a few minutes to talk about business. Fully-loaded barges will not be streaming down the river by the hundreds . . . . now that we have declared the Port of Muskogee opened. We are going to have to work long . . . hard hours to merchandise and sell this port. Several divisions of Williams Brothers Company are doing that now.

We are running schedules of advertisements for the Port of Muskogee . . . in leading transportation magazines. At the end of this month . . . we are putting up and sponsoring an exhibit featuring the Port of Muskogee . . . at the National Waterways Conference in Chicago.

I cannot get too specific at this time . . . but will tell you, in general terms, about some other projects. In the past few months . . . our Resource Sciences Corporation subsidiary has initiated several engineering feasibility studies for multi-million dollar plants . . . that could be located in the Muskogee area. We believe in this area . . . and we feel certain that large corporations will soon realize . . . the many benefits of locating plants here. I am not at liberty to name specific companies or projects. But they are nationally known companies.

The point I want to make is . . . that we are taking the initiative. We may be successful quickly . . . and we may not. But be assured we will keep selling the Port of Muskogee.

I hope . . . that everyone here will do the same. Let's all work together to achieve our goal!

I thank you for your kind attention.

EDUCATION BY TELEPHONE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education has instituted some innovative educational techniques, including a unique telephone system to establish a communications network among colleges to share academic resources. President of the council, Herbert H. Wood, in an article in the New York Times, of January 11, describes the kinds of activities in which KCRCHE is engaged, funded under the Higher Education Act.

"Education by Telephone" published in A.T. & T. Long Lines and the article from the New York Times, follow:

EDUCATION BY TELEPHONE

Learning by telephone is an effective academic and administrative method of communication. Rapid communication allows ideas and knowledge to flow smoothly and contributes to the cooperative aspects of all educational programs. The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education's Telephone Communications Network is an example of how an innovative communications network allowed students and faculties of 18 schools to share each others academic resources.

The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education (KCRCHE) is one of the oldest educational consortiums in the country. The consortium's 18 member colleges decided they could accomplish more collectively than if they functioned independently of each other. The member colleges consist of 4-year liberal arts institutions, junior colleges and state schools in Kansas, Missouri and Iowa.

The main objective of the consortium is to upgrade the quality of education and facilitate cooperative administration within the member colleges. However, since most of the communication had been done by mail and by excessive and expensive traveling of key academic and administrative personnel, there was a lack of ideas, enthusiasm and communication.

Late in 1966, the KCRCHE staff decided something had to be done to improve communications. They contacted representatives of Long Lines and Southwestern Bell to see what they could come up with to effectively coordinate the member schools. The facility most needed was conference calling ability which would allow a fast and efficient exchange of ideas and in-depth discussion between the 18 member schools in the consortium.

To achieve this flexibility, the KCRCHE network was custom engineered by the Bell System. It provides 2-point dial access and total conferencing capability. Each member school is connected by a 4-wire private line to a 310 switching system located at KCRCHE headquarters in Kansas City. This console has a 30-position capacity and monitoring capability. The system runs manually and conference calls are set up by the representative located at headquarters. The private lines are backed by foreign exchange lines which provide an extra line to be used for transmitting written material. This is done with the use of a Data-Phone 601-A1 and an electro-writer.

The instructor writes his material on the transceiver. It is then sent over the foreign exchange line to the receiver at the other end and is projected on a screen. Instructors have found this equipment very handy for giving long distance examinations.

The audio "suitcase Tele-lectures" have been modified to work on the 4-wire system. The Bell System men have also modified some of the equipment to meet the needs of the schools. They, for instance, have moved the "push-to-talk button" from the microphone stand to the cord so the instructor does not have to remain stationary during a lecture. The cords have been designed with a clip so the microphones can be attached to the speaker's belt for easy mobility.

The communications staff, headed by Mrs. Donna Murphy, Telenet coordinator, coordinates all the services required in the transmission of educational formats such as the tele-lectures and arranging of conference calls for administrative functions.

A typical campus arrangement on the network includes two conference telephone lines. Each president's office, classroom or lecture hall is equipped with facilities for tele-lecture programs. Any number of member colleges can participate in a tele-lecture. A moderator usually presides at the transmission site of the lecture.

Each semester the campuses check their needs for speakers and advise the KCRCHE network of their choices. KCRCHE then polls all the member colleges to determine who wants to be brought in on the lecture via the tele-lecture system. If a member college participates, it is expected to share the expenses for the speaker. With this economical use of the network, the campuses can better afford distinguished lectures.

Conference arrangements are used for committee meetings among member campuses. The member campuses include 2500 faculty members and 42,000 students. According to Donna Murphy, "the combined administrative faculty and student commitments among the campuses are enormous," with a total of 17,858 participants during the fiscal year '69-'70. The Network expands "communications among faculty members on distant campuses, extends teaching and lecture resources, reduces travel time to attend meetings and speeds requests between libraries for inter-library loans," she said.

The KCRCHE network staff is made up of experienced communications specialists. Some have taught previously and are familiar with the professional needs of the faculty members. The coordinator spends a great deal of time on the campuses instructing the faculties in how to use the network effectively, and assisting them in promoting ideas of potential users.

Several notable speakers have been brought to the member campuses via the tele-lecture. Recently, Dr. Barry Commoner, an extremely well known lecturer, spoke on "Crisis in Our Environment" to over 3100 people on 15 campuses. The American Film Institute initiated the services of the KCRCHE network by monitoring a conference call arrangement about a recent film shown among the consortium members. The director of the film was on the conference circuit for an inter-campus critique.

The tele-lecture system also provided 384 students and faculty with the opportunity of hearing an overseas speaker. Dr. Hans Kung, a German theologian, spoke on the situation of the church today. The lecture was transmitted from Germany via trans-Atlantic cable to the students of the consortium. Leroy Buffon, special representative at Southwestern Bell, sat in on the conference and said, "it was as if Dr. Kung was in the same room. The lecture was a real plus for the system."

In addition to transmitting tele-lecture programs, the network sponsors and arranges inter-college debates over its conference call facilities.

Campuses, which have unequal laboratory facilities, can share the special features of each by using a series of tele-lectures and conference arrangements. This eliminates the necessity of transporting whole sections of students from one campus to another.

According to Donna Murphy, the KCRCHE network has made an impressive contribution to education. "The network is the keystone of all cooperative activities within the Regional Council, providing to each campus ready access to human resources at other campuses in the region and in the higher education community nationally. The network has helped educators consider the telephone as an additional educational vehicle as well as a basic point-to-point communications tool. The telephone has, in fact, become an educational asset."

College "Common Markets" Growing

(By Herbert H. Wood)

With little fanfare, substantial numbers of colleges and universities have ventured voluntarily into a systematic restructuring of higher education through the development of cooperative arrangements. Where formalized, such groups are called "consortia."

Voluntary cooperation is the factor that distinguishes these associations from statewide systems of coordination imposed by legislative statute.

Still relatively new, consortia already operate in such areas as administration, faculty development, instruction, student services and community services.

By recent count, over 550 private and public colleges and universities, from the smallest to the largest, have formally associated themselves in 61 consortia, each substantial enough to have a full-time administration, two or more academic programs requiring long term financial commitment, and including three or more institutions. Less formal cooperative arrangements, estimated to number over 1,200, also continue to emerge for special projects requiring less intensive relationships.

Growth of formal consortia is recent. Of the 61 major consortia, 12 were organized in 1970. Only nine were in existence prior to 1961. Only seven states have no institutions participating in the cooperative arrangements. There is growing evidence of similar arrangements in Canada, especially Ontario and Quebec, and in Western Europe. The gradual eroding of historically based autonomy apparently is becoming an international phenomenon.

While mounting costs of operation have been a chief stimulant for colleges adopting the consortium approach. It turns out that cutting operational expenses is neither sought nor achieved as a primary goal once a consortium is under way. Joint purchasing of goods and services provides certain economies, of course, but the resulting qualitative improvements are viewed as being of greater significance. And, as expected, cooperation has its operational costs as well.

Curiously, the activities a college in financial difficulty would choose to curtail first in a retrenchment move, receive the most attention in a consortium. Illustrations are curriculum experimentation, faculty development, curriculum revision, specialized services and resources, provision of new study opportunities and the like.

Such endeavors lend themselves particularly to the cooperative arrangement. Programs that can be pursued more advantageously on an individual basis are generally not considered appropriate for consortia.

Generally the most significant impact that consortia have had may not be found in a listing of successful projects and, too often, eludes the outside observer. If restructuring, in low key, is being achieved, it is to be found in the very processes that involve the personnel of the participating colleges in generating and managing cooperative programs.

Faculty and staff interests, so often untapped in the traditional campus setting, can be brought to bear on cooperative projects by directly facing the competition and criticism of colleagues on other cooperating campuses, a member is more apt to make better proposals and plans. New approaches are not only possible but there is also much to encourage their being done well. Indeed, faculty and staff development may have become a more significant output of a consortium than the cooperative programs themselves.

Consortia have also evolved a new breed of administrator. The full-time staff director is in a unique position in higher education. Although primarily a catalyst rather than a supervisor, he has nevertheless found an important leadership role.

He works with the big picture in mind and long-range implications. His interests lie in serving all rather than any one institution. Recruited from college and university campuses, such leaders walk the thin line that the margin of institutional consensus provides.

His daily contacts take him to faculty presidents and students. With suggestions, a working paper and a followup reminder, he encourages college representatives along the approach that they feel will most generally serve the needs of the membership.

No two consortia have the same set of programs, though much borrowing goes on. In Kansas City, there is an Urban Center for undergraduate social work, in Washington, D.C., graduate students take work at several institutions; private colleges around the Great Lakes provides study abroad; a Midwest group operates a Washington office; five colleges and universities operate a joint astronomy department; a jointly owned re-

search vessel sails the Finger Lakes; industrial and research representatives are included in Dayton; a visiting lecturer series serves the colleges and universities in Virginia; a single admissions application expedites a student's admission to several art schools and in New York State a library group provides reference and research resources.

Student exchange is often seen as holding great potential in the consortium "common market." When graduate study specialization is concerned, where institutions are a short bus ride apart, or where a joint study opportunity is maintained, a modest number of students will travel to obtain a desired course, program or experience. The vision of a widespread movement of students from campus as their course interests require is not likely to be realized soon.

Ahead for consortia is more activity in coordinating experimental settings in the community for instruction, more attention to systematic development of higher education services, and the exploration of news possibilities for the January interterm.

In national affairs, the consortium is a strategic link between the institution and national and regional agencies, providing a focus for membership viewpoints and a clearinghouse for institutional participation. Some Government agency funding already shows certain preferences for cooperative projects, such as the Office Education's College Support programs.

Tomorrow's student still may register at a particular college, but he will find instructional and library resources, management systems and student services much beyond what one would have expected of that particular college in the past.

Each campus will still have its own distinctive environment and style. This will be by its own choice and not as a result of its distance from the mainstream of higher education. The reform and restructuring made possible by the consortium point not only toward more survival but also rather toward additional dimensions of quality.

THE REALISTIC DETERRENCE—INFERIORITY ACCEPTED—III

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the United States is on the defensive in the global struggle and has been since the end of World War II. This fact has important implications for our strategic force posture, especially in the nuclear age.

There are three possible force postures: superiority, parity, and inferiority, measured both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Quality can overwhelm quantity. For example, if one nation has an army of 5 million men and no tactical nuclear weapons, and another nation has an army only half that size, but equipped with these weapons of great destructive value against massed troops, then the nation with the smaller army enjoys a qualitative advantage which would probably enable it to achieve victory.

But quantity can also overwhelm quality. For example, if one nation has 1,000 ICBM missiles which are more accurate than those the other nation possesses, but the other nation has 3,000 ICBM's, by attacking on a ratio of 3 to 1 it can probably overwhelm the smaller but more accurate force.

Keeping this in mind, what do each of the three possible strategic force postures mean for the United States? Superiority means that the enemy has no chance of achieving a successful sneak attack. Our survival is assured and his destruction probable, should he launch a first strike. If deterrence fails, we are the winners.

Parity means that neither side foresees probable victory in a nuclear war. The Soviets are free to aggressively extend their operational bases and expand their empire without any real fear that the United States will dare to seriously threaten the Soviet heartland. One recent example of the results of this posture is the Soviet nuclear submarine base which has been installed in Cuba, their 900-mile-long launching platform off our south coast.

Inferiority means that a successful Soviet sneak attack become a real possibility. Because of the destructiveness of nuclear weapons, the prerequisite of nuclear attack is that the nation to be attacked must have a relatively low level of strategic nuclear power. Soviet advance has been creeping rather than blitzing for the last 20 or so years, mainly because a blitz would have resulted in their sure defeat.

When Soviet survival is not threatened the blitz is not ruled out. Czechoslovakia is a case in point. As Khrushchev pointed out, the losing side in the global struggle will certainly resort to nuclear weapons. To a Communist this means that it would, therefore, be absurd for the winning side not to use them first. They plan to win.

Being on the defensive, as we are, we have a supreme need for clear superiority in weapons systems in being, especially in advanced ABM systems to protect both our counterstrike capability and our population. The swiftness of nuclear war, coupled with the destructiveness of the weapons, means that we will not have the chance to construct the means to fight after the battle begins as we did in World War II. We must fight the entire war with the weapons available at the beginning of the war. More to the point, we must fight the entire war with those weapons remaining after the Soviet blow.

We must also understand that because we are on the defensive, the Soviets may choose the moment for attack. They can bring their forces to a point of maximum readiness prior to launch. The United States, on the other hand, has at any given time only one-third to one-half of our Polaris force on station, only a fraction of our B-52's on nuclear alert status, and a portion of our Minutemen undergoing maintenance. A surprise strike in itself, therefore, increases the relative quantity of the aggressor's forces. This increases our need for clear superiority.

The Soviets are now spending 40 to 50 percent more than we are spending on weapons research and development, which determines the quality of future weapons. They now have a deliverable megatonnage two to three times as great as ours, and recently passed us in the number of nuclear powered submarines deployed. We are slipping from uncertain parity to clear inferiority, with all that this means.

The new administration defense policy of "realistic deterrence" is not designed to reverse this situation. It is not designed to assure the United States the superiority we need to assure our survival in the nuclear age.

It might be well to write the President and advise him that you consider the first priority of Government, defense, to be identical with the first human need, survival, and request that he proceed accordingly. We cannot settle for less than a posture of superiority and assured survival.

THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam is not and never has been a U.S. war. It is and must remain a fight to be fought and won by the people of South Vietnam themselves.

The root of the present dilemma in which the United States finds itself in South Vietnam lies in the aftermath of France's defeat at Dienbienphu on May 7, 1954. Today—after 17 years, the U.S. position resembles that of France.

I hold that neither South Vietnam nor Southeast Asia is strategically important to the United States as some observers believe. I assert that the present American commitment there is far too great in relation to the United States vital interests in that area. I suggest and have done so many times in the past that the United States disengage itself from Southeast Asia.

South Vietnam is not an area of major military and industrial importance and the United States receives little economic benefit from the resources of Southeast Asia. I am of the firm belief that any future development in Southeast Asia would have little bearing on the basic U.S. defense system in the Western Pacific which is based largely upon our air and sea power.

Our withdrawal from South Vietnam can further be based on the fact the United States has no cultural, political, or ethnic bonds to the peoples of that region.

Southeast Asia may be important to such neighboring nations as Japan, Australia, and India, but that factor has been overemphasized, as evidenced by the failure of these countries to render more support to the American effort in Vietnam.

The expense of the Vietnam war has run into untold billions of dollars and has curtailed the initiation and expansion of our domestic programs which could solve, to some degree, our urban problems such as slum clearance, unemployment, expansion of health programs, and facilities, expansion of our educational facilities and study programs, aid to our aged, improving our welfare pro-

grams, and combatting our environmental problems.

I feel that it is more essential that we do what we can to improve the lot of our people than to fight a war that is unnecessary and immoral. This war should be liquidated. We cannot keep on sending our troops there when our allies troop contributions have been minimal. Britain, France, and Pakistan have remained aloof from any military role—and France takes a very critical position to American policy. Our country is exhausting human and material resources while other nations, more vitally affected by the developments in Southeast Asia watch the conflict from the sidelines.

The time has come to reverse our policy of undertaking to defend such areas as South Vietnam, whose people are reluctant to do so themselves. If we wish to supply South Vietnam with arms to continue this war, let us do so. Let us give them the means, but not our men.

We have, time and time again, explained our policy that we are helping a free government resist Communist subversion. But South Vietnam has never been a free government. In its existence its governments have been picked for it by the United States and by our heavy doses of economic and military aid.

Our present policy in Vietnam is eroding our prestige in Asia. We are losing despite the steady increase in our aid both in military arms and our manpower.

For 17 years we have tried, and failed, to attain a military victory, thus it appears that a negotiated settlement in South Vietnam is the solution we are obliged to seek. If we fail to reach a negotiated settlement, then we should turn to the UN whose charter requires that the dispute be brought before a regional organization, such as SEATO, or one of the U.N. bodies.

For several months now there was hope in the hearts of the people of our country in that we will be withdrawing our combat troops from South Vietnam and bringing them back to their homes and their loved ones. Although this hope still remains, it appears that many of our young men will have to remain in that battle-torn area for some time. While we are assured that no ground troops will be utilized in the spreading of the conflict to Cambodia and Laos, our commitment to South Vietnam remains as the South Vietnamese troops expand the war to these two areas. While the South Vietnamese are engaged in Cambodia and Laos, our American manpower must fill in the gaps of the depleted ranks of the South Vietnamese forces.

The recent news blackout on the activities in Cambodia and Laos is a travesty upon the American public. I would think that the American public, which pays the bill for this incursion into new areas of Southeast Asia, should be totally informed of what is taking place there. I ask you why was there an American news blackout when information was available to the press of nearly every country in world and news dispatches reached the American public through the back door.

This was a shameful action taken by the administration to keep us from the information that should be given out freely. This blackout was not for military reasons I am sure, for, as I stated just a minute ago, the world's press had written it up in its own press and spread it over its own news media.

I hope that we will not be faced with this situation in the future.

I have said it many times that we should restructure our priorities and give more attention to our domestic problems and withdraw from the military field. I consider the life of one American worth more than the objectives thrust upon us by the war. The United States should not be expected to jump into every fracas in the world at the cost of our youngster's lives; to stay blindly and stubbornly when bitter experience of blood and tears has shown us that this expenditure resulted in failure.

The situation in South Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia cries out for an internation solution. The problem will not be resolved in battle, but around a conference table at which all parties to this conflict will be participants.

Our hope for Southeast Asia to live in a quiet and peaceful atmosphere lies in this operation. Let us hope that the participants avail themselves of this opportunity and use it to end this conflict.

THE CONQUEST OF CANCER

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives has declared war on an elusive and dangerous killer—the dread disease cancer. With the single exception of heart ailments, cancer is responsible for more deaths in this country than any other cause, and no group is immune from its terrible effects. It strikes the young as well as the old; statistics show that it is responsible for the deaths of more children between the ages of 1 and 15 than any other other cause. It is projected that over one-quarter of the 200 million Americans alive today will develop some form of cancer, and a majority of these cases will result in death.

And statistics tell only a part of the story—for with cancer comes pain, suffering and heartache to the afflicted individual and to his loved ones.

Yet, I do not believe that we must accept these statistics as inevitable. On the contrary, if we put our minds and the vast resources of this Nation to work today—and not tomorrow—I think we can prove these projections wrong. Past years have seen a rise in the rate of cure from one in five to one in three. We must do still better.

Now is the time for America to eradicate the tragedy that cancer brings by channeling all available resources toward finding a cure. Delay means more tragedy.

We have reached a level of scientific sophistication that brings such a cure within the realm of possibility. What is required now is dedication, facilities, and a large investment of funds.

I am, therefore, proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation being introduced today—the Conquest of Cancer Act which would commit the United States to a massive and systematic attack on cancer through the establishment of a National Cancer Authority as an independent agency within the Federal Government. It would have the same absolute jurisdiction over the cure and control of cancer as the National Aeronautics and Space Agency has over the conquest of space.

The Authority would carry out such work as the expansion and coordination of research, including the encouragement of research by other groups that have the proper facilities. It would collect, analyze, and disseminate all data useful in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer. At present, even so seemingly elementary a need as comprehensive statistics on the incidence and the type of cancer most prevalent in a particular area are lacking. If such statistics were made available, improved diagnosis and detection of cancer would follow.

The Authority would establish and support the large scale production of materials needed for research, and would acquire, operate, and maintain comprehensive cancer centers for research, teaching, and for the development of the best methods of treatment.

I am happy to note that the statement of purpose is accompanied by a large authorization to translate these words into a series of effective programs. The bill provides for a $400 million authorization for immediate research with increases of up to $1 billion per year.

I believe that Congress must take the initiative in improving the health of our citizens. Presidential action in the area of health has led to a series of cutbacks in money and services—the National Heart Institute, the closing of Public Health Service hospitals, vetoing of hospital construction and family medicine programs. Somehow the President seems to believe that good health is fiscally irresponsible.

I hold, on the other hand, that this Nation can ill afford not to spend more money for health. I am, therefore, calling upon this Congress to take strong and immediate action so that the challenge of this dread disease will be met, and our citizens will be the victors.

HOOVER TURNS SPOTLIGHT ON INDULGENT JUDGES

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a doubt in anyone's mind that a fair portion of the blame associated with the Nation's rising incidence of serious crimes in the past few years may be di-

rectly attributed to judges and parole boards, that doubt should be dispelled by the recent revelations of the venerable J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director. His critics, of course, are the same ones who would threaten to shoot police who enter on a no-knock warrant, propagandize the news media with claims of police brutality, and literally bend over backward to advance the rights of individual defendants who have thumbed their noses at the police and the courts while victimizing the society that plaintively demands more protection.

In the current issue of the FBI Bulletin, Mr. Hoover documents a few of the more blatant cases of judicial softheadedness and, as a result of an FBI followup survey of some 19,000 offenders who were released in 1963, reveals a shocking record allowed by those who are entrusted with the responsibility of administering the Federal criminal justice system. Enough attention has been diverted to the faults of the system and Mr. Hoover is to be commended for putting the serious problems of criminal justice into a more proper perspective by focusing on the personnel who operate that system.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, addressing himself to this point in his Evening Star column of January 30, 1971, writes:

HOOVER TURNS SPOTLIGHT ON INDULGENT JUDGES

Old J. Edgar Hoover, long a clay pigeon for professional libertarians, has brought one up from the floor in the current issue of the FBI Bulletin.

From the files of the bureau he has collected a few gaudy examples of soft-headedness among some judges and parole boards which help explain why once-safe cities have become jungles and why citizens who used to stroll the streets in the evenings now barricade themselves in their homes.

Most disturbing, we now have on the bench some judges who are patently hostile to police.

One such character, according to Hoover, not long ago announced that he would hand out a light sentence to any defendant claiming mistreatment by police. The judge insisted on no corroborating evidence. He appeared perfectly willing to damn the police by hearsay.

One young thug, previously convicted of car theft, assault and attempted rape of a child, was captured after a gun battle following an attempted jewelry store holdup. Three policemen were injured.

But when the captive complained that the police had roughed him up, this judge sentenced him to two years probation, conditioned on his getting treatment for drug addiction. When the narcotics institution refused to accept him on the grounds that he could not be rehabilitated, the judge let him go.

This same judge gave a five to seven-year term to another hoodlum who beat a 75-year-old woman to death in a $5 street robbery. The judge explained the light sentence on the grounds that if the woman had been young and healthy she would probably have survived the beating and that, hence, it really wasn't murder.

A man arrested after an unsuccessful attempt to hijack an airliner was ruled by another judge as insane at the time of the attempt but sane for the trial. The court ordered the jury to turn him loose.

In a western state a man with a 40-year criminal record was sentenced to life in 1959 as a habitual criminal. Released after only eight years, he was picked up for a hit-and-run accident and given 30 days. Shortly thereafter, while on bond for a new armed robbery charge, he killed a police officer. He was finally given 20 years—much less than his 1959 sentence.

An appeals court in an eastern city freed an alleged burglar because, it said, the lower court had erred in not telling the defendant his trial could proceed without him. The defendant, who had been convicted 20 times in 33 years, had ignored two summonses to show up for trial. His excuse was that he had been depressed and gotten drunk.

A 6-foot 2 inch 185-pound youth, guilty of rape at gunpoint, attempted rape, robbery and assaulting arresting officers, was remanded to juvenile court because he was 16—right along with youngsters who break windows.

The FBI has followed up 19,000 offenders released from the federal criminal justice system in the year 1963. Of those put on probation, 57 percent had been arrested for new crimes within the next six years; of those paroled, 63 percent. Of youths under 20 released from federal custody in 1963, 74 percent had been rearrested by 1969.

Much is being said these days about the inadequacy of our prisons. They surely are. They are usually overcrowded, outmoded, overgloomy, understaffed, lacking adequate schooling and job-training and short on psychiatry and counseling.

But they are vastly better, in general, than any prisons we ever had in the past. And if life is less secure in America now than it was when we had worse jails and penitentiaries, if increasing numbers of innocent citizens are preyed upon by the benficiaries of a generation of juvenile courts, hair-trigger parole boards and maudlin judges, let's not overblame the prisons. The locked-up prisoner is no menace. The unrepentant released prisoner is.

Says Hoover:

"In today's society one of the most privileged of creatures is the repeating offender, prematurely released time and again, free to abuse parole, probation and bail privileges while wreaking havoc upon law-abiding citizens.

"We have sunk into this morass through a distortion of human values. We have forgotten history's lesson that law, order and justice exist only when personal liberty is balanced with individual responsibility, that public welfare must take precedence over private privilege."

Amen!

STATE OF UNION MESSAGE: CONSTRUCTIVE, FAR REACHING

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon in his excellent state of the Union message presented 6 great goals aimed at closing the gap between promise and performance in American Government. I include the following constructive analysis and comment regarding the President's message from the editorial opinion page of the Wichita Eagle and the Beacon, Wichita, Kans. It is a realistic appraisal deserving of attention by Members of the House. The editorial follows:

STATE OF UNION MESSAGE: CONSTRUCTIVE, FAR REACHING

The "experts" are busy dissecting the President's State of the Union message, but even the most critical cannot deny that this was Richard Nixon at his best.

Speaking to Congress and the nation Friday night, the President presented the blueprint for a reorganization of government and a reallocation of federal funds and priorities that can vastly improve the operation of the governmental process, both in Washington and in every state.

President Nixon, halfway through his first term in office, obviously is hoping to make his next two years constructive and memorable ones in the history of the United States. Neatly outlined and explained in this long text are the plans the President and his advisors have carefully built over the past months. They're beautiful.

In addition to government reorganization and reallocation of funds, Mr. Nixon proposes passage of more than 35 pieces of legislation left over from the last Congress, including reform of the welfare system by placing an income floor beneath every family with children; achieving "full prosperity in peacetime" by approving an "expansionary budget," restoring and enhancing the natural environment through a system of "strong initiatives" which he did not further explain, and improve America's health care, especially for the poor, by pumping in new funds, increasing the number of doctors, improving delivery of health services, and encouraging better preventive medicine. Included is a $100 million campaign to find a cure for cancer.

It is obvious that the executive branch in Washington needs real reform and recognition. The President proposes a startling change—to create four new departments. One, the Department of Economic Development, would combine the present Departments of Labor, Agriculture, Commerce and Transportation. The others would be Departments of Housing and Community Development, Human Resources and Natural Resources. These would be built around, respectively, the present Departments of Housing and Urban Development; Health, Education and Welfare; and Interior. In doing this he would reduce the number of cabinet posts from 12 to eight.

On paper, this looks promising. The work of the new departments could, presumably, be more clearly defined. Now, the authority of old departments sometimes laps over that granted newer ones like HEW and HUD, with resulting confusion and in-fighting. The proposed new departments emphasize the increasing interest in upgrading the environment and enhancing the quality of life for all citizens.

But it won't be easy. Anyone who remembers the bloodletting when the old military departments were combined into the big Department of Defense will concur. In our own farm belt, there will be many farmers vehemently opposed to losing the Department of Agriculture, even though farming, as a major business, probably should be considered at a cabinet level along with other facets of the economy.

Another major part of the President's address concerned revenue sharing. This was a promise made when he was campaigning for President, and he now is ready to try to keep it.

Here, too, he makes good sense. This is progress. It would reduce the flow of dollars into Washington bureaus, and let the people have some of their federal tax dollars back, some $16 billion, without strings, to spend on programs at home.

This is another change that won't be simple, however. Having our tax money spent at the discretion of state and local governments, instead of federal officials, doesn't mean that the real interests of the people will be served automatically. Local governments have often been blind and callous about real local needs, preferring to dispense tax money according to a century-old philosophy ignoring human needs and environmental needs.

Revenue-sharing is going to put a greater burden on the voter back home. He's going to have to know what good city, county and state government is, and he's going to have to vote into office the people who will provide good local and state government.

Certainly, in his six goals, the President has dealt with most of America's most pressing domestic problems—the poor, the ecology, the national health, the return of the power of money from Washington to the local level, the mushrooming federal bureaucracy, and a return to prosperity in peacetime, which as he said, this country has not enjoyed since 1957.

Moreover, they are programs that will be popular for the most part with the voting public if not in every case with officialdom, and Mr. Nixon appears in conceiving the program to have virtually assured that whatever becomes of the proposals, he will emerge strengthened in the presidential campaign.

If Congress buys most of the program many people will approve of the various new benefits. If it doesn't, there will be lots of campaign ammunition for 1972.

He mentioned no pricetag for his package, but it is plain that it will be large. If we can shed ourselves of a significant portion of the cost of the Vietnam operation, and if the federal reorganization results in any important saving, the cost may not be burdensome, and certainly what the programs will be buying will benefit Americans far more than many federal expenditures of the past have done.

STATE OF THE JUDICIARY

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, in the 91st Congress, I introduced legislation along with my colleague from Illinois, Mr. McCLORY, requesting the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court to address a joint session of Congress on the state of the judiciary. Today, I would like to have reintroduced the same legislation for consideration by the 92d Congress.

Members of Congress are well aware of the criticism and controversy that surround the courts of our country. We have all heard or said the truism that "justice delayed is justice denied," but delay and congestion in our Federal courts continue to grow.

Delay and backlog have most undesirable effects: witnesses give up in frustration after numerous cancelled court appearances; jurors despair waiting endless hours only to go home without having fulfilled their civic duty; litigants often give up in frustration or settle for less because they cannot wait for the court to act. Too often, congestion and delay become excuses for inaction rather than focal points for reform. It is the duty of Congress not only to improve and expedite Federal justice, but also initiate innovative procedures to assist the courts in handling their problems. Our overall purpose must be to quicken the pace of justice without impairing the quality of judicial output.

For these reasons I introduced legislation requiring the Chief Justice of the United States, from time to time, to present to the Congress and the country a realistic appraisal of the state of the judiciary. This, I believe, would spotlight current and long-range problems and motivate the Congress to effective action.

I am of the opinion that the time has arrived when the problems of our judicial system should be presented to the Congress and to the country by our highest ranking judicial official. Such an address would be a dignified approach from the head of one of the coordinate branches of the Government to the branch responsible for its legislation and appropriations.

The intent and purpose of this legislation is not to demand that the Chief Justice appear before the joint session of Congress annually, but rather require the head of our judicial branch of Government, with all the prestige and wisdom of that office, to address Congress and the Nation, at his discretion, on the needs and problems of our courts. I am of the opinion that such information is of paramount importance and should come from the highest level.

I see no constitutional problem with the separation of powers between the legislative and judicial branches of Government. On the contrary, article III of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to "ordain and establish" the lower Federal courts and each year the Appropriation Committees of Congress consider legislation to fund all the Federal courts. On June 2, 1970, our President signed into law legislation creating 61 new judgeships. On January 5, 1971, our President signed into law legislation, which I introduced, along with the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that would establish throughout our Federal judiciary a system of court executives to assist our judges with their nonjudicial responsibilities.

The Congress has created, by statute, the Judicial Conference of the United States (28 U.S.C. 331) wherein we require the Chief Justice of the United States to summon annually certain lower court judges to a conference. In this same law we require the Chief Justice to submit to Congress an annual report of the proceedings of the judicial conference and its recommendations for legislation. No one has suggested that this section of the United States Code is in violation of the separation of power doctrine. Indeed, anyone familiar with the function of this particular body realizes its importance to the Congress and to the effective operation of our judicial system. My bill would not, in any way, change what is presently being done under title 28, United States Code, section 311, it would merely require the Chief Justice, from time to time, at his discretion, to address a joint session of Congress.

STATE OF THE JUDICIARY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. McCULLOCH, in reintroducing legislation which would require the Chief Justice of the United States to address a joint session of Congress from time to time on the state of the judiciary.

Together with the vast majority of my colleagues in this great body, I feel a sense of urgency with respect to the problems facing the judicial machinery of the Federal Government. Congress can not ignore these problems insofar as it possesses the authority to deal with them under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 30 years we have seen the jurisdiction of our Federal courts greatly expanded through legislation and through Federal court decisions. Now we hear of congestion, frustration and confusion in the halls of justice accompanied by a drastic increase in the national crime rate. As the present Chief Justice pointed out to the American Bar Association in August of 1970, our present judicial system is "cracker-barrel justice in a supermarket world."

Mr. Speaker, we can expect to receive constructive suggestions from the Chief Justice, and I believe sincerely that they should be given to the Congress firsthand.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt and careful consideration by the House Judiciary Committee of this proposal which the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McCULLOCH, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and I have introduced today. Thereafter, I hope that the committee and this House will express their overwhelming approval.

MAKING THE "DUST BOWL" BLOOM

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Congress has long been aware of the wide range of benefits of irrigation projects and has authorized many of them throughout the country through programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Engineers. But a recent article of Universal Science News which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner on January 10 particularly intrigued me when it suggested that irrigation has so changed the weather in the Central United States that the conditions which brought about the terrible dust bowl of the thirties will not happen again. We can easily recognize the many tangible rewards of these projects to the local economy and social life, but we have long failed to include in our evaluation many results which improve the life of our people. If the theory suggested by Mr. Lothar Joos of the Environmental Data Service proves to be true, then the benefits of these projects may have a value beyond calculation. The article follows:

MAKING THE "DUST BOWL" BLOOM

UNIVERSAL SCIENCE NEWS 1971

KANSAS CITY, MO.—Man is changing the weather in the central U.S., and because of what he has done Dust Bowl states will never

be threatened by drought again, according to a Weather Bureau researcher here.

Lothar Joos, regional climatologist with the Environmental Data Service, says statistics show that Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado and Nebraska are experiencing man-made climatic changes responsible for an increase in rainfall since 1955. This increase, he believes, precludes the recurrence of the devastating droughts of the middle 1930s.

Joos theorizes that the increased rainfall is due to irrigation. Water covering over 11 million acres in those five states increases the amount of water vapor that enters the atmosphere, he maintains. This vapor contains heat energy which initiates rainstorms, or adds power to those already forming.

"We're uncovering increasing statistical evidence that man actually is affecting the weather," Joos says. "But a 15-year wet spell doesn't seem to be long enough to convince most meteorologists. What I wonder is how long a spell it has to be before others will admit climatic change is taking place."

A candid, affable fellow, the climatologist began studying the Dust Bowl when he was transferred to Kansas City three years ago. As a young man, he remembered the devastating days when a three-year drought turned fertile top soil into huge black clouds of powder.

To residents of the drought area, this meant enduring sunless days when dust reduced visibility to zero, all traffic halted, the Red Cross recruited volunteers to make cotton face masks, and what physicians called "dust pneumonia" was rampant.

"I lived in Wisconsin then," Joos recalls. "The dust was so fine and remained airborne for so long it blew into our homes 500 or more miles away."

By the end of the drought, nearly 100 million acres of farmland had been denuded by daily 20 to 30-mile-an-hour winds.

When Joos moved to Kansas City he decided to take a car trip through the Dust Bowl to refresh his memory of those miserable years. He was surprised to find it had become one of the nation's largest garden and agricultural areas.

"I was genuinely puzzled," he says. "I was expecting to see miles of dust and sand and all I saw were large fields of crops."

To explain the change, Joos began collecting data on the area.

He concludes that new agricultural practices, innovations in machinery and new tilling methods have played a part in the comeback of the Dust Bowl. But something else changed too. Joos discovered that the average rainfall of the area—20 inches a year—has increased 10 to 40 per cent since 1955.

Joos also found that the precipitation increases were most prominent during June and July—usually the driest months and therefore the time of highest irrigation activity.

There were local exceptions to the increase in rainfall. Rather severe drought conditions prevailed, especially in Texas, during the late 50s and early 60s, but Joos says this period was by no means comparable to the Dust Bowl days.

Since World War II, the total acreage under irrigation in the area has increased ten fold, to 11.4 million acres, Joos estimates. When land is irrigated, the surface temperature drops. In this case, a drop of 12 degrees C. produced heavier air and reduced surface wind speeds, the climate researcher believes.

"My theory only holds true during light wind periods," he adds.

In addition, irrigation darkens soil, thus increasing its ability to soak up sunlight. Joos calculated that there is a 15 per cent increase in the amount of solar energy absorbed by wet versus dry ground, and this additional energy goes into evaporation of the irrigation water. The more water available, the quicker soil and crops release water vapor into the atmosphere.

Each grain of water vapor carries with it 580 calories of heat energy, Joos says. This heat is released when the vapor rises to higher, cooler layers of the atmosphere and condenses into rain or snow. Release of the heat increases the instability of the atmosphere and promotes rain. Joos emphasizes that it is the energy released from the water vapor, not the water vapor itself, that can either initiate a thunderstorm or add vigor to those storms already forming.

ENERGY SHORTAGE BRINGS POWER CUTBACKS

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the current cold snap has brought a measurable curtailment in available power in the Washington, D.C. and New York City areas.

The Potomac Electric Power Co. Tuesday reduced by 5 percent its power available to customers here while New York City suffered a similar cutback for the second day.

The action comes as no surprise. It has long been predicted that an extended period of cold this winter would bring these brownouts.

The reasons given for the shortages are several.

Pepco says power is short because of a combination of planned and unplanned shutdowns, coupled with increased use of electricity brought on by the cold.

According to press reports, a spokesman for Pepco said the situation is not unique to this area. Mr. N. Eugene Otto is quoted as saying—

> The same conditions exist up and down the coast in the Northeast. This is nothing new.

Unfortunately it is not new.

Unfortunately it is the rule rather than the exception and nothing very much is being done to alleviate the threat of continued brownouts or blackouts in the future.

Tuesday's curtailment of power in New York City was the sixth voltage cutback there in the past 16 days.

The press and media also have reported very discouraging news concerning negotiations between international oil companies and the Persian Gulf producing states. Discussions on a new agreement have apparently broken down which could spell profound adversity for Western oil supplies.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of energy sources and resources in this Nation continues to grow. Today's occasional power shortages are going to become tomorrow's commonplace occurrences unless something is done to untangle this mess and launch some rational policy in regard to the production and consumption of power in America.

For this reason I have introduced House Resolution 155 to establish a Select House Committee to study the energy resources of the United States. The intent of the investigation is not to "witch hunt" or to seek some scapegoat at which to point the finger of blame. Rather, it is my belief that the study should dismantle the problem piece by piece and recommend appropriate legislation which will protect the power consumer's interest, assure an ample and dependable supply of power and provide incentive to the power industry to meet our Nation's growing power needs.

COPE TOPS CAMPAIGN DONORS' LIST

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, we hear and read a lot of nonsense about the rich Republicans and the poor Democrats and how we outspend them 3 to 1 or 5 to 1 or 10 to 1 in election campaigns.

Even though this is nonsense, it is hard to cut through the myth and get the point across. One reason is that the Democrats use as a poverty front a bankrupt national committee, while funneling money and other aid to candidates through organized labor's COPE organizations, through special fundraising and dispensing operations like the McGovern committee, like the Committee for an Effective Congress, and like SANE and other leftwing groups that claim to represent the peace fronts, the ecology, and whatever else they may think up.

The Associated Press' James Polk disclosed at least the tip of the Democrat's financial iceberg in the attached story in the Washington Sunday Star of January 17.

The article follows:

PEACE GROUP IS CLOSE SECOND: COPE TOPS CAMPAIGN DONORS' LIST

(By James R. Polk)

Unions, peace groups, doctors, businessmen and dairy farmers top a list of special interest groups that poured $7 million into the 1970 political races—mostly to Democrats.

The biggest of the spenders was the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education, which put nearly $11 million into the campaigns.

Close behind among organizations filing with Congress was a new peace group, the 1970 Campaign Fund, organized by Sen. George McGovern, D—S.D., to help liberal colleagues in Senate fights.

Year-end statements show that Democrats bulwarked by money from labor unions and anti-war funds ran up a 3-to-1 edge in contributions from the big-spending groups.

This advantage for the Democrats offset the GOP bulge in traditional national party spending. The Republican national campaign committees for Senate and House races outspent their Democratic counterparts $4 million to $1 million last fall.

State party organizations are not required to report their spending to Congress.

Compiled from the campaign spending reports that national political committees must file with the clerk of the House, the top 10 special interest groups for 1970 include:

1. COPE—$967,328.

COPE's largest outlay, $31,522, went into the re-election race of Sen. Harrison A. Williams, D-N.J. When Congress comes back

this week, Williams will take over as chairman of the Senate Labor Committee.

2. 1970 Campaign Fund—$853,244.

McGoverns' new peace fund was so successful in its first year that it put more money into Democratic Senate races than the party's own Senate campaign organization could raise.

CREDITS FOR 1972

More than half the candidates backed by the fund won, which may mean 1972 political IOU's for darkhorse presidential hopeful McGovern. The fund's main contributions included $70,000 for new Sen. John V. Tunney, D-Calif., and $56,000 each for Sen. Frank E. Moss, D-Utah, and defeated Sen. Albert Gore, D-Tenn.

3. Machinists—$723,010.

The Machinists Non-Partisan League put $404,000 into political races through its general fund and spent another $319,000 out of its educational fund. The main donations went to Democratic Senate candidates including Tunney, Williams, and Gore.

4. National Committee for an Effective Congress—$695,501.

Tunney, at $33,000, also topped the list of candidates helped by the NCEC, a liberal fund which gave heavily to 19 Democratic Senate races. Its candidates won 11 races.

5. American Medical—$693,412.

The American Medical Political Action Committee, a doctors' fund, channeled its spending through state affiliates and kept secret the names of the candidates who got the money. Most of them apparently were Republicans. The biggest sums went to California and Indiana.

6. Business-Industry—$539,156.

OFFSHOOT OF NAM

The Business-Industry Political Action Committee, an offshoot of the National Association of Manufacturers, backed Republicans in 16 Senate races but also shelled out money for conservative Democrat Lloyd Bentsen in Texas and independent Sen. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia. The businessmen broke even on their Senate investments, with winners in 9 of 18 contests.

7. Seafarers—$422,649.

Despite a federal indictment for illegal campaign contributions in the 1968 race, the Seafarers Political Activity Donation Committee found congressmen still accepting its money.

The Seafarers group gave to 109 House races, and backed winners—usually incumbents—in roughly 100 of them.

Included was $3,000 for Rep. Edward A. Garnatz, D-Md., the chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, who was unopposed for re-election. Garnatz' committee oversees the government subsidies which pay a large portion of seamen's wages.

8. Conservative Victory Fund—$376,630.

The total spent by the conservative group isn't known yet because its treasurer, Lammot Copeland Jr., the DuPont heir who recently filed in bankruptcy court, has not filed the year-end report required by law. But, in spending through October, the Senate losers backed by the fund outnumbered the winners, 2 to 1.

9. Milk Producers—$368,851.

The Trust for Agricultural Political Education, a new fund financed by milk producers, is one of the few large groups making genuine bipartisan donations—sometimes to two candidates in the same race. "We hope to have a friend no matter which one is up there in Washington," said a milk official.

Its donations included $5,000 for the unopposed chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, W. R. Poage, D-Tex.

10. Steelworkers—$307,401.

The United Steelworkers of America Voluntary Political Action Fund chose Democrats in every Senate race it entered. The top outlay of $18,000 went to Howard Metzenbaum, a close loser in Ohio.

THE COYNE ELECTRICAL SCHOOL

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I woul i like to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter which I have received from one of my constituents regarding the Coyne Electrical School in Boston, Mass. The Coyne School i. a private trade school which has made significant contributions in the field of vocational education as detailed in the letter from Mr. Francis J. Hickey, Jr.

The letter follows:

JAN. 24, 1971.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MACDONALD: I am grateful for your commending me on my work in vocational education in your letter of December 17th. I am proud of the acknowledgement. The satisfaction stemming from my position as guidance counselor is, I would imagine, the same type of fee'ing you, Representative Macdonald, experience in your line of endeavor.

As an avid reader of the Congressional Record, the articles, speeches, etc. never fail to captivate my attention. Every year intermittently attention is focused on some very worthwhile theme such as education. Specifically, what always interests me is the support, moral and financial, for vocational education because there is a prediction now for the dire need of technicians there will be, judging from the need there is today for them.

For three quarters of a century Coyne Electrical School traditionally has taught and practically trained men exclusively for the constantly growing electrical industries and professional engineers. Just as enthused and confident as I am about the great future for the man with an electrical skill is the entire instructional staff and student body as is evident in these men who will spare no effort—on the part of the instructional staff to impart their knowledge, as on the part of the students who are eager to take advantage of the low instructor-student ratio.

The Coyne Electrical School as established in 1896 by James Coyne, widely known engineer. Mr. Coyne attained world-wide fame as an engineer and educator. His firm beliefs then, still followed today, that only by practical methods of teaching can the graduates enter into the employment markets qualified to assume responsible occupations have stood the test for three quarters of a century. This is fractually attested to by the thousands of Coyne graduates in skilled substantially paying positions with security and an opportunity to grow. Many are in a business or professional firm of their own.

While training at Coyne Electrical School takes in both theory and practice, our methods are quite different from the ordinary school where electricity is merely included as part of a technical course.

At Coyne Electrical School we teach electricity, layout, design, planning and estimating exclusively. No other unrelated subjects that have no direct bearing, take up time for homework, classroom, and examinations are given.

Concentrated instruction on the basis of a full week in class followed by a full week in shop gives the student a better understanding than a system of classroom periods of one hour each and moving from one subject to another

The course offered at Coyne Electrical School is intended for beginners without special regard for prior educational programs It also is taken by men engaged in some phase of the electrical or industrial areas where additional training is essential to the broadening of their knowledge and experience

As a consequence, motivation—a definite desire on the part of the prospective student to enter into the phenomenal growth of electrical energy in America—is vitally important.

The applicant should be inspired, eager, confident to enter into the many branches of the electrical industry from the electrician to the major utility because electric power and electronic devices constitute the heart and life line of any industrial plant, commercial building, automation, and the economy of our nation.

Opportunities are galore with new ones arriving constantly—in public construction, automation, computers, modern lighting, all phases of industrial electronic applications, shopping centers, school expansion, efficient all electric living, all electric heating for homes, industry, schools, commercial buildings, etc.

With pride we point to the achievement of one of our own graduates, Milton Eisenhauer, Coyne 1962, who directed a 15-man team working on audio configuration for the Apollo 11 moon shot.

Coyne Electrical School since its date of establishment has aggressively and closely worked with the employment market and industry and has over the years maintained an enviable record of placement. A special catalogue is available on request.

Employer interviews are made at the school and because of Coyne practical training it is not difficult for the prospective employer to evaluate the students' qualities.

I wish you, Representative Macdonald, every good measure of success in the ninety-second Congresional session. I hope that this will be another banner year for you in enhancing the cause of education, particularly for the skill-minded students, who very much desire to further their education after high school.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS J. HICKEY, Jr.,
Medford, Mass.

SOUTH FLORIDA EDITOR PRAISES MEXICAN PRESIDENT

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from Diario as Americas was recently brought to my attention, which I feel points out the route Latin governments should consider following in the years ahead if we are to jointly strengthen our hemisphere against the ever-increasing danger of international communism.

Mr. Horacio Aguirre, who has been editor of this outstanding Spanish-American daily since 1953, points out in this current editorial that Mexico's new President Lic. Luis Echeverria has emphasized the necessity of strengthening the functions of democracy as a way to confront totalitarianism and dictatorships of every kind in the Americas.

The Aguirre brothers, Horacio and Francisco, have long been proponents of a free press and free governments for their Latin brethren and this editorial, which follows, depicts the continuous

crusade Diario Las Americas espouses to keep our hemisphere free of Communist domination.

Diario Las Americas, is published in south Florida, and has been for years a key spokesman for democracy. It is well recognized as a spokesman for free government, and is circulated widely throughout the Americas.

With the advent of the pro-Communist President in Chile and Fidel Castro in Cuba, there is no doubt that more and more effort must be placed on supporting the true advocates of democracy.

I compliment the Aguirre brothers on their stands to strengthen the true democratic governments and hope that their works on behalf of President Lic. Luis Echeverria will be heeded throughout the Americas. Viva, Mexico and may she be the model for free government we can all be proud of in the Western Hemisphere.

The following is Mr. Aguirre's editorial:

LUIS ECHEVERRIA AND THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY IN THE AMERICAS

Mexico's President elect, Lic. Luis Echeverria, who starting on December 1st of this year will discharge the high office of Mexican Chief of State for six years, has emphasized, in statements made in Washington after his meeting with President Nixon, the necessity of strengthening the functioning of democracy as a way to confront totalitarianism and dictatorships of every kind.

Lic. Echeverria was categorical when he referred to representative democracy. He probably wanted to avoid confusions regarding what some dictators do in the Americas in the sense of filling up any public square and claiming that with a few yells, democracy has just expressed itself there in favor of this or that thesis. President elect Echeverria advocated for the strengthening of the democratic institutions with representative elections and with the three classical powers: the Executive, the Legislative and the Judicial, and he also mentioned freedom of the press, as conditions for the existence of a democratic regime.

Therefore, within this ideological conception of President elect Echeverria, there is no room for Fidel Castro's communist dictatorship nor for any other dictatorship that violates democracy and human dignity.

Let us hope that throughout the Americas there is a renovation and reiteration of the desire to strengthen the democratic institutions, so endangered now, especially by international communism. Without it being possible to say absolutely that the prevalence of democracy closes the doors to communist aggression and subversion, because experience shows that this is not so, it is clear that the functioning of the democratic system encourages the people to defend it. Furthermore, with the functioning of democracy are elminated the justified popular reactions against arbitrary political regimes and, above all, of prolonged duration through the discredit re-elections.

The absence of democratic methods in the government creates conditions of civic rebelliousness that nowadays are cleverly taken advantage of by the communists to infiltrate in the movements of a republican inspiration. That is why one of the ways to fight against communism is by strengthening democracy in the Americas.

From the Mexican presidency, through the international influence that that nation might exert, Lic. Echeverria can contribute to strengthen the functioning of representative democracy in the Americas as a way of defending the liberty and dignity of our peoples.

FADING MYTHS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have pointed out some of the fables and myths that have surrounded the F-111 program. "Accident prone" is a favorite stated with a frequency that is matched only by its inaccuracy. Myths do persist, but hopefully, for the good of the country, they are not immortal. To hasten the demise of this particular one, I insert in the RECORD the safety record of the F-111 at 70,000 flying hours as it compares to those of our other modern fighter bomber type aircraft:

COMPARISON OF ACCIDENTS AT 70,000 FLIGHT HOURS

	F-100	F-104	F-102	F-101	F-105	F4B	F-106	F-111
Major accidents	65	55	48	39	39	34	29	20
Destroyed aircraft	30	40	22	20	29	15	15	13

THE BIG THICKET OF TEXAS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill that would create a Big Thicket National Park in Texas. This is the same bill that was introduced by Senator Yarborough in the 91st Congress and has been reintroduced by Senator LLOYD BENTSEN in the 92d Congress.

This bill passed the Senate too late last session for House consideration, but hopefully it will be agreed to quickly by both the House and Senate early in this session.

I commend both Senators Yarborough and BENTSEN for their work on this bill. Especially Senator Yarborough for the years he has invested in this great, but vanishing wilderness. The bill calls for establishing a national park of up to 100,000 acres in five counties in southeast Texas.

The area known as the Big Thicket is one of the last great wildernesses, but it is diminishing fast. Congress must act quickly to save this area that is often referred to as an environmental laboratory, and the "Biological Crossroads of North America."

The Big Thicket is both a preserve and a recreational area. There are several waterways in the wilderness that provide opportunity for water recreation. Also it is a paradise for campers.

Mr. Speaker at one time the area known as the Big Thicket covered over 3 million acres. But now that area has diminished to 300,000 acres. Time is of the essence in passing this bill and saving this beautiful wilderness.

Our colleague JOHN DOWDY had sponsored last year another version of the Big Thicket which lies in his congressional district.

I believe his version would entail a smaller area to be reserved; the bill I have endorsed would commit an area up to 100,000 acres.

It seems to me that the area of disagreement is one which we can work out in the public interest, and I certainly will work with our colleaguess to find a suitable answer. The main thing is we preserve the Big Thicket area.

U.S. NUCLEAR ROCKET PROGRAMS—NERVA

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I include the following:

U.S. NUCLEAR ROCKET PROGRAM—NERVA

A long range program that has demonstrated outstanding progress. The U.S. cannot afford to fall behind in any major field of technology.

Its aim is to break the basic limiting constraint on future space flight—both unmanned and manned—thus providing greater economy and range of utility.

Other high thrust chemical space propulsion systems are limited to about 460 ISP (specific impulse, which is push per pound measured in pounds of fuel burned).

Nuclear propulsion is the only known method of breaking this limitation.

NERVA engine already has demonstrated 825 ISP in experimental tests and has growth potential to about 950 ISP.

Current program leads to a reusable nuclear stage for advanced space missions in the early 1980's (unmanned or manned).

NERVA engine development in the 1970's will permit preservation of wide range of mission options—both scientific and military, unmanned and manned—in the 1980's.

Essential that we move ahead on such significant advancements at reasonable pace even in a constrained budget period. This is particularly important in a limited but balanced program where no Apollo-type mission is underway to pull advances with it.

PRIMARY NERVA ENGINE REQUIREMENTS

Thrust: 75,000 lbs.

Specific impulse: 825 seconds.

Mission duration: Reusable.

Reliability: 0.995.

Reactor size and weight: Similar to Phoebus-1 and NRX-A reactors.

Additional features: Shielding; man-rating; startup and shutdown constraints; transportability, and maintainability and storability; contingency operation.

NERVA MISSION CAPABILITY

Missions and NERVA capability

Lunar and synchronous-orbit logistics: NERVA increases delivered payload or substantially lowers cost compared to any new chemical rocket designed for this purpose.

Automated planetary surface exploration: NERVA delivers very meaningful payloads permitting large areas of exploration and re-

turning large samples to Earth for Mars, Venus, Mercury and asteroid missions. No existing vehicle can approach such exploration.

Fast planetary orbiters: NERVA delivers a wide range of payloads in very short trip times. Even nuclear-electric systems not available would take longer time at same cost. For example, NERVA could cut trip time to Jupiter from 800–1000 days to 450 days. Similar benefits can be achieved for Mercury and Saturn.

Fast outer-planet probes: NERVA delivers large payloads in shorter trip times than can be achieved even with advanced nuclear-electric propulsion.

NUCLEAR ROCKET HISTORY AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Technology program started in 1955.

NERVA phase started in 1961.

Total funding 1955–1971:

	Million
NASA	554
AEC	848
Total	1,402

Fiscal year 1971 funding levels:

	Million
NASA	38.0
AEC	42.9

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENT TO DATE

Demonstrated 825 Isp in flight type reactor system.

Demonstrated 60 minutes operation in a full power reactor test of 50,000 pounds thrust, and 10 hours of fuel operation in the laboratory.

During 60 minutes test at 50,000 pounds full thrust, there were 10 stops or shut downs and restarts as scheduled.

Demonstrated all other operational features necessary to a high performance propulsion system, including ability to start and stop at will, stability, and wide range of operating modes.

Already built up unique test facilities.

Built up a uniquely capable government-industry team to conduct the program—now in being.

Flight engine baseline design completed right on schedule.

PRINCIPAL NUCLEAR ROCKET PROGRAM CONTRACTORS AND FACILITIES

Westinghouse (largely Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) funds):

Responsibility: NERVA Reactor Development (Subcontractor to Aerojet).

Plant: Large, Pa.; Cheswick, Pa.; Waltz Mill, Pa.

Current employment: 910 (Direct and indirect).

Current annual funding level: $23.9M [1].

Aerojet General (largely NASA funds):

Responsibility: NERVA engine development.

Plant: Sacramento, Calif.

Current employment: 796 (direct and indirect).

Current annual funding level: $32.0M [1].

Nuclear rocket development station:

Function: Test station for conducting tests of nuclear rocket reactors, engines, and certain other engine components.

Investment: $120 million.

Current employment: 491 [2].

[1] These figures include NERVA activities supporting the major contractors so that not all of these funds go to the contractors.

[2] Aerojet and Westinghouse employment of 148 at nuclear rocket development station included in this figure and also included above.

Contractors: Aerojet, Westinghouse, Pan American (site and test support), EG&G (Electronics support), Catalytic Corp. (Construction management).

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory (AEC funds):

Responsibility: Fuel element and reactor materials development in support of NERVA Advanced Nuclear Rocket Concepts.

Location: Los Alamos, New Mexico.

Current employment: 337.

Current annual funding level: $16M.

NERVA FUTURE—PROCEEDING IN FISCAL YEAR 1972 WITH PLAN UNDERWAY IN FISCAL YEAR 1971

FUNDS REQUIRED

[In millions of dollars]

	NASA	AEC
NERVA	50	38.2
Other nuclear rocket	8	13.8
Total	58	52.0

Expected accomplishments:

Proceed with integrated development of all engine and reactor components.

Initiate fabrication of first flight reactor for test in 1973 and first engine for ground development testing in 1974.

Provide efficient means of conducting development of engine for first test flight about 1978 and operational use about 1980–81.

1972 employment (approximate) (direct plus indirect):

Westinghouse	1,075
Aerojet	935
Los Alamos	284
Other	375
Total	2,669

WITH FISCAL YEAR 1972 FUNDS AS SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS

FISCAL YEAR 1972 FUNDS PROVIDED

[In millions of dollars]

	NASA	AEC
NERVA	10	7.5
Other nuclear rocket	5	7.5
Total	15	15.0

Impact:

Work can proceed on only a few critical components.

Defer first reactor and engine tests and engine availability for flight indefinitely.

Nevada nuclear rocket development station placed on caretaker basis.

The major part of experienced and successful team will be dissipated.

Lose program momentum and make difficult the retention of best people.

1972 employment (approximate reduction figure)—

(Direct plus indirect):

	Employees
Westinghouse	180
Aerojet	300
Los Alamos	170
Other	75
Total	725

COURT ATTACKS CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, last year the Internal Security Committee, of which I was then a member, undertook a survey of honoraria paid to speakers on the Nation's college and university campuses.

We sought to determine how much, if any, money Communists and other radicals are earning from speaking engagements before our young people.

The results were interesting, even if the survey was not sufficiently complete to reveal the revolutionaries' entire earnings while instructing our children to kill their parents and burn down their institutions of higher learning.

It was reported that speakers like Jerry Rubin, Mark Rudd, and Bobby Seale picked up more than $102,000 in campus visits to less than 4 percent of the schools in this country.

Few people could see the harm in publicizing this fact to Congress and the American people. But, predictably, the American Civil Liberties Union and some members of the radical-liberal press raised a great howl that this would interfere with the rights of Communists, Black Panthers, and others.

A Federal judge issued first a temporary and then a permanent restraining order against publication of the report as a Government document. But this honorable body, by an overwhelming vote, forbade interference with publication of the honoraria survey, and published it was.

A great deal of rhetoric, pro and con, was heard and read on the matter. A recent editorial in the Passaic, N.J., Herald-News is one of the most reasonable and thoughtful I have read since the controversy erupted.

The last paragraph sums it up particularly well: Suppression of the document by the court was an "attempt by the courts to grab more power" and "has been resisted by the House of Representatives, as it must be. It was never intended that the Federal Courts, staffed with men with life tenure and appointed, not chosen by the people, should rule the country." I doubt that many Members of this body would disagree with that statement.

If there is no objection I will enter the editorial in the RECORD:

COURT ATTACK ON CONGRESS

Back in October, a heroic or presumptuous (depending on your point of view) United States judge took on the House of Representatives.

Judge Gerhard A. Gesell prohibited by permanent injunction the publication or distribution of a report by the House Internal Security Committee on radical campus speakers. The judge said the report was "without any proper legislative purpose and infringes on the rights of the individuals named therein."

The judicial command was hailed as "a landmark decision limiting congressional power." It was that indeed. The decision meant that the courts had the power to censor the reports of the Congress of the United States. The decision thereby confirmed the worst fears of the saint of liberals, Thomas Jefferson, about the federal courts.

One journal thought the Gesell decision so important that it devoted 30 inches of type to it. At this point the decision apparently vanished from the news.

However, the decision certainly did kick up a storm. The House of Representatives did not take kindly at all to Judge Gesell's prohibition. The House passed a resolution, by a vote of 302–54, ordering the report to be published and distributed. Interested citizens may obtain it for 30 cents from the U.S. Government Printing Office in Washington. The title is "Report of Inquiry Concerning Speakers' Honoraria at Colleges and Universities."

The House went further. It said for the benefit of judges:

"All persons, whether or not acting under color of office, are hereby advised, ordered and enjoined to refrain from doing any act, or causing any act to be done, which restrains, delays, interferes with, obstructs, or prevents the performance of the work ordered (publication and distribution of the report) . . . and all such persons are further advised, ordered and enjoined to refrain from molesting, intimidating, damaging, arresting, imprisoning, or punishing any person because of his participation in, or performance of, such work."

Before rushing off 30 cents for a copy of a report which a United States judge deems too wicked for the citizen to see, be advised that it is unexciting. All the names which the judge did not want the public to know have appeared time beyond counting in the newspapers.

What the committee did report that is news concerns those honoraria—the amounts the speakers received for their appearances. And this information is interesting.

Before going into it, however, it should be explained how the House Internal Security Committee obtained its information. It sent inquiries to 169 institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia requesting information. The colleges in this sample did not have to answer. Two of four New Jersey colleges queried—Fairleigh Dickinson and Glassboro State—did not reply. A total of 99 did reply, including institutions like Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins.

The survey turned up some amazing information. Dr Spock made 12 appearances between October 1968 and April 1970 at institutions in the group of 99 and pocketed fees of $21,600. There are 2,500 institutions of higher learning in this country. Dr. Spock's speechmaking was not confined to the 99. Assuming the 99 are a fairly representative sample, Dr. Spock made more than $500,000 from college appearances during that period.

William Kunstler, the lawyer for dissidents, is listed as making seven speeches. His fees for two appearances is not known. For the other five he received $7,000. His estimated income from all his college appearances in this period is $175,000 plus.

Even smaller fry like Mark Rudd did handsomely on the college lecture circuit. Rudd is listed for five speeches, for which he collected $1,068.95. On a national scale, an estimate of his earnings is better than $25,000.

At the 99 colleges, 1,414 speeches were delivered and $911,835 collected for them—and these colleges represent 1/25 the of the total number of institutions of higher learning in the country.

The House Internal Security Committee, which is headed by Rep. Richard H. Ichord of Missouri, has done a service by its study of the troublemakers whose speechmaking contributed to the recent turmoil in colleges. The committee deserves the nation's thanks and support.

The American Civil Liberties Union was responsible for the request which Judge Gesell granted so handsomely. This attempt by the courts to grab more power has been resisted by the House of Representatives, as it must be. It was never intended that the federal courts, staffed with men with life tenure and appointed, not chosen by the people, should rule the country.

END THE DRAFT BY REFORMING THE MILITARY COMPENSATION SYSTEM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Air Force Times noted a DOD report:

> Most younger servicemen have only a sketchy understanding of retirement pay, survivor's benefits, family medical care, and related programs. In addition, they probably undervalue the savings in the benefits they do understand.

The editorial went on to add:

> The big thing with new people in service, and those not yet in, is the immediate compensation and benefits, and the expectations for the very near future, not what they might receive two decades away.

In concluding, the Times stated:

> The administration and Congress should hammer out a bountiful, point-by-point compensation improvement program for the lower ranking people. After all, they would be the backbone of all all-vol force.

The lesson of the editorial is clear: so long as we have the draft to compel our young men to serve regardless of the military wage rate, the compensation system will ignore the first-termer. While we need to maintain a comprehensive benefits program to retain the careerists, we cannot shortchange the junior enlisted man if we wish to make the President's goal of an all-volunteer force a reality.

The President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force—the Gates Commission—has found that we can end the draft, and maintain our national security, by paying our young men in service a reasonable wage. Let us enact the recommendations of the Gates Commission and end the discriminatory treatment of first-term military personnel. I commend this item to your attention:

PAY: A BIRD IN THE HAND . . .

A recent report from the Defense Department on military "entitlements" has shattered some old illusions about the holding-power on people of fringe benefits. The findings are especially timely since they appear while Defense Secretary Melvin Laird is discussing benefits and their relationship to ending the draft and creating an all-volunteer force.

As Defense officials told a recent congressional probe (last week's AFTimes), most younger servicemen have only a sketchy understanding of retirement pay, survivors' benefits, family medical care, and related programs. In addition, they probably undervalue the savings in the benefits they do understand.

Since the government pours hundreds of millions of dollars into various "incentives" annually, the findings are quite upsetting to some officials. The big question boils down to this: Are these really inducements if most men the services want to attract either don't know about them or attach little value to them?

The first reaction of some government leaders is to call for a massive information program to tout the benefits. That's a logical reaction, but we doubt that it will work. In fact, there already has been a great deal of publicity about these benefits.

We suspect the younger troops are saying they know something about them but they just don't attach that much importance to them at the moment. For example, neither first-term airmen nor a brand new lieutenant is impressed with retirement pay 20–25 years later.

The big thing with new people in service, and those not yet in, is the immediate compensation and benefits and the expectations for the very near future, not what they might receive two decades away.

So what is the government planning to do about it? Mr. Laird keeps booming his long-proposed 20 percent basic pay increase for servicemen with less than two years service (which Congress has ignored completely).

Now this would be a good deal for new lieutenants, boosting their present $417.60 monthly basic pay by $83.52. But it wouldn't do much for lower ranking enlisteds, such as under-two E–2s, who now get $138.30 monthly in basic pay; their raise would be $27.60, way insufficient to help attain an all-volunteer force.

Mr. Laird also talks about putting more money into "other pays" and improving service housing. Fine, but these things have been talked about for years, followed by insufficient actions. We'll be surprised to see real improvements in such areas soon that will benefit potential volunteers.

Flat, across-the-board percentage pay raises that give high ranking people huge raises, and people at the other end of the scale tiny ones, is the wrong approach entirely. The Administration and Congress should hammer out a bountiful, point-by-point compensation improvement program for the lower-ranking people. After all, they would be the backbone of the all-vol force. This should be done without delay.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING SHOULD NOT BE A TAX DEDUCTIBLE BUSINESS EXPENSE

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, cigarette smoking today is one of the major contributors to death and disease in this country. Medical evidence showing a link between cigarette smoking and cancer, heart disease and emphysema is overwhelming, and can no longer be disputed.

Several steps have been taken in an effort to limit the powerful appeal of cigarette advertising and smoking. First, Congress passed the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act. Then, since January 2, 1971, cigarette com-

mercials on radio and television have been banned. Despite this progress, however, it still will be difficult to combat cigarette advertising which, incidentally, does not give a hint of the dangers of smoking. Because of the ban on television and radio, the cigarette companies already are adding much of the $250 million previously earmarked for the electronic media to the approximately $50 million budgeted for newspaper, magazine and other promotional ads.

American ingenuity and salesmanship have the reputation of being able to sell anything, but the cigarette industry should not be left totally free to sell ill health and early death to the American people. While the advertising dollar tax exemption is extended to all businesses in this country, I feel the harmful effects of the product which cigarette manufacturers market should prevent them from enjoying this otherwise universal privilege.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for our society to place a high priority on the health of the public. In order to minimize the promotion of hazards to the health of the American people, particularly young people, I am introducing legislation today to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by declaring that cigarette advertising is not a deductible business expense.

CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT PROPOSED

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the February 6, 1971, issue of the Saturday Review carried an editorial urging Congress to give speedy approval to legislation to create a Joint Committee on the Environment.

In that editorial, science editor John Lear states:

The White House is now completing the weaving together of its many diverse responsibilities for restoration and preservation of the environment. The Council on Environmental Quality is established as a shaper of policy; the Environmental Protection Agency is firmly in charge of integrating enforcement of antipollution laws; and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is committed to exploration of future dangers and opportunities through scientific research. Only a data-collecting center and an intellectual frontier post assigned to blue-sky speculation about alternative directions for American society remain to be set in place before the grant design is finished.

Although President Richard M. Nixon did not originate all or even most of this reorganizational pattern for the executive branch of the government, he did carry out the plan and deserves applause for doing so. Indeed, were he so inclined he could properly claim more credit than his critics in Congress have earned, for they have failed in their obligation to keep our system of government in balance.

A Joint Congressional Committee on the Environment is obviously the most effective mechanism for achieving and maintaining legislative parity with the executive. A resolution authorizing creation of such a committee was passed in slightly variant forms by the House and the Senate last year. The resolution said the committee would have no legislative authority but would receive the annual reports of the White House Council on Environmental Quality, conduct hearings on those reports, initiate hearings on matters of the committees' own choosing, and funnel executive agency recommendations and advice to the appropriate operating committees of the Congress.

Passage of the resolution was uneventual in both the House and the Senate. Those Democratic majority leaders who were not pushing it did not oppose it. But the resolution went to conference during the frayed-nerve ending of the 91st Congress in late December and foundered on the picayune question of whether a Senator or a Congressman would be the first to fill the alternating chairmanship of the joint committee. The traditional way of making such a decision was to toss a coin. But tempers were too far gone to discern the simplicity and eminently non-partisan character of that ancient device.

Mr. Lear also said:

A certain amount of impatience under the trying conditions of late December 1970 may be excused. But its continuance in 1971 cannot be condoned. What the country needs more than anything else in this opening year of the eighth decade of the twentieth century is a set of priorities that commands common respect, a summary statement of what it really means to be American. Do we want to be known as a peaceful people or a savagely violent people, devotees of spectacle and speed or of patient determination and a quiet and profound regard for our fellow humans? Is an SST as important to us as decent housing for the poor? Should railroads be exclusively freight handlers while people suffocate on stalled highways? Should we spend millions for medical care while spreading virus diseases through misconceived sewage systems that cost still more millions? Should geothermal power underground be neglected while the wild beauty of Alaska is disfigured by a pipeline to carry oil?

Immediately upon its appointment a Joint Congressional Committee on the Environment would be in position to undertake assembly of a priority list that the legislators and the President would have to accept, improve upon, or be judged by at the polls for rejecting.

THE APPALACHIA PROGRAM

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Appalachia program is one of the most successful Federal aid programs of all time, and I am disturbed by reports that this great program may be terminated after fiscal year 1972.

From its inception in 1965, the Appalachia program has been a splendid example of Federal-State cooperation aimed at sections of the Appalachia region whose economic potential was particularly untapped.

This has been truly a grassroots, States' rights concept, in which no program can be funded unless it springs from local initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated the concept of meaningful revenue sharing with the States; but there is no incompatibility between the proposed revenue sharing and the Appalachia program, for both are based on the principle of local planning of how Federal funds will be spent. To curtail the Appalachia program now, while some of its long-range objectives are just now approaching fulfillment, would be wasteful and untimely.

Mr. Speaker, this program has had both tangible and intangible benefits for the affected areas. The tangible benefits include grants for technical and higher education, medical treatment facilities, sewage treatment facilities, and airport facilities. One of the most outstanding of these projects is South Carolina Highway No. 11, partially funded by the Appalachia program, which will provide scenic access to the new nuclear power development by Duke Power Co. at Keeoway Toxaway.

On the intangible side is the new sense of optimism and opportunity that the program has brought to some sections of the Nation, always with healthy emphasis on local initiative and local planning.

I hope this program will be maintained.

FRED M. THROWER RECEIVES CRYSTAL AWARD

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn last week that Mr. Fred M. Thrower, president and general manager of WPIX, channel 11 in New York, was honored on January 20 with the Crystal Award of the National Hemophilia Foundation. The award was presented by Ambassador Robert F. Wagner, former mayor of New York City, at the annual winter wonderland ball at the Plaza Hotel.

Those of us who claim Fred Thrower as a friend have long been aware of his station's and his outstanding record of service, and are pleased that their important contribution has been recognized. In speaking about the reasons for the choice of Mr. Thrower and WPIX to receive the award, Bernard Segal, executive vice president of the metropolitan chapter of the National Hemophilian Foundation, pointed to the fact that WPIX "has contributed in an unusual degree in initiative and in the amount of time devoted to public service and material in WPIX news programs publicizing the problems of hemophiliacs, and the larger problem of the need for increased blood donations."

I bring this award to the attention of my colleagues because, in a period when the news media are so often accused of irresponsibility—either because of inaction or ill-advised actions on their part—it is encouraging to know that some members of the media do fulfill their public service function. I am sure that Fred Thrower has led the way in making WPIX conscious of its public responsibilities, and I am proud to have him as my friend.

YOUTH SETS RECORD HIKING 2,500 MILES THROUGH THE ROCKIES

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a fantastic undertaking last summer by a young high school senior in my congressional district. Eric Ryback, after his graduation in June from Belleville High School, set off on a 2,500-mile hike through the Rocky Mountains from Canada to the Mexican border. He completed the trek in 132 days, the first person to accomplish this remarkable feat.

During the previous summer, young Eric had made a similar hike on the east coast—trudging the 2,000-mile Appalachian Trail, from Maine to Georgia, in 78 days.

Eric's hazard-filled 1970 walk through the Rockies was featured in an excellent article by Judith Frutig in the January 17, 1971, edition of Detroit, weekly publication of the Detroit Free Press. It is such a fascinating and inspiring story that I include it at this point in the RECORD.

Back in Belleville, Mich., the graduating class of 1970 was comparing presents, stringing tassles on car mirrors, dunking in neighborhood pools, and celebrating their first day of post-graduate freedom.

But 2,500 miles away and 12,000 feet up, Eric Ryback, a member of the Belleville class of '70, was sliding, sliding, inexorably skidding down an icy mountain slope toward the edge of a 3,000-foot cliff. Flat on his back, turtle-helpless atop his bulky back pack, he was about to die, and it was only his first day out.

They had warned him. Sitting in the park supervisor's office outside Vancouver, B.C., he had listened—and essentially ignored—what older, wiser heads thought of his plans for a 2,500-mile hike down the backbone of the Rocky Mountains from Canada to the Mexican border.

The supervisor lectured and itemized: "One, we don't have any responsibility for you. We'll go into the mountains and pull you out if you break a leg or something, but you're on your own. Two, the trip is impossible. And Three . . . good luck."

It was the day after Eric Ryback would have graduated from Belleville High, if he hadn't skipped the ceremonies to get on with a ritual much more important to him, one he had been planning for two years.

He wanted to walk the Pacific Crest Trail, a twisting red line on the map, drawn by Congress in 1968 and designated a National Scenic Trail. It's marked only on the maps. There aren't any convenient signs and arrows along the way saying things like: "Picnic Tables Ahead," or "Comfort Station This Way," or "Shifting Snow Fields Ahead," or "You Shouldn't Be Here." For no one—not even the men of the U.S. Forest Service—had ever walked all of the Pacific Crest Trail. Eric was to be the first.

Eighteen years old, five-feet-six, 120 pounds, Eric had already walked the east coast version, the Appalachian Trail, from Maine to Georgia. That one was easy, no valleys filled with snow, no high winds, well-marked trails. He made those 2,000 miles in 78 days of summer, 1969.

But the Pacific route was different, and on the morning of June 10, he learned that fact in a way no amount of planning and map reading could have suggested.

At 5 a.m., Eric started walking up the Canadian slopes of the Cascade range. He had never been in these mountains before, and the view out and down from 12,000 feet nearly overwhelmed him.

"I saw the snow caps on those mountains and I could hardly wait to get up into that snow and start walking. I've always wanted to do that," he said.

Arriving at the top of the first pass, he took pictures of his first mountain snow. Snow peaks. Snow surrounding him. Snow on the trees below. The sky. "It was ridiculous," he said later. "But I was so excited."

He walked farther and the snow got deeper and deeper. A hard crust kept him from sinking, but he could tell it was deeper because the trees were getting shorter. The ground was crisp white and the air, biting. Eric crunched over the tops of drifts ranging from 30 to 60 feet.

In 12 miles, he came to the wilderness border between Canada and the United States. The wind shifted and uncovered a small bronze monument, the only separation between the two countries. He stood over it and realized how far away he was from everything. It was 12 miles to the nearest road on the Canadian side, and 60 miles from an American road.

The crests around him stood like whipped-cream peaks above vast sloping bowls of valley snow, broken by sharp drops and ledges.

To hike from peak to peak and through the passes between them, the winter climber has two choices. He can cross those deep bowls or walk around their sloping sides. But in June, the bottom snow is melting, the streams have swollen to rivers, and crossing is only possible by circling around the walls of the valleys.

That isn't easy. The snow is sloping and crusty, and a climber must chop out foot holds before each step. Below him, always, wait the cliffs. Under the snow lie hidden rocks. One bad step can send him sliding toward the valley and virtually certain injury if not death.

As Eric made his way around the bowl leading to the Cascades' Hopkins Pass, the snow seemed flat and safe. But late in the day, when he was only 40 feet from the pass between two peaks, the angle of the slope changed abruptly.

"The snow was too hard packed and I couldn't get good footholds," he said. But I knew I had to get across it or I wouldn't get any sleep that night. I was exhausted. I had gone 25 miles that first day, and I knew I shouldn't have.

"You know how sometimes you know something's going to go wrong? I had that feeling. My eyes were pinned on the point I had to get to. Now it was 20 feet away. I could have jumped to it almost.

"I said to myself, 'On the next step you're going to fall.' It just registered in my mind over and over. 'You're going to fall.' So I looked out and below at how far I was going to fall, and I stood there for a second. It was one of the most beautiful places to stand. I could see for 100 miles. It was a whole series of snowcapped peaks, with snow all through the valley. I said to myself, 'There's no one out there for 100 miles. You're all alone.'

"I put my foot down on this icy patch. I thought, 'It's secure enough, I'll quickly pick my up my left foot again and swing my right foot down.' "

He slipped.

"I fell on my back. I was sliding down the snow bank like a big toboggan, except I was falling 45 degrees. My pack was on my back. I couldn't do anything.

"I couldn't turn sideways and grab on or anything. My fingers were trying to dig into the snow but they couldn't. They were frozen.

"I couldn't yell. I couldn't scream. I thought, 'There's no one there and you know it!'

"I kept falling and falling. I was trying to stick my heels into the snow to get a hold but it just didn't work. I felt so helpless I couldn't even feel scared. There was nothing I could do. I was just falling."

It was his pack that saved him. Two poles, each the length of an index finger, stick out the bottom on either side of the metal frame.

"This one side I was leaning into started sticking to the snow. Every once in a while it would grab.

"So I put all my weight on one side and finally it dug into the ice and scraped on the snow and stopped me right before the ledge."

He was 20 feet short of disaster.

"So I lay there. I remember my hands were so cold I wanted to put them in my pockets, but I was afraid that if I moved I'd lose my hold and fall again.

"I was pinned there against the snow. The wind was howling, and I started scraping my heels against the snow to build a platform I could stand on."

Finally he stood up, turned around and slowly, slowly, began cutting footsteps back up the sides.

If there had been any value in the endless walking he had done for months before, the weightlifting, the exercising, it all had been tested on that first day out. And though he would make other mistakes, other miscalculations, the next 132 days would end the way that first one had—safely, but just barely.

The son of a Belleville attorney, Ernest Ryback, and eventually aiming for an anthropology degree from the University of Denver, Eric doesn't look reckless, but he is. He explains. "There's this drive inside me, and I have to do it.

"The only time I feel good is when I push myself to the limit. Like when I've climbed a mountain, and I'm sitting on a ledge and the sun comes up. It's the greatest feeling in the world."

His parents understand and encourage him. "He's got one life," his mother says. "He's got to lead it the way he thinks is best."

Eric had been thinking about the Pacific hike since he was 16, and had made detailed plans. He was to start out bearing a cumbersome, 85-pound pack, decorated with flags of the U.S., Canada and Mexico. Inside were a cold-weather sleeping bag, clothes, a 22-day supply of dehydrated food, a tent, rain gear, maps, cooking utensils, camera, diary and a first aid kit.

Along the way he was to pass five food pick-up points where Forest Service men would leave 33-pound boxes of food packed by his family before he left.

Each box carried a stipulation: If Eric didn't pick it up within three days of the date marked, the Forest Service men should call his parents and then send out a search party.

During the first 400 miles, Eric got to know snow very well. During the days, it crunched under his feet, and at night it formed a six-inch cover on his sleeping bag. At mealtimes, it seasoned his food.

And he nearly froze. "I never saw the sun for the first week and a half," he said. "I was beginning to think it didn't come out in that part of the country."

Temperatures ranged from zero to 10 degrees below. He cooked his dinner and climbed into his sleeping bag at sundown merely to survive. "If I hadn't been in my bag when the sun set every night, I would have frozen to death. I had a sleeping bag good for 20 below and even when I went to bed fully clothed—sweater, pants and everything—I'd shake all night."

Finally the sun came out. It warmed the air, and Eric could move around better, but it made his trip rougher.

It melted away the crust, and by midafternoon he began to slip and slide in the slush.

The first road he reached was at Stephens Pass in Washington, 250 miles along the way. He was tempted to just forget his plans and take that road out of the snow and the cold.

"I hated it," he said. "I wanted to go home."

What made it worse was that on that road he saw the first person he had encountered since he started his hike—just a man walking down a road, but it was an important moment, for he didn't see another soul for the next 200 miles. All summer, he guessed, he only saw 50 other people.

"I enjoyed it the first few days," he said. "But after that it wasn't a challenge. Day after day, over and over, it was snow, snow, snow. It's beautiful country, but it was all under snow and the challenge was gone."

He was 375 miles along the trail before he touched dry ground.

"What I really wanted to do was get out of the state of Washington, but I was afraid to get to the Columbia River. I was afraid there would be snow in Oregon and I just couldn't take that.

"If that happened, I was going to pack up and go home.

"All through that first stretch I was about 125 miles from the nearest road in any direction, and in all that snow. My compass and maps were all I had, but the maps were topographical. What good did that do? The snow was laid in so deep it filled in the cracks and rocks. You couldn't tell which mountain was which with all the contours."

Through most of the first stretch he walked blindly. "I'd go five miles one way and end up standing on the edge of a cliff. And all that snow. It kept hitting my ankles because I was dragging my feet. And at five miles an hour it hurts.

"Every day I'd come to a ledge and have to backtrack maybe a mile and a half, and go up another ridge. Sometimes I'd come back to a spot three times and start in another circle."

And he needed to be with people.

"I was really lonely. That was probably the biggest thing. Psychologically, those were bad times. I kept thinking, 'there's no one else here.'

"I was only through Washington, but that was 450 miles."

So he tracked and backtracked through Washington until he passed his first food drop and came to the Columbia River, and the end of the snow.

It was the beginning of July as he crossed over the Bridge of the Gods.

The climate changed and he was happy again. The days were warm, and Eric found himself in hiking weather.

In Oregon he followed old existing paths along mountain ridges and deer trails and stayed on the crest as much as he could. The elevation in that area was between 8,000 and 9,000 feet.

"By this time I was glad I was on the trip," said Eric. "When I look back on that section now, I can see I wasn't able to comprehend most of what I went through. It was too much, and probably a good thing. I could have gotten out then but it was good times."

Until he came to the mosquitos.

In the Minks Lake Crater Basin, the map shows a 50 mile stretch of countless lakes.

"I thought it was going to be the most beautiful place in the world. I could hardly wait to get there. Well, it isn't. You can't see a thousand lakes because of the mountains. You walk from one shoreline to another. And besides it was July and nice for mosquitoes. For 50 miles I was covered with mosquitoes."

Crater Lake was his second food drop, and it was there he came upon an unexpected crisis.

"I thought Oregon and Northern California would be perfect. The terrain would be rocky and rough, but I'd be able to get over it.

"The first part was beautiful. Beautiful hiking weather and good times.

"But when I reached the Klamath River it was 113 degrees. I was walking between 7,000 and 9,000 feet. There were lots of snakes—rattle snakes especially—and those hot temperatures."

He was being beaten down by the heat. He'd start walking in the early morning and by afternoon he would get the first of a series of headaches. "All my energy was drained. I had to keep stopping and then walk until late at night. For 10 days I had to keep stopping to rest.

"Every day seemed to get worse. Physically I couldn't carry the pack, so I started throwing things out. Even before I got to Oregon, I had gotten rid of my sweaters. Now I was going through my pack and throwing out food I didn't like.

"I had oatmeal for 132 mornings. And I alternated two lunches and two dinners. I threw out dehydrated carrots and that. I knew it was a waste of food but I wasn't going to carry it. By this time, I hated everything—chili, spaghetti, escalloped macaroni, beef stew, and everything had noodles in it. I hate noodles.

"Just as I started to break, the weather changed."

But he could enjoy that only briefly, for as he moved on, he miscalculated the route he should take to his third food drop. He walked an extra 200 miles and arrived six days late and weak from lack of food.

"I was carrying very poor maps for this section. The last survey was done in 1955. Some areas were never even surveyed. I only had sketches of the mountains in this area and it covered 500 miles—bigger than the state of Washington.

"I was in trouble," he said. "I had thrown out all that food, and for the last four days, I was starving. When I was three days late, the Forest Service started looking. But they were looking on the trail I was supposed to be following, so of course I wasn't there. When they found me, they were mad, really mad. My parents had kept calling. Nobody had heard anything from me for 28 days.

"I was pulling open my food box when a ranger spotted me. He said: 'You've got a lot of people looking for you. We thought you were gone.'

"He made me walk 15 miles down the mountain to call my parents. The rangers were really disturbed at first, but not me, man. I was really happy to get my food."

Well-fed, he moved on into what he considered the most rugged part of the trip, a primitive, wild river area where he had to climb up and down the walls of deep river valleys—sometimes traveling 12 miles up and down to make two or three miles across.

The rivers he crossed were the Feather, the Yuba, the Rubicon and one fork of the American.

"They were all the same thing. Four thousand feet down, across the river, and 4,000 back up." Those 4,000 feet usually took him about six miles in actual climbing.

"It was just like this, down, up, down, up. That's rough going."

Exhausted from the river crossings, he climbed on toward Donner Pass and Lake Tahoe. As he went higher, he left trees behind him, not because he was above timberline but because the wind blew too hard for trees to stand against it.

In that barren country, he changed plans again, just to get a good look at Lake Tahoe, and it caused him the second serious mishap of his trip.

"I didn't want to pass up Lake Tahoe. I could see portions of it through gaps in the mountains. So I looked at my topographical map to find the highest point on my side of the lake, and I climbed to the top of Dick's Peak.

"I wanted to camp and see the sun set and rise.

"I climbed up to the peak. There were no trees. I went hand over hand on the rock. The winds were strong, and as I climbed they got stronger and stronger. By the time I got to the top, I was hanging on jagged rocks so I wouldn't be blown off the mountain.

"I got there early. But to block the wind I had to build a rock wall three feet high just to stay up there. I couldn't even sleep because the wind was so strong. I didn't even cook breakfast. I got the sunrise and packed my gear and got ready to climb back down.

"Well, the wind had calmed a bit but it was really gusty, and the shadows fooled me. The sun was low and the shadows were sideways, and I couldn't tell rocks from indentations."

He mistook an indentation for a rock, stepped into a hole and fell.

"Luckily, my pack hit first and then I bounced off my head. I was knocked unconscious for nearly six hours."

When he came to, he was scared. "I thought I was bleeding internally, I couldn't walk straight and my head was throbbing. I took aspirin and it didn't do any good."

Even more dangerous was the fact that he was back in an area where the snow again filled the mountain gaps and he had difficulty getting proper footing. He went slowly, resting frequently for several days.

The temperatures began to fluctuate. One day it would be warm and breezy; that night, below freezing.

He was 40 miles short of his fourth food drop, where he would pick up another sweater, and all he had with him was his cotton shirt and long pants.

Finally he arrived at Tuomulme Meadows at Yosemite National Park where food and sweaters were waiting.

After the fourth stop he stepped onto the John Muir Trail, a popular hiking trail in the Sierras.

"It was like a highway," said Eric. "I walked 214 miles in 7½ days."

He passed Mt. Whitney, the highest peak in North America, standing at 14,496 feet. But he was heading downhill—to the heat of the desert.

As he entered the Mojave Desert, the temperatures shot up to above 100 degrees and he hiked across sand dunes.

"When he entered the lowlands of the desert, hard ground with dry bushes and rocks, he could no longer find water.

But the Forest Service once again backed him up and left him gallons of water at predetermined water caches.

The heat during the day, and the cold at nights, drained his strength; he dragged the last 300 miles.

"It was very depressing," he said. "I would have hated it any other way, but every footstep was bringing me closer to the border."

He walked the desert in 16 days of October—115 degrees by day, freezing temperatures at night. And, again, loneliness.

"Some days, I didn't get water, and it really dried me up and drained me. I got nauseated and sick. I had to stop a lot during the day."

The last two days, the forest service sent a man to walk with him because the entire section ahead of him had been burned black by fire. "It was 35 miles of burned desolation," said Eric. "Deer herds had burned, and rabbits, snakes and even field mice. Everything was ugly and depressing." The gentlemen of the Forest Service figured—and rightly—that across that tortured landscape, he could use some company.

That last day they walked 12 miles. Eric could see the border from two miles out. Re-

porters and photographers were waiting for him, and his guide wondered why he wasn't excited.

"It would have been fake," Eric answered. "I just wanted to walk to the end and touch the border."

He couldn't even cross it—the border was blocked off with a heavy barbed wire fence. So he poked his toe through an opening and kicked up a bit of Mexican sand.

Two months later, rested and refreshed after long hours of sleep in his own bed and his mother's overfeeding, Eric was ready to go again.

"It wasn't always a good time, I'll admit to that. But I want to go again. Not to the same place, but I want to keep growing.

"I know a lot more about myself than I did before. With the long hours by myself I could think and understand myself better. The big difference is I know I can do anything now."

RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1971

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am introducing the Rural Job Development Act of 1971, a proposal designed to create new rural job opportunities for young people as well as for older persons interested in bettering themselves. If enacted, the act will also enable small communities to make more effective use of their human and natural resources, thus slowing the urban migration and reducing the mounting population and economic pressures on urban centers.

Creating new and meaningful job opportunities for rural Americans and fostering a more healthy population balance are goals of prime importance. For in a very fundamental sense perhaps the chief reason why an estimated 600,000 farmers and young people leave rural communities each year is because they think their life styles and prospects for the future are neither enriching nor rewarding. Their frustrations are, unfortunately, well grounded in dismal facts. Nonmetropolitan America has one-third of the Nation's population, but it has one-half of its poverty stricken. This means that almost 14 million poor people live in rural areas. In terms of living conditions, over half the Nation's substandard housing, more than 4 million dwellings in all, is located in rural America. On a community basis, nearly 30,000 rural townships do not have water systems, and another 45,000 lack adequate ones.

Finally, in addition to water and sewage problems, thousands of small communities lack medical centers, public libraries, good schools, and public recreation programs.

Despite these deficiencies, however, rural America is struggling to stem the tides of poverty, underemployment, and urban migration. And these struggles are paying dividends. For example, during the last decade almost 50 percent of the Nation's new manufacturing jobs were created in the countryside, although it should be noted these areas accounted for only about one-fourth of the total jobs created during the sixties. Moreover, in the 5-year period between 1962 and 1967, nonfarm employment in nonmetropolitan counties rose 5 percent a year compared to 4 percent for urban counties.

Mr. Speaker, these facts and circumstances taken together provide ample documentation of the need for increasing rural development. But with the need clearly established, a central question still unresolved concerns the best way to affect rural development. In my mind, the interests of progress would be best served by the Federal Government encouraging private enterprise to take the lead in attacking rural problems at their roots. The achievement of this goal could be facilitated if private enterprises were given tax and other incentives to relocate in rural areas and to work with individuals and groups interested in improving the quality of life in their communities. In this regard, I should point out that although public revenues would be diminished to the extent tax credits and other incentives were utilized by commercial interests, the losses would be more than offset by the increases in payrolls, increases in the consumption of goods and services, and the decreases in public welfare costs that would accompany successful rural development programs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today constitutes a first step toward drawing together the vast capabilities of free enterprise, focusing them upon the needs of rural America, and providing them with an incentive for action. I urge my colleagues to give these proposals their full attention and consideration because, as was concluded by the President's task force on rural development:

> It is in the rural countryside areas that we can find generous resources of clean air, clean water, living space, recreation, scenic beauty, tranquility and inspiration for tomorrow's people. And it is there that we can most readily and economically develop and preserve these natural resources in living harmony with man . . . in the generations ahead.

THANKS TO THE USO

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to take note of and express appreciation for the great job the United Service Organization has been doing for our men in the Armed Forces on this day, the 30th anniversary of the USO. Founded on February 4, 1941, the USO has helped to make life away from home a little more cheerful for our servicemen all over the world. This voluntary organization, which receives no Government funds, has ensured for 30 long years that our servicemen need not be alone in a strange country, city, or town, whether it is Christmas day or any day. The thousands of volunteers who have made the USO a continuing reality deserve the heartfelt thanks of all Americans on this 30th anniversary.

WETA INTERVIEW WITH DR. JOHN HANNAH

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, while Congress was in recess, Dr. John Hannah, Director of the Agency for International Development, was interviewed by WETA-TV newscaster, Warren Unna.

Dr. Hannah's responses to a number of probing questions about the future of the U.S. aid program will, I believe, be of interest to Members of this body. The interview focuses upon congressional and public reaction to foreign aid in general and in so doing provides a preview of the annual debate on this subject which will soon commence.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a transcript of the WETA interview with Dr. Hannah. The interview follows:

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. JOHN HANNAH

The reporter conducting the interview—Warren Unna:

REPORTER. This country since World War II has been in what we call the foreign aid business. The Marshall Plan was the first, and that was for a leveled Europe; but basically it was sophisticated and industrialized. And so restoring that was one kind of a problem.

Since then the United States has been faced with the developing world—Latin America, Africa and Asia—where you don't have the sophisticated society. You have much greater poverty. And you don't have any industrial base to deal with. So this has been a bigger challenge and often more discouraging.

And Congress has been discouraged. Administrations have been discouraged. There have been lots of changes in the names of the programs. There have been smaller and smaller requests for money, and Congress, on the whole, has begrudged everything it approved.

However, the program does go on. And it goes on worldwide. For instance, the Agency for International Development builds dams in India. It provides the funds of some of the engineering, and India provides the manual labor and materials. And in Colombia, they've developed what's called a mini-tractor, with the aid of the University of Nebraska, for small plots of ground.

In Tunisia, bigger tractors, bulldozers are used for building irrigation systems. And in Iran, you have tent schools to educate the children of the nomadic tribes. And in Ethiopia, you have small planes being used by AID for crop dusting. And in Pakistan, you've got mobile medical teams where mother and child and doctors get together for inoculations and so on.

And you have also in Pakistan agricultural advisers with things like miracle seeds to improve the crop production. And then with the recent disaster in East Pakistan, AID and others have stepped in with emergency shelters to save lives by housing people, and also with dropping emergency rice for the refugees to keep them from starving.

So the program, on the whole, has still got lots of customers, lots of needs. But there's also lots of misunderstanding about it.

And one of these occurred last week when the congressional committee—the joint Economic Committee looked into the fact that there seemed to be anywhere from five billion dollars to seven billion dollars for what we all call aid. But this is actually military aid, and not economic development aid at all. And it's been all sort of diffused; no one really apparently kept track of it. And it even included some Food for Peace money, which is being used to convert it into local currency to buy uniforms and small arms.

We have as our guest tonight the number one authority on foreign aid in the United States, John Hannah. He's the former president of Michigan State University. During President Eisenhower's Administration, he was an assistant secretary of Defense for manpower and personnel. He was the first chairman of the Federal Commission on Civil Rights. And he's been in more activities than "Who's Who's" pages can hold.

Dr. Hannah, I'd like to ask you one thing. At a press conference this weekend, you indicated that even though the administration planned to ask Congress for some increase over last year's record low request for foreign aid money, and particularly economic aid money, the Bureau of Management and Budget had already cut you way down.

Why is it that there's a low priority in actual action for something that every administration in recent times has always said it holds in such high regard?

Dr. JOHN HANNAH. Well, I don't think I can answer your question in a minute. But as you indicated in your very fine introduction, aid under aid or some other name has been in business now for twenty years. It started out as a very simple concept, that it was appropriate for the United States to make available American know-how, scientific knowledge, education, and so on, to help people in the poor countries to help themselves. It was reorganized several times, the last time eight or nine years ago when it became AID.

At one time, of course, we were the only aid giving country in the world. Now, we're eleventh on the basis of our capacity to give, on the basis of per capita income or per capita GNP. Most of the countries of Western Europe and Canada and Japan do relatively better.

REPORTER. Well, we're eleventh out of the sixteen industrialized nations of the world . . .

Dr. HANNAH. That's right.

REPORTER. . . . pretty near the bottom.

Dr. HANNAH. That's right.

REPORTER. Well, why are we that low?

Dr. HANNAH. Well, you asked the question "why." Well, of course, as you know, the agency has been under almost continual criticism because there have always been many people that doubt whether the United States should be interested in trying to help people in the poor countries.

In recent years, due to the unpopularity of the Vietnamese war and the fact that the AID agency was given an assignment back in 1962 through the import program of trying to control inflation and do something about providing schools where there hadn't been any or where the schools had been destroyed, and be concerned with feeding the refugees, and all the rest of it (sic). And we've had much wash-off from the unpopularity of the Vietnamese war.

So each year it's been more difficult to get dollars for—and I like to separate, of course, economic, or assistance designed to improve the economic status or the social situation of people in the poor countries from military or short-range political objectives.

Well, it was against that kind of a background that President Nixon came into the White House. And he appointed the Peterson Task Force to take a look at the world, and take a look at the world from the standpoint of what it is that the government of the United States should do in this whole area of foreign assistance and suggest that they not waste time looking at aid; but that they could write their own definition of foreign assistance and give him their recommendation.

Well, their recommendations came in back last March, and this has been a matter of discussion since.

REPORTER. Well, that's why I asked you about this priority. It's been a matter of six months before the President actually sent any aid message to Congress after he had this task force report. He still hasn't sent any legislative request. And that's coming, I suppose, this year. But there is no real new aid program after all this time.

Dr. HANNAH. But, of course, the reason you know without my telling you, that with all of the discussion in the Congress of antiballistic missiles and Cooper-Church and Cambodia that those of us who are concerned about this economic assistance program couldn't see much gain in injecting a new aid program in the unfriendly climate towards all matters that had to do with overseas assistance.

And the President's message was delayed until September.

Your beginning question was, "Why am I unhappy because the President's budget may not ask as much money as I'd like?" Well, you might as well ask me the question, "Are they asking more money than you're likely to get?", and I'd have to answer, yes. And so it's kind of an academic exercise. The request is considerably better than we're getting now. And I'll just leave it there.

REPORTER. Let me put it a different way then, Dr. Hannah. You served under President Eisenhower. I'm aware that he used to get on the telephone to individual congressmen and say, "Please vote for the foreign aid bill and please keep it up high." Has this been the practice of President Nixon?

Dr. HANNAH. Well, there's been some White House pressure where we had to have it. Of course, I watched the aid program during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations where it was in continuing trouble. Trouble is not new. It's been getting worse and worse.

And the intention of the President has been to reorganize it, give it a new name, separate military and short-range political objectives from the kind of aid that I'm interested in, and see if we can't get a new commitment from the American people.

I'm much more interested in tomorrow and the next day than I am in what happened last year and the year before. A great many people have a notion that we're sort of dying by degreees.

As a matter of fact, when I talk about aid, I'm talking about economic aid, nonmilitary aid. When I came in almost two years ago, we had an annual appropriation for '69 of about a billion three hundred and eighty million dollars in economic aid. For fiscal seventy, it was increased to about a billion four hundred and sixty million. For fiscal '71, the appropriation has just finally been completed. It's up to about a billion seven hundred and fifty-one million.

Now, admittedly, in aid in each of those years there is the supportive assistance of what we're doing in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. And under the reorganization, if the Congress approves what the President has already recommended in principle, the military assistance and political programs will be handled by State and Defense and we'll be back in the business of trying to help people help themselves.

REPORTER. Dr. Hannah, may I ask you a question. You said you're trying to get a new commitment out of the American people. Have Americans lost their traditional charitable feeling towards the rest of the world?

Dr. HANNAH. I don't think they have.

REPORTER. Are you in a program that's on its way out is what I'm asking you here.

Dr. HANNAH. No, I don't think so.

REPORTER. Do you see any evidence of this country getting into a new form of isolationism?

Dr. HANNAH. Well, I'm worried about it sometimes. I think that that has been the tendency in the last year or two, triggered largely by the disenchantment with the Vietnamese war. I find, though, in talking to young people or old people, or people that are unfriendly about the whole idea of foreign assistance, when you put it in this frame, the only thing that's really important to the United States or any other country in the world is its people.

And to most people they're more interested in their children and their grandchildren than any other people. And they're always interested in improving a situation in the United States so that their community, their state, the nation as a whole will be better than it has been.

Turn it around. When you ask a question, "What's the United States going to be like thirty years from now or fifty years from now, or seventy-five years from now?", of course it's a futile question, unless you first ask the question, "What's the world going to be like?" Because those of us who have lived in the last several decades can't certainly help but realize that what the rest of the world is like is going to be determined pretty largely by what the United States is like. And we really haven't any alternative but to cooperate with the other developed countries. There're sixteen countries now in the aid giving business. We're eleventh in the line in our contribution to the kind of aid I'm talking about when measured either by per capita GNP or per capita income. That isn't good enough.

BEN GILBERT. Dr. Hannah, if I may interrupt. If the American people feel that they ought to be doing their share, if they get what you're talking about, why is it that year after year—and it's not only a matter of the last two years but as long as I can remember—that the annual aid appropriation is a sitting duck for the budget cutters, for the people who have other programs who say we've got to cut aid. And aid goes through a life and death struggle. And, as Warren recalled, during the Eisenhower years, you never knew for sure until all the telephone calls were made whether the appropriation was going to go through.

Why is it that aid has got that kind of a bad name in Congress, if the American people are really behind the idea?

Dr. HANNAH. Well, when I say they're behind it, I believe they're behind it when they understand it.

If you were to ask the average taxpayer of this country if he is for having his taxes used to help people in Chad or the Central African Republic or Bolivia help themselves, he is not going to say that he's very favorable to it.

But for the reasons I've already mentioned—and we can't get into all of this this evening—I'm convinced that most Americans recognize that there is really no alternative but that we do our fair share along with the rest of the free world in making it possible for poor peoples in poor countries to help themselves.

Now, the other side of this, what a great many people forget is in this shrinking world the people in the underdeveloped countries, in the very poor countries, no longer believe that it was ordained by God that children have to go hungry or die because there isn't any food; that they have to be deprived of vaccine and these simple steps that can be taken to control epidemic diseases; that it's reasonable that there be no schools, no teach-

ers, no books for their kids. You can put it on the basis of the Christian-Judaic ethic that we ought to be interested in unfortunate people. You can put it on the most selfish possible basis—what's good for the United States and our children and our grandchildren—and you come up at the same place.

I don't believe what people have been telling me that it can't be sold. And I use as evidence the fact that in two years without being on the front pages, with very little organized help, we've actually turned the situation around so that we have better than three hundred million dollars more for economic assistance in this fiscal year. We have. . . .

REPORTER. Dr. Hannah, could I just follow through on something. I know you feel that economic aid should be separated from military. But there're people like Congressman Morgan, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, that feel that the military requests carries the economic; that if you separate them, as I think you and the administration intend to do, nobody's going to pay any attention to the real guts, the economic part.

You don't have this fear?

Dr. HANNAH. Well, I don't—I have the fear. Of course, I'm always concerned. But when I came in I asked this question two years ago. And I was told that it was the vote for the military assistance that made the difference between our getting it through or not.

I watched in two consecutive sessions where the votes that we lost because of squadrons of planes for Vietnam or something for Korea far outnumbered those that we gained as a result of being tied together.

And there isn't any question in my mind that we're going to be better off if we go to the American people for the kind of economic aid that we're talking about that helps them build schools and improve health and control population growth and increase food supplies.

GILBERT. Well, our time has run out. I want to thank you for joining us. And I take it from your remarks that you're going to try to take this story to the American people in the next few months. And we appreciate your coming on our program to tell the story.

Dr. HANNAH. I appreciate your inviting me. Thank you very much.

GILBERT. Thank you.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE NEEDED NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I insert in the RECORD, part III of the article entitled: "Private and Public Retirement Pensions: Findings From the 1968 Survey of the Aged" by Walter W. Kolodrubetz:

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

The levels of social security benefits are affected by several key factors that enter into calculation of the primary insurance amount (PIA): the amount based on past earnings that would be payable to a worker receiving benefits no earlier than age 65. The minimum benefit amount for a worker with a low or irregular earnings history is specified in the law. (In 1967 the minimum unreduced benefit was $44 for a nonmarried person and $66 for a worker with a spouse over age 65.) A worker whose average monthly earnings qualify him for a benefit higher than the minimum receives a benefit graduated according to his earnings, but the benefit formula is weighted in favor of the lower paid. Differentials in benefits are minimized and the benefit distributions compressed because of both the minimum benefit provision and the statutory maximum limit on earnings creditable for benefit computation purposes.

Table 3 shows the distribution of OASDHI benefits for couples and nonmarried persons in 1967. Almost two-thirds of the aged units received less than $1,250 in OASDHI payments for the year, and the median payment was $1,090. Only 10 percent of the aged units received payments that amounted to $2,000 or more, and most of this group were married couples.

Reflecting, in part, the influence of spouses benefits, married couples received more in OASDHI payments than did nonmarried persons; the medians were $1,555 and $905, respectively. Furthermore, benefits were distributed over a much wider range for married couples. Almost 30 percent of the married couples had $2,000 or more in OASDHI benefits, and 20 percent had less than $1,000.

Among the nonmarried, benefits were higher for men than for women, averaging $1,080 and $860, respectively. This difference reflects, for the most part, differing employment histories and earnings levels, as well as the benefit reductions associated with survivor benefits. Benefits for almost 40 percent of the women were less than $750 (with many close to or at the minimum); for men, the corresponding proportion was 25 percent. More than a third of the men had payments ranging from $1,250 to $1,750; only about one-tenth of the women had payments at that level.

BANNING UNSOLICITED CIGARETTES FROM THE MAILS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited samples of cigarettes. As you are well aware, the U.S. Surgeon General has determined that cigarettes are dangerous to one's health. Furthermore, only yesterday the Federal Trade Commission requested Congress to require an even stiffer health warning in all cigarette advertisements and on the front of every package of cigarettes. The proposed new warning would state:

Warning: Cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death from cancer, coronary disease, chronic bronchitis, pulmonary emphysema and other diseases.

Yet, presently the U.S. mail is being used at reduced rates for the distribution of unsolicited complimentary packages of cigarettes. This, in effect, amounts to a Government subsidy for the distribution of a product determined by the Government as being dangerous to its citizens' health.

It would seem both logical and reasonable that if Congress can prevent the mail from being used to distribute sexually oriented advertisements, pandering advertisements, and unsolicited advertising of matter designed to prevent contraception, Congress can prevent the mail from being used to distribute unsolicited dangerous matter such as cigarettes.

GILBERT GUDE DECLARES NIMH STUDY REINFORCES NEED FOR FURTHER MARIHUANA INVESTIGATION

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the National Institute of Mental Health's annual report on cannabis sativa, more commonly known as "pot" or "grass." The Institute's findings reinforce my opinion that further study of marihuana's effects are necessary and that those who have proposed legalization of the weed are making a dreadful mistake; at least until more is known about the results from its usage.

I am certainly familiar with the standard argument that if alcohol is legal, then why not marihuana? My reply to such logic is that alcoholism, the abuse of alcohol, is now considered by many doctors to be the No. 1 health problem in America. Do we need another? Legalization of marihuana today could well mean that within a few years we would be compelled to establish another program, such as the "Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970," only this time to treat victims of marihuana usage rather than alcoholics.

I feel the NIMH report is so important that I am mailing it to all the principals of the secondary schools in my congressional district.

The NIMH report is discussed in the following Washington Post article dated February 2, 1971:

UNITED STATES CITES MARIJUANA'S ILL EFFECTS BUT FORESEES SOME MEDICAL USE

(By William Greider)

A potent dose of marijuana can induce acute psychosis in some people, yet it is a mild drug that may some day be used to ease the pain of cancer victims or relax the convulsions of epileptics.

Between those extremes of positive and negative qualities, the National Institute of Mental Health reported yesterday that there are still too many unanswered questions remaining to render a final verdict now on *cannabis sativa*, better known as pot or grass.

In the meantime, NIMH presented Congress its first annual report on the weed, a comprehensive summary of all that science knows or suspects about the drug's effect on people.

For the short term, said Dr. Bertram S. Brown, a NIMH director, "general deleterious effects are minimal" for most casual users.

"But, we do not yet have firm scientific knowledge about the effects of long-term chronic users," Brown said "Until we know more about the drug, we certainly cannot give it a clean bill of health."

Marijuana smoking is still spreading in popularity according to surveys cited by the NIMH report.

But Dr. Brown speculated that a decline may lie ahead, based on recent studies showing decreased usage in some California high schools, often the leader in trends.

In terms of marijuana's effect, the report's description of a typical "high" by a moderate social smoker notes:

"The acute mental effects of the intoxication, including a variety of perceptual alterations, short-term memory loss, time disorientation, and depersonalization, considered toxic reactions by many, are frequently desired by the user."

In a limited number of unpredictable cases, however, these desired results "sometimes progress to acute anxiety attacks and even acute psychoses in some cases," the study said.

On the positive side of pot, the NIMH scientists said drug companies are already at work developing therapeutic uses for ingredients extracted from cannabis. Dr. Brown foresees its application to reduce pain for cancer patients, to treat high blood pressure, and to relax the central nervous system in epilepsy.

The NIMH report notes that marijuana has been used to treat various ailments since ancient times and only passed out of general medical use at the end of the 19th Century, when new synthetic drugs with more easily controlled potency became available.

Regarding the long-term health consequences from smoking it, the report noted that there is no scientific evidence available linking marijuana to cancer or birth defects. But it warned that pot smokers should not take too much comfort from that statement.

Research on animals has produced conflicting results—with deformed offspring in some animals. And it was only after decades of heavy tobacco consumption by the general public that scientists could establish a statistical link between cigarette smoking and cancer the report said.

The report also summarizes scientific data on the old debate between alcohol and marijuana but NIMH declines to draw any conclusion about which is worse—only that they are similar when taken in moderate doses.

The NIMH summary discards the long-held notion that marijuana is addictive or that it leads progressively to other stronger drugs. On the other hand it notes that a moderate-to-heavy user of marijuana is more likely to be taking something stronger as well.

Much more research is needed to explore the long-term effects Brown said. About $3 million in the NIMH budget this year is earmarked for cannabis.

A NEW DECK OF CARDS—A NEW "GAME PLAN"—WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, on December 21 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 794, designed to express the sense of Congress on inflation and recession. There was little cause to believe the resolution would receive committee consideration during the closing days of the 91st Congress. However, I wished to declare, in a public way, my fears concerning the economic crisis and the need for Congress to act. These fears have since proved well-founded. It has been reported that in December—for the first time since the 1958 recession—the Nation's gross national product decreased a net decrease of 0.3 percent, signaling a full-scale recession for the 1970's. This was coupled with a national unemployment level of 6 percent for the month of December.

To come to grips with inflation and recession, more positive action is called for in the Congress, and I have therefore joined with my colleague, Mr. MONAGAN, in introducing legislation on January 29, designed to establish a temporary emergency guidance board.

When introducing my resolution on December 21, I stated it is necessary to break out a new deck of cards and develop rules for a new "game plan" for we can no longer tolerate a policy with a record of failure which threatens the future stability of our national economy. We must change the present course which has brought on inflation and runaway wages and prices. We must admit that an emergency does, in fact, exist; we must admit the present rate of unemployment is intolerable; we must admit the economic decline of 1970 has brought on a halt in growth of total output; and we must admit there is no prospect of increased economic activity in the immediate future unless new policies and programs are developed relating to wages, prices, interest rates, and productivity.

Mr. Speaker, at that time I made a commitment to offer new legislation in the 92d Congress to carry out the intent of the House concurrent resolution. H.R. 2502 serves this purpose and I call on the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee to schedule early hearings and report the bill to the floor for a vote.

The bill establishes an Emergency Guidance Board composed of five members appointed by the President and subject to confirmation by the Senate. One member with extensive Federal administrative service is to be appointed by the President to be chairman and the other members are to represent a fair balance between business, labor, and consumer leaders. The life of the Board is limited to 18 months, except that its life may be extended by a concurrent resolution of Congress.

As soon as is feasible after taking office, and after consulting with business, labor and consumer leaders, the Board will publish a set of basic guidelines for price and wage changes. After the guidelines are published, corporations and labor organizations subject to the mandatory provisions of the act will be required to file an economic justification with the Board indicating how a proposed price increase or wage settlement complies with or departs from the published price and wage guidelines. The act will apply to corporations having capital assets in excess of $500 million or supplying more than 30 percent of any market of substantial volume, and to any labor organization bargaining with such a corporation. In addition, the Board will have discretionary power to require an economic justification from any corporation having capital assets in excess of $100 million or more than 10 percent of any market of substantial volume if the Board determines that an economic justification is necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. A similar grant of discretionary power is granted to the Board over labor unions, which, in the Board's determination, obtain wage increases that the Board determines to have a substantial inflationary impact on the economy.

Under terms of the bill the Board may publish economic justifications filed with it, negotiate with corporations where the guidelines appear likely to be breached, hold hearings, administer oaths to witnesses appearing before it, subpoena witnesses and records, and announce findings and recommendations with respect to inflationary departures from the guidelines. Where a corporation or union refuses to cooperate with the Board by failing to supply documents or neglecting to appear or by refusing to file an economic justification, the Board may apply to a District Court of the United States for an order requiring the production of documents, personal appearance or the filing of an economic justification.

Hopefully, business and labor will cooperate with the Emergency Guidance Board, recognizing its merit as a bulwark against inflation, will cooperate with it in its task, and will voluntarily adhere to any published guidelines.

Administration spokesmen more and more are beginning to acknowledge the need for direct actions to check inflationary pressures. Newly appointed Secretary of the Treasury, John B. Connally, Jr., has expressed such thoughts. In addition, Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, forecast recently that the administration will develop a vigorous price and wage policy to combat inflation.

Earlier, President Nixon personally intervened to forestall a threatened increase in the price of some steel products reaching 12.5 percent, that could have become the pattern for the entire industry. As a result, the increase was cut approximately one-half.

It is encouraging also that the President has altered his previous budgetary concept that helped to swell the ranks of the unemployed and brought economic growth in the Nation to a standstill. The fiscal 1972 budget, labeled a "full employment" or "expansionary" budget, may help get the economy moving again by injection of needed funds in programs which earlier had been severely reduced. If this occurs, it will be especially important to have an established mechanism available to provide full information on proposed price and wage increases in order to turn the spotlight of public opinion on them. This proposal would accomplish this goal.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced legislation to abolish the electoral college system and substitute for it a direct, popular election of the President and Vice President. I felt, then, that the mandate of the

people and the need of the Nation's political institutions coincided for the first time, demanding immediate congressional action on electoral reform. The overwhelming support in the House for that measure seemed a vindication of my feeling.

Apparently, our counterparts in the Senate felt otherwise. A filibuster against the resolution once again thwarted the will of the people and once again frustrated the development of our institutions. Now, we must begin again.

Accordingly, I am reintroducing my resolution to create a direct and popular system of electing our highest executive officers, confident, after all, that the coincidence of national will and national need remains as strong as ever. I trust my colleagues will not argue that point.

The Harris and Gallup polls have shown, for example, that close to 80 percent of the American people favor direct popular election. Such widely varied groups as the AFL-CIO, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Small Business Association, the American Bar Association, and the League of Women Voters, among many others, all favor direct popular election of the President and Vice President. Most important, more than 60 percent of our State legislators support direct popular election. The will of the people for reform simply cannot be questioned.

Nor can the need for reform be doubted. Consider the havoc that could have followed an electoral impasse in 1968. With a shift of only 42,000 popular votes in three States or 1½ percent of the vote in California, no one would have had an electoral majority. This would have given Governor Wallace with his 46 electoral votes, the balance of power—or, better, the balance of electors, which he could have released to either party's advantage.

As long ago as 1862 a Senate report pointed out that:

> The free and independent electors had degenerated into mere agents in a case which requires no agency and where the agent must be useless if he is faithful and dangerous if he is not.

Experience has not qualified that opinion. In 1824, 1876, and 1888 this system left us with Presidents who did not receive a majority of the votes. In 1948 a shift of less than 30,000 votes in three States would have given Governor Dewey an electoral vote majority—despite President Truman's 2 million vote margin. At the present time a candidate could win an electoral majority by capturing slim statewide pluralities in the 11 largest States—even if he did not receive a single popular vote in the remaining 39 States. In other words, 25 percent of the popular vote can elect a President in 1972, if our laws are not reformed.

The dangers of rule by a President elected without the majority of popular support should be obvious: he would have no mandate from the people nor would he be responsible to the people. What legislation he tried to pursue would be frustrated by the Congress; what actions the people demanded, he could easily dismiss. It would be an exceedingly difficult situation.

Moreover, the electoral system tends to discourage minority parties and, therefore, voting in traditionally one-party States. If the victory of one candidate is a foregone conclusion, then people are not going to waste their time voting for his opponent. Nor are they going to vote for the rest of the opposition ticket. It is no wonder our turnouts for presidential elections are so small, and no wonder we find so many one-party States throughout our Nation.

Some have argued that the electoral system works to the advantage of the larger urban States; others, that it benefits the more rural areas. Of course, this will vary from election to election: the vote of a citizen from Arizona may count more than that of a citizen from New York, if Arizona is involved in a particularly tight race. But the opposite can be just as true.

Whatever the case, the entire controversy presents even greater evidence of the fundamental problem underlying the electoral college system; that one American's vote can count more than another's. The President is elected by all Americans, not merely by Americans from New York or South Carolina or California. Citizens from all areas must be fairly represented; all should have an equal vote. One man, one vote requires more than redistricting, Mr. Speaker; it requires, it demands, a complete reform of our electoral system. No less will do.

EXPLODING THE MYTH OF A POPULATION EXPLOSION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert, for the consideration of my colleagues, the material from the February 1971 special issue of Triumph magazine exploding the myth of a population explosion. This consists of a statistical review of the actual population situation in the world and in the United States today, illustrated by four charts, together with the refutation of Paul Ehrlich's "The Population Bomb" and an editorial summarizing the contents of this special issue.

The article follows:

TABLING THE POPULATION QUESTION

In 1930 the world's developed countries—those parts of the world enjoying relatively advanced industrialism and high standards of living—made up approximately a third of the world's population. By 1970, with the "underdeveloped" countries' substantially higher growth rates, that percentage had shrunk to 26.5 and by the year 2000, according to U.N. projections, the presently "underdeveloped" world—which means, for all practical purposes, Africa, Latin America and Asia (minus the U.S.S.R.)—will form about 80% of the world's population.

The figures in Chart 1 are based on the Population Reference Bureau's Data Sheet for 1969, and on the United Nations' "Medium Estimate" of world population growth by the year 2000. The most obvious revelation of the graph is the expanding portion of the earth's population in the "Third World." The graph also has its political significance, of course. Economic development often depends heavily on population growth (see, e.g., Dr. Clark's article elsewhere in this issue) and inasmuch as the underdeveloped countries, with their relatively low populations, have in the past served as "client states" to the developed countries, it is by no means surprising that expanding economic potential in the Third World should be greeted in the developed countries by alarm over a "population explosion."

CHART 1. *Percent of world population by region, 1970–2000*

North America:	
1970	6.4
2000	5.8
Latin America:	
1970	7.8
2000	10.4
Europe:	
1970	12.8
2000	8.6
U.S.S.R.:	
1970	6.7
2000	5.7
Asia:	
1970	56.1
2000	56.4
Africa:	
1970	9.6
2000	12.5
Oceania:	
1970	.6
2000	.6

The absurdity of the population alarm, whether applied to developed or underdeveloped regions of the world, is illustrated by Chart 2. The most densely populated part of the world is now and has been for some time Europe; yet even in the year 2000, when the average population density in Europe will be 276.6 persons per square mile (according to the U.N.'s Medium Estimate of growth), the continent as a whole will be less than half as densely populated as, for example, West Germany is today. And West Germany, of course, is one of the most prosperous countries in the world. There can obviously be no clear equation of population density with poverty.

But sparsity of population does not go hand in hand with poverty, either. North America (which in Chart 2 includes only the United States and Canada) is virtually empty today and will still be so at the end of the century; yet American and Canadian stomachs are the fullest in the world.

In sum: there is no necessary proportion, either direct or inverse, between population density and prosperity. The most that can be said with any degree of accuracy is that growing countries tend to be growing in more ways than one: they tend to be vigorous, economically expanding—rising nations on the world scene; while countries that are static or declining in population tend also to be in decline in other ways.

Of course there is political meaning in that fact, too.

CHART 2.—POPULATION DENSITY BY REGION 1969-2000

	Population, 1969 (millions)	Density, 1969 (persons per square mile)	Population, 2000 (millions)	Density, 2000 (persons per square mile)
North America	225	26.6	354	41.9
Europe	456	239.3	527	276.6
U.S.S.R.	241	28.0	353	41.0
Oceania	19	5.7	32	9.7
Latin America	276	36.1	638	83.5
Asia	1,990	191.2	3,458	361.1
Africa	344	29.4	768	65.7

Is the United States threatened with a population explosion? That was one of the questions President Nixon's National Goals Research Staff set out to answer. In its report, presented to Mr. Nixon last July, the NGRS summarized both sides of the argument in "scientific" fashion, but left little doubt as to its own conclusion: "We have before us a set of decisions. One which appears not to be urgent is that of overall size of the population—even after the effects of a considerable amount of immigration are taken into account."

Chart 3 (not printed in RECORD) illustrates an important datum leading to the Committee's judgment. The "fertility rate" is the number of births per woman of childbearing age—15 to 44 years. In 1957 that rate began a sharp decline (more precisely, renewed a decline that had been going on since the beginning of the twentieth century, with only a brief reversal after World War II) which persists to this day; according to projections of the National Goals Research Staff itself, the decline will continue at least until 1990.

Thus whatever temporary fluctuations there may be in the birth rate—the number of births per thousand of population per year—it is clear that American women are wanting fewer and fewer children, and that preference will be the controlling factor in American population growth for decades to come. So pronounced has the decline in fertility been in recent years that from 1961 to 1968 the actual number of births in the United States dropped each year! It is evident that underpopulated America is not in the foreseeable future going to experience any precipitate population growth. That the American population will at any time within reasonable sight of 1970 strain the limits of the country's resources is simply a preposterous proposition.

But the motivation for population alarmism in the United States is not totally mysterious. Chart 4 (not printed in RECORD) suggests what may be animating some of those who fear that the "quality of life" in America is endangered.

With a fertility rate that consistently outpaces that of whites (even when, as they have been recently, both are in decline), America's blacks, though numbering only about ten per cent of the population, have been producing about 15 per cent of all the births in the United States. This disproportion in fertility rates is likely to expand as rising black consciousness runs counter to the increasing tendency of whites to embrace the contraceptive mentality as a mark of social grace.

Interpreting the disproportionate growth of the black population, Professor Andrew Hacker of Cornell predicted last year that "in the process of creation right now are rioters and rapists, murderers and marauders who will despoil society's landscape before the century has run its course." Commenting on Hacker's prophecy, columnist and sometime Nixon adviser Kevin Philips benignly envisioned that "the last three decades of this century could see the United States turn in the direction of a police state" to cope with the burgeoning black "under class."

It is well to know what it is that the phrase "quality of life" is a euphemism for.

PAUL EHRLICH: BOMBARDIER

(By Michael Lawrence)

"While you are reading these words four people will have died from starvation, most of them children."

This disturbing announcement graces the cover of a widely read paperback book entitled *The Population Bomb*, by Dr. Paul R. Ehrlich. This little volume (A Sierra Club-Ballantine Book, 95¢) has gone through nineteen printings since May 1968; it is not too much to say that it has been the single most important factor in making the "population explosion" a clear and present danger in the American psyche. Whether it is also a clear and present danger in reality is a question that may be answered in large part by a close reading of Dr. Ehrlich's book.

The reading may as well start with the cover. Let's see: the sort of person who moves his lips as he reads and runs his finger along the line of type would read the blurb above in four seconds, tops. That's one person dead of starvation per second—31,536,000 in a year. In 1969, according to Population Reference Bureau figures on population and death rates, 52,265,000 people died. If Ehrlich is correct, 60% of them died of starvation. Do you believe it?

The United Nations doesn't. Worldwide causes of death are not easy to identify but probably the most nearly accurate source is the UN's annual Demographic Yearbook. The 1969 Yearbook enumerates deaths according to causes for over seventy countries representing about 57% of the world's population. (The data are for the latest available year for each country; there is considerable variation.) The UN's categories do not include starvation, but to give Dr. Ehrlich the widest possible benefit of the doubt I have counted as a death by starvation every death by a cause that might be associated, however remotely, with nutritional deficiency (e.g., diphtheria, dysentery, typhus, all parasitic diseases, cirrhosis of the liver, etc.). The UN's list includes 541,735 deaths by such causes. There are two ways to project this figure into worldwide terms: (1) assuming that the proportion of deaths by such causes to total number of deaths would remain roughly the same if the entire world had been counted, about 5½% of the world's deaths would have been by causes possibly associated in some way with malnutrition or undernutrition; (2) assuming, alternatively, that the UN list's figures were expanded proportionately to take into account the 43% of the world not counted, deaths by causes possibly associated with malnutrition or undernutrition would amount to about 949,000. Dr. Ehrlich's error then, may be expressed in two ways: it is the difference between 5.5% and 60%; or it is the difference between 949,000 and 31,536,000. To put this still another way, his *factor* of error is somewhere between 10.9 and 33.2; that is, Dr. Ehrlich's figure is somewhere between 10.9 times and 33.2 times the true figure.

Is the wildly erroneous blurb on the cover characteristic of *The Population Bomb?* Or is it a piece of hyperbole that may be forgiven in an otherwise accurate and sober book? Move inside. Here are the very first words Dr. Ehrlich has to say in *The Population Bomb*—the first sentence of his Prologue: "The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970's the world will undergo famines—hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now."

Well, we have just seen how fantastically wrong any such judgment would be if based on an extrapolation from present rates of starvation; and we know—if from nowhere else, then from Dr. Colin Clark (see p.)—that the present state of agricultural science equips us to feed many times the present population of the earth; moreover, we know, if we read the papers, that we are in fact using our equipment—we *are* feeding the world. The New York *Times* is an outspoken editorial advocate of worldwide population control, but last October a *Times* news story began: "Until recently the world's food experts were wondering how to drive off the specter of hunger and frustrate the predictions of Malthus, who warned in 1798 that population was outrunning food supply. Today many experts are concerned about the specter of feast rather than famine and a single phrase—'the green revolution'—signals the new attitude and the growing vogue." On what grounds does Dr. Ehrlich contradict this hopeful view?

The answer, very simply, is: on no grounds at all. Dr. Ehrlich *asserts*, he does not argue. Nowhere in *The Population Bomb* does he even attempt to justify his prophecy of mass starvation. Instead, having made the prophecy, and leaving us to take its accuracy for granted, he moves on to propose the most flagrantly totalitarian measures to assure that the prophesied famines will not be repeated. Along the way he demonstrates to the point of tedium how utterly foolish is the alarm over the "population explosion." For example:

"Each year food production in undeveloped countries falls a bit further behind burgeoning population growth." The fact is that in virtually every country of the world agricultural production is advancing more rapidly than population. Dr. Clark, again, has made the demonstration, but on this point he is only citing statistics that are known to every competent student of world population.

"[M]ost of [the developed countries] are overpopulated. They are overpopulated by the simple criterion that they are not able to produce enough food to feed their populations." See Chart 2, page 24.

"In the United States the current low birth rates will soon be replaced by higher birth rates as more post World War II 'baby boom' children move into their reproductive years." See Chart 3, page 25.

"How did we get into this bind? It all happened a long time ago, and the story involves the process of natural selection . . . [N]atural selection is simply defined as differential reproduction of genetic types. That is, if people with blue eyes have more children on the average than those with brown eyes, natural selection is occurring. More genes for blue eyes will be passed on to the next generation than will genes for brown eyes. Should this continue, the population will have progressively larger and larger proportions of blue-eyed people. This differential reproduction of genetic types is the driving force of evolution; it has been driving evolution for billions of years." This may be Ehrlich's most creative contribution to science: a theory of evolution that gets around the problem of the origin of species by posting, implicitly, that *all* species *always* existed—some have just got more numerous than others.

"Everyone agrees that at least half of the people of the world are under-nourished . . . or malnourished. . ." This is Ehrlich's way of avoiding the problem that no one has ever been able to show that this fact with which "everyone agrees" is even remotely connected with the truth—once again, cf. Colin Clark.

"True, there are hopeful signs, especially in the form of new wheat and rice varieties. But we're not even in a position to evaluate the true potential of these developments, let alone assign to them the panacea role so devoutly wished for by many." Panaceas, by definition, are illusory; but the new wheat and rice varieties to which Ehrlich referes are the stuff of the "green revolution," and the fact that, thanks to the new strains, *Pakistan* in 1969 became an *exporter* of rice ought to be sufficient evidence of the "true potential of these developments."

"Our vast agricultural surpluses [in the U.S.] are gone." That is largely correct; but is it not relevant that the reason they are gone is that, as a matter of national policy, we have both limited cultivation so as to avoid surpluses and destroyed them when they have materialized?

"Biologists must . . . point out the biological absurdity of equating a zygote (the cell created by joining of sperm and egg) or fetus (unborn child) with a human being. . . . People are people because of the interaction of genetic information (stored in a chemical language) with an environment. . . . When conception is prevented or a fetus destroyed, the *potential* for another human being is

lost, but that is all." Oh . . . Ehrlich is a theologian, too.

But enough. It is one thing to run through *The Population Bomb*, as I have been doing, and show by selection of almost any of Dr. Ehrlich's assertions of fact that his argument is an edifice of mistaken premises supporting still more mistaken conclusions; but it is another thing to *explain* Ehrlich. How, for one thing, account for the impact his book has had, despite its callous disregard for the most elementary principles of logic?

I think the fundamental reason for the success of *The Population Bomb* lies in the appeal for the modern mind of apocalypse in the abstract. Ehrlich has resurrected the mathematical horrors of Malthus, and our age cannot resist them.

The Rev. Thomas Robert Malthus was an English clergyman whose *Essay on Population* (first edition, 1798) first lit the fuse of the "population bomb." Malthus's thesis was simple: since population tends to increase in geometrical ratio while food production can only increase arithmetically, "the power of population is indefinitely greater than the power in the earth to produce subsistence for man."

Now, even so stated—stated, that is, as a mathematical proposition—the Malthusian insight was not exactly a truism. He was simply wrong, for one thing, about the earth's capacity to produce "subsistence"—food. We know today that agricultural production has increased almost geometrically, in fact, since his day. But given the state of the art in Malthus' own time, his equation had an apparent abstract validity; and so men listened when he predicted that, as a consequence of the "misery and vice" attendant upon overpopulation, the iron law of death control would begin to operate, and "the deaths will shortly exceed the births." But as this specter failed to materialize in the nineteenth century, Malthus's reputation suffered, finally reaching its perigee in the first half of the twentieth century when the real danger was felt to be *under*population—thus Gunnar Myrdal in *Population* (1940), for example, worried that the "slow but steady development of birth control has become a truly serious peril for the reproduction of people. . ."

What Paul Ehrlich has done is to revive the Malthusian specter. In calling attention to the rapid population growth rates that have been achieved in some parts of the world in this century, Ehrlich is merely re-emphasizing the first half of Malthus' equation—the potential of population to increase geometrically. Press Ehrlich hard enough—I am told this has been accomplished—and he will concede that the world may be able to feed itself indefinitely. *Nevertheless*, he will say, the population bomb keeps ticking: if nothing else we will eventually run out of space! That is apocalypse in the abstract, and it is what accounts for the credulity accorded to the incredible Dr. Ehrlich.

All right, then: how soon may we expect the apocalypse?

Before attempting an answer, it must be remembered that, as a mathematical proposition, the Malthusian equation as revived by Ehrlich is still not a truism. Population growth is dependent on a disproportion between birth rates and death rates: when the former exceed the latter, population grows. The relatively rapid growth rates in this century which it has been Ehrlich's crusade to slow down have been the result of remarkable advances in medical science which have worked dramatic reduction in death rates. But observe: a reduction in the death rate traceable to any particular cause is of its nature temporary: after that cause has had its effect—and the effect is, quite simply, an increase in life expectancies—the people who have been affected by it still die. The death rate can remain low only if there is a continuing series of medical advances to keep driving life expectancy higher and higher; once life expectancies level off, the death rate will fall back into equilibrium with the birth rate. This being the case, it is impossible to predict with any certainty what population growth rates will be over a long period of time. More specifically, it is impossible to say what growth rates will be like in the twenty-first century without knowing whether the medical miracles of the twentieth are about used up, or are only the beginning of a continuing age of miracles.

With that caveat in mind, then, let us measure Ehrlich's apocalyptic vision. How much, on his showing, have we got to fear?

Well, if we apply the standard dictionary definition of apocalypse as an imminent cosmic cataclysm, Ehrlich's nightmares tend to fail one of the tests: they tend not to be imminent. "In a book about population," Ehrlich announces in the first chapter of *The Population Bomb*, "there is a temptation to stun the reader with an avalanche of statistics. I'll spare you most, but not all, of that." Instead he offers several variations on the theme that the world's population may now be expected to double every 37 years. That being the case (though of course—remember our caveat—neither Ehrlich nor anyone else knows that it is the case), "what might happen?" Ehrlich proposes several possibilities:

"If growth continued at that rate for about 900 years, there would be some 60,000,000-000,000,000 people on the face of the earth. . . . This is about 100 persons for each square yard of the Earth's surface, land and sea." There is only one way a rational man can respond to a horror destined to materialize in 900 years, and that is to ask: Gee, couldn't we start worrying about it in, say, 600 years?

"But, you say, surely Science (with a capital 'S') will find a way for us to occupy the other planets of our solar system and eventually of other stars . . . But it would take only about 50 years to populate Venus, Mercury, Mars, the moon, and the moons of Jupiter and Saturn to the same population density as Earth. [Even] if the fantastic problems of reaching and colonizing the other planets of the solar system . . . [could] be solved [it] would take only about 200 years to fill them 'Earth-full.' So we could perhaps gain 250 years of time . . ." Somehow even 250 years seems awfully far away—especially since, as we have seen, there is no particular reason to accept Ehrlich's premise that growth rates will remain constant during those two and a half centuries.

"Enough of fantasy. . . . If you still want to hope for the stars, just remember that, at the current growth rate, in a few thousand years everything in the visible universe would be converted into people, and the ball of people would be expanding with the speed of light!" OK, I'll remember that; I'll keep it in mind for the next thousand years or so.

Enough of fantasy, indeed. Dr. Paul Ehrlich is a scientist by reputation, but he is a fantasist of the first order by vocation, and it takes no scientist, certainly I am not one, to see his fantasies for what they are; it is required only that one take him seriously, read him carefully, to understand that his "population bomb" is an utter dud. But to understand Ehrlich, the man, is more difficult. The imbecilities of his book were perhaps explained by *Playboy* magazine's unwitting revelation that, on the urging of the head of the Sierra Club, "Ehrlich worked every night for three weeks and produced *"The Population Bomb."* Given the patient superficiality of the book, the only mildly surprising thing about that disclosure is that the work took so long. But again: how explain the man? What moved him to record his superficialities so indelibly for posterity?

Dr. Ehrlich provides a clue. Chapter 1 of *The Population Bomb* is entitled "The Problem." It begins as follows:

I have understood the population explosion intellectually for a long time. I came to understand it emotionally one stinking hot night in Delhi a couple of years ago. My wife and daughter and I were returning to our hotel in an ancient taxi. The seats were hopping with fleas. The only functional gear was third. As we crawled through the city, we entered a crowded slum area. The temperature was well over 100, and the air was a haze of dust and smoke. The streets seemed alive with people. People eating, people washing, people sleeping. People visiting, arguing, and screaming. People thrusting their hands through the taxi window, begging. People defecating and urinating. People clinging to buses. People herding animals. People, people, people, people. As we moved slowly through the mob, heat, and cooking fires gave the scene a hellish aspect. Would we ever get to our hotel? All three of us were, frankly, frightened. It seemed that anything could happen—but, of course, nothing did. Old India hands will laugh at our reaction. We were just some overprivileged tourists, unaccustomed to the sights and sounds of India. Perhaps, but since that night I've known the *feel* of overpopulation.

Simple scrutiny easily penetrates the errors, the distortions, the wild exaggerations of *The Population Bomb*. But Paul R. Ehrlich, the man, is in need of something more profound than scrutiny. How do you understand a man who fears and despises. . . . *people?* And how do you help him?

THE MYTH EXPLODED

Some scientific facts about population are known to everyone in the field. They are collected in this issue of Triumph by way of demonstrating that the "population explosion" is a myth.

Chief pillar of the myth is the popularized Malthusian notion of a geometrically expanding population inevitably outstripping resources. Modern demography knows by experience that Malthus's thesis has been proved false by history. Not only has population *not* grown at a constant, invariable rate, but quantum advances in agricultural technology and food science have pushed production far beyond expected limits. Colin Clark pioneered in demonstrating that food production is simply not a "population problem"; his researches, sketched in this issue, are now accepted by virtually all students of population resources. More than a year ago, United Nation demographer Jean Mayer, for example, declared that providing the world's population with adequate food was "no problem" for the foreseeable future.

But when the scarcity-of-food myth is refuted, the myth of "not enough living space" inevitably surfaces. Someone usually points to New York City and remarks that with a population density like *that*, life is something less than humane. What is overlooked, however, is that the rest of the world does not share this atypical density—and even in regions that do approach it (parts of Northern Europe, say), the life of society does not seem to fall so inevitably into barbarism.

In any case, as the graphs on page 24 show, the world is characterized by nothing if not by large habitable regions with little or no population, both in the Third World (even India has a population density 200 people per square mile *less* than England) and also in highly developed countries like the United States, where most of the people are crowded into less than one-tenth the available, habitable land area.

Framing the issue in Malthusian terms falsifies it. For the birth rate is *not* responsible for the century's growth of population. Indeed, birth rates in the industrial nations have declined, while they have largely remained constant in the Third World. Nor is the world's population approaching the limit of its resources; in fact, it was precisely the development of technology and capital resources, as F. A. Hayek has shown, which

historically permitted greater numbers of people to sustain life. It can be plausibly argued, moreover, that "surplus" population creates the impetus for technological progress.

The truly central demographic fact of the modern era, as Michael Lawrence explains, is that population growth has resulted principally from declining *death* rates and increased average life spans due to advancing technical sophistication in medicine, sanitation and public health. More people live after birth now, and for a longer time.

But medical technology can only extend the human life span so far. The UN Population Commission, in fact, has lately pointed out that man's life expectancy seems now to be reaching its outer limits. If you worry about such things, what that means is that population growth may peak in the near future at a point well within the world's capacity to provide a decent existence, *without* any resort to worldwide repression in the form of coercive programs of contraception, sterilization and abortion.

What is true of the world is even more true of the United States. Morning mouth is more nearly a national peril than population, and some such truth is not lost even on those most avid to build "the contraceptive society"—like Mr. Nixon. The President's own National Goals Research Staff reported last July: "Now it is thought that . . . fertility might drop to a level that would stabilize the population in a decade . . . This possibility plainly is incompatible with the idea of a current or impending U.S. population 'explosion.' . . . No population analyst or policymaker has developed any objective criteria for arriving at an 'optimum population' for a given area at a given time."

If a "population problem" exists, the NGRS said, it comes a) from crowding 70% of Americans into twelve metro areas occupying one-tenth of the nation's total land area—and 50% into three "urban corridors" (Boston-Washington, Chicago-Pittsburgh, San Francisco-San Diego)—and b) from pollution caused by careless patterns of industrial and individual consumption. Much the same conclusion was put forward last month by Conrad F. Taeuber, the Census Bureau's chief demographer, who pointed out, as does Fred Domville in these pages, that much of the nation (three-fourths of its counties) is in fact *losing* population, and that "pollution, high crime rates, transportation problems and other social ills are not primarily a result of our rate of population growth." The last census, moreover, reduced the number of future people expected by 100 million; *and* confirmed that the present birth rate is the lowest in our history.

The "population explosion," we repeat, is a myth. But it is no less perverse for that. So many millions have been spent over the last decade to advance the myth—the national government spent $88.9 million last year alone—that most men seem convinced of its truth, and seek rescue in a veritable sea of estrogen and vaginal foam. The myth is everywhere, as Dr. R.J. Ederer says, "like Goebbels' loudspeakers." Yet it is myth.

What is more, the myth-makers know it. The population explosion orthodoxy is rarely challenged in the popular media, but in their technical literature the doomsday demographers will concede that the myth is also the "royal lie."

For example: The doctor editors of *California Medicine*, who want abortion as a population control measure, which is understood to be a necessary step to a new social order, recently stated that to increase its public appeal, "it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing . . . The result has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact, which everyone really knows, that human life begins at conception and is continuous whether intra- or extra-uterine until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forward under socially impeccable auspices . . . [Yet] this schizophrenic sort of subterfuge is necessary."

And what of the nation's political leaders? Mr. Nixon's own research staff is not lying to *him*. He knows the population explosion is a myth. He knows the nation's social and ecological problems are not caused by too many people, and will not be resolved by contracepting them—that's stuff for the rubes. Why then has he made, as his chief health officer stated he has, "massive" population reduction his "highest national priority"?

Much of the population control enthusiasm, political and otherwise, can be explained in terms of self-interest. Mr. Nixon, for example, is not unaware of the considerable political influence the "populationists" exert within industry, the professions, the state and national bureaucracies; his support of the movement lends a certain respectability to his Administration where its credentials are weakest—among the technocratic and intellectual elites. Self-interest of an even baser sort motivates other elements of the "contraceptive society." The Washington *Post* recently reported, for example, that in New York one abortion referral service alone had grossed over $150,000 in five months of operation and that some enterprising doctors were making as much as $3,000 in an afternoon of abortions.

There is also a cultural and economic imperialism involved in our export of the contraceptive society to the Third World, which has always been a client-region in the past but whose increasing population (and wealth) threatens that relationship. Happily, the Third World knows what's up. Juan Bosch is a Dominican Marxist, but he may as well have been speaking for Christian Latin America when he charged not long ago that "the idea of family-planning in Latin America . . . is North American imperialism."

Yet, more profound than such political and economic motives, there is a contempt for sexuality and new life at the spiritual sources of the population control movement. The nation's Calvinist and Social Darwinist traditions seem to have coalesced in a Manichean synthesis. Dr. Mary Calderone, who was for eleven years medical director of the Planned Parenthood Federation, typified it with the comment that contraception is a "polio vaccine" for today's "dangerous epidemic of babies."

But Manicheans, old and new, have a way of desiring the elimination of someone else's life, not their own. Among contemporary population controllers this tendency is increasingly taking a racist form. Historically, U.S. immigration policy has discriminated against colored, Catholic and Latin peoples in favor of Northern European and Anglo-Saxon Protestants; that same bias can be found in population policy. HEW touched on it once when weighing voluntary versus coercive contraception: "Elite reactions to the higher fertility of the poor [and ethnics] have always simplicitly subsumed the compulsion idea as the 'realistic' solution for people who are regarded as irresponsible, immature, and animal-like." Now (see p. 25) Ivy League professors have nightmares of a new barbarian invasion from runaway reproduction of the "under class"; and presidential advisers care less and less to conceal the totalitarian implications of their advice on how to ensure that the nightmares not come true.

The population explosion is a myth—yes. But it threatens to be as destructive as that earlier "myth of the twentieth century" that was thought to have died in a Berlin bunker a quarter of a century ago.

PRAYER AND BIBLE READINGS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great humility that I introduce House Joint Resolution 193, a resolution which would amend the Constitution so as to permit the offering of, reading from, and listening to nondenominational prayers or Biblical Scriptures in any governmental institution or place, including our public schools.

There is little need for me to elaborate on why such legislation must be introduced. The U.S. Supreme Court's decisions in Engel against Vitale and Abington School District against Schempp has, for all intents and purposes, prohibited the reading of the Scriptures and the recitation of prayers as a part of the school day. Consequently, this legislation which I have introduced qualifies the freedom of religion clause in the first amendment, so that we might have His infinite love revealed, for in learning to love Him, we learn to love one another.

It was 24 years ago, Mr. Speaker, when, at the opening of the 80th Congress, the Reverend Peter Marshall led the U.S. Senate in the following prayer:

> O Lord our God, if ever we needed Thy wisdom and Thy guidance, it is now—as the new Congress begins a new session, standing upon the threshold of a new year, fraught with so many dangerous opportunities. We pray that Thou wilt bless these men chosen by the people of this Nation, for Thou knowest them, their needs, their motives, their hopes, and their fears. Lord Jesus, put Thine arm around them to give them strength, and speak to them to give them wisdom greater than their own. May they hear Thy voice, and seek Thy guidance. May they remember that Thou are concerned about what is said and done here, and may they have clear conscience before Thee, that they need fear no man. Bless each of us according to our deepest need, and use us for Thy glory, we humbly pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

And, at the start of each daily session, this House, as well as the Senate, our State legislatures, and our courts, still seek the wisdom and guidance of the Almighty God. Each of us, during this moment of prayer, asks that He make us courageous in our convictions, wise in our decisions, and faithful to our responsibilities.

Through prayer, one opens himself to the Almighty God, and through Him to the entire community. Only then does man identify himself with the community of men, and only then can he develop a community of common interests, the community of mutual concern, while still preserving the freedom of the individual. Through prayer, man gains a new feeling in life and he recognizes a new meaning in life. Or, as the poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge wrote:

> He prayeth well who loveth well
> Both man and bird and beast.
> He prayeth best who loveth best
> All things both great and small.

This country, Mr. Speaker, was founded because of the religious convictions of the persecuted worshippers of the Old World. We have been, and we still are, a country which prides itself in its spiritual heritage. Yet today, the courts have abridged that privilege of worship to our schoolchildren. In the process of forbidding the reading of prayers in our schools, we have lost sight of that tenet common to all religions:

BUDDHISM

Hurt not others with that which pains yourself. *Udanauarga*

CHRISTIANITY

All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them. *Bible*

CONFUCIANISM

Do not unto others what you would not they should do unto you. *Analects*

HEBRAISM

What is hurtful to yourself do not to your fellow man. *Talmud*

HINDUISM

Do naught to others which if done to thee, would cause thee pain. *Mahabharata*

ISLAM

No one of you is a believer until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself. *Traditions*

SIKHISM

As thou deemest thyself, so deem others. *Kabir*

TAOISM

Regard your neighbor's gain as your gain; and regard your neighbor's loss as your own loss. *T'ai Shang Kan Ying P'ien*

ZOROASTRIANISM

That nature only is good when it shall not do unto another whatever is not good for its own self. *Dadistan-i-dinik*

Today I ask that we make ourselves aware that He is concerned with all that is said and done within these hallowed walls; today I ask that we make ourselves aware that our children, as well as ourselves, are in need of recognizing His love and grace and understanding; and today, Mr. Speaker, as astronauts Shepard, Roosa, and Mitchell explore another part of His realm, I ask that, we, who now petition for the privilege of praying in our public schools and in our other governmental institutions, recall that first prayer from space:

Give us, O God, the vision which can see Thy love in the world in spite of human failure. Give us the faith to trust Thy goodness in spite of our ignorance and weakness. Give us the knowledge that we may continue to pray with understanding hearts, and show us what each one of us can do to set forward the coming of the day of universal peace. Amen.

WHO WILL CARRY THE FLAG?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an inspiring poem by a constituent, Maj. Billie B. Boyd, Jr., USAF, retired. This great expression of respect for our flag has already received wide acclaim in our home State of Tennessee, and it is worthy of national attention:

WHO WILL CARRY THE FLAG?

(By Billie B. Boyd, Jr.)

In troubled days such as these, a moving thought comes to mind,
And words to express its meaning really aren't too hard to find;

There are those around us who say they will,
And there are those who say they won't—
Along with those who have the courage of their forefathers,
Coupled with those who wish they did, but won't admit they don't;

Some people join crowds because of outright fear,
While others stand fast for the things they hold so dear;
Look around my friend and see what I mean,
Those who would dishonor our Emblem, proud and clean—
The very Flag our forefathers stood up for and demanded that they be named,
Yet, some weak and gutless parasites would have it insulted and defamed;

It boils down to the simple decision,
On which side of the street you choose to stand—
While Old Glory, our National Banner,
Marches proudly by, escorted by honor guard and band;

And if the Flag could speak,
From the day of first being held in George Washington's steady hand,
Through its long, proud history of blood honor and tears—
Up to this very day, waving proudly for nearly 200 years,
Over our democratic, free and unshackled land,
It would speak out in a clear voice, long and loud,
"I've seen it all, and forever I shall remain proud,
As long as I am carried by a freedom-loving American,
Who is not afraid to face a crowd;
So, I ask *you* in the name of those who have died for freedom's cause,
If at anytime I am abused or dropped,
Who will snatch me up and carry me to the front,
Who will carry the Flag, so proud and true,
Who will carry Old Glory, your own Red, White and Blue?"

MILITARY JUSTICE?

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I want at the outset to express my gratitude to my distinguished colleague from Maryland, Mr. MITCHELL, for bringing to our attention this latest incident. The United States Army belongs to all the people of this country; it is not the private province of professional career officers. As United States citizens and as Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to insure that the men to whom we give administrative power to run the daily affairs of our Army do not abuse that power by taking arbitrary action against men under their command whom they dislike or disagree with.

Also because it is our Army, we have the right and the duty to criticize existing military policies which we feel are wrongly conceived, and to do whatever is in our power to see that such policies are reviewed and changed. Louis Font, as a citizen of the United States, shares these rights and duties. He did not give them up when he applied for and was granted appointment to West Point, nor when he was commissioned as an officer in our Army. Nor did he yield those rights and duties when his deepest beliefs caused him to speak out in opposition to the Army's activities in Southeast Asia. He did not waive his belief in the Constitution just because he took an oath to defend it.

On January 12, 1971 Lieutenant Font cosigned a letter to Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor requesting that a Board of Inquiry be convened under Article 135 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to review whether certain activities and policies of our Army—such as free-fires zones, search and destroy, defoliation, massive air strikes in populated areas—violate the principles of international warfare. In that letter, Lieutenant Font also requested that the inquiry consider the responsibility of command officers who have implemented those policies.

All of this has made Lieutenant Font an unpopular man among his superiors. It is no secret that career officers do not look kindly on criticism of Army policy and practices, particularly when it reflects on them personally. Lieutenant Font has been subjected to various forms of petty harassment. As part of their effort to muffle his outspokenness, authorities at Fort Meade changed Lieutenant Font's duty assignment, making him a barracks inspector. What they thought would be an innocuous, anonymous position turned out quite to the contrary, for Lieutenant Font refused to be silent about the uninhabitable condition of the barracks he toured, just as he had refused to be silent about what he considered to be improper conduct by commanding officers in Vietnam. The public response which followed Lieutenant Font's disclosure was apparently the last straw. Lieutenant Font's superior officers have turned from petty harassment to much more serious means of silencing this man who dares to criticize their Army.

This may sound like an extreme construction to place on the court martial charges brought against Lieutenant Font by the men he has criticized, but when you examine the substance of the charges it is difficult to construe them any other way.

We cannot permit our Army to treat its critics in such an arrogant and arbitrary fashion. I do not want my Army trumping up charges to stifle criticism from within any more than I want it spying on private citizens to stifle criticism from without. I join Congressman MITCHELL in calling for an immediate investigation by Secretary Resor of the circumstances surrounding the charges against Lieutenant Font, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

If Lieutenant Font is a gadfly, then the Army needs more of them. In any event, American needs an army that can take criticism, may even dissent, from its citizen-soldiers.

CLEAN AIR AMENDMENTS OF 1971

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress passed a series of amendments to the Clean Air Act designed to update and strengthen the existing law. In spite of the wide publicity given to these changes, a substantial number of gaping loopholes still exist, and it is for this reason that I am introducing today the Clean Air Amendments of 1971.

I am proposing a number of important provisions which will help the public cut through the labyrinthine procedures which too often stall effective action against pollution. A citizen's eyes and nose tell him when he is assaulted by pollution, but he frequently finds it impossible to translate this knowledge into the specific data and procedures required to get the pollution halted.

My Clean Air Amendments of 1971 provide for the following:

First, Government financed research into the availability of low polluting fuels.

Second, certification of new stationary sources of pollution, preconstruction review of the sources and performance tests after commencement of operation.

Third, public disclosure by polluters of the pollutants they are discharging into the air.

Fourth, Government sponsored testing of alternatives to the internal combustion engine and setting of new emission standards based on this testing.

Fifth, exemption from the national standards on auto emissions, fuels, fuel additives and aircraft emissions for those States desiring to establish standards that are more restrictive than the national standards.

Sixth, granting authority to the Administrator to immediately enjoin sources of severe air pollution.

We all partake in a common ownership of the air, and the public has the right to know who is polluting the air we breathe and to what extent. I propose that both individual and corporate polluters be required to file with the Federal Government reports on the substance and quantity of their pollution; these reports would be available to the public and would be verified by the Government through monitoring.

To prevent pollution before it begins, I propose a system of certification for new stationary sources of pollution—factories, mills, incinerators, etc. This certification would include a preconstruction review of a proposed building as well as performance tests after the facility began operation. The certificates would be reviewed, and suspended if the facility fell below pollution standards. Operation in violation of the certification procedures would cost the polluter $5,000 per day.

Under present law the Administrator cannot act quickly in an air pollution emergency. Cumbersome delays occur while the air becomes more and more deadly. Pollution officials have already developed a term to describe fatalities caused by extreme air pollution occurrences: "excess deaths." To prevent "excess deaths" and to divert a developing pollution emergency, by mill would allow the Administrator to immediately shut down sources of severe air pollution.

The automobile is our country's single largest polluter of the air, accounting for 60 percent of the Nation's total air pollution, and contributing up to 75 or 80 percent of the pollution in such cities as New York and Los Angeles. The cities of our country cannot continue to function much longer under these conditions.

Essentially two things need to be done. First, States must be allowed to establish auto emission standards that are more restrictive than the national standards. Under existing law, California is the only State which is specifically exempted and can adopt tighter motor vehicle emission standards than the Federal ones. Auto pollution in States such as New York is surely as critical as in California, and any State which desires stricter emission standards should be allowed to set them.

Second, an alternative to the internal combustion engine must be developed. An important step was taken last year requiring a 90 percent reduction in motor vehicle emissions by 1976. However, propulsion systems other than the internal combustion engine, including the steam and electric engines, promise to provide even further reductions in emissions. Unfortunately, the auto makers and the oil companies have a vested interest in retaining the internal combustion engine. I therefore propose that the Environmental Protection Agency begin the testing of all types of propulsion systems for motor vehicles to determine which has the most satisfactory emission characteristics and performance. If, based upon these tests, the Administrator determines that another propulsion system has superior emission characteristics, he shall set standards based upon such characteristics.

Although the automobile is our major polluter, pollution from sulfur fuels—oil and coal—whose combustion produces noxious sulfur oxides should not escape our attention. The largest users of these pollution-producing fuels are the electric utility companies. The national demand for electricity has doubled every decade since 1940, and this increase will accelerate rather than decline. Today over 85 percent of the electricity to meet this demand is generated by coal- and oil-burning plants. Electrical generating plants alone account for 50 percent of the sulfur oxide emissions in the Nation.

The most feasible alternative to increased sulfur oxide pollution that will accompany the growing demand for electricity is the use of low polluting fuels.

To date, most research on low-polluting fuels has been done by those who have a vested interest in the status quo: the oil and coal industries, the natural gas suppliers, the atomic energy industry and the electric utilities. These interests have erected a smokescreen of excuses: that low-polluting fuels are not available in sufficient quantity, that their location makes the cost prohibitive, that a changeover would require new and expensive equipment. My bill would provide for Government-sponsored research to break through this resistance and provide unbiased information on low-polluting fuels.

Last year's widely heralded clean air amendments were a major step forward in the field of air pollution abatement. However, we cannot afford to bask in the warmth of self-congratulation while our cities strangle from dealy air. Loopholes in the existing law which allow pollutants to pour into our atmosphere must be closed, and we must act before our limited time runs out.

H.R. 3686

A bill to provide for the abatement of air pollution by the control of emissions from motor vehicles; preconstruction certification of stationary sources; more stringent state standards covering vehicular emissions, fuel additives and aircraft fuels; emergency injunctive powers; and public disclosure of pollutants

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Clean Air Amendments of 1971."

SEC. 2. Section 104(c) of the Clean Air Act is redesignated Section 104(d) with a new section 104(c) inserted in lieu thereof as follows:

"SEC. 104(c)(1). The Administrator shall commence an immediate inquiry into the availability of low-polluting fuels used for non-automotive industrial and domestic purposes. The Administrator shall report the results of his inquiry to Congress by June 30, 1972. The report shall contain accurate and detailed information regarding—

(A) the location and ownership of low polluting fuels, both foreign and domestic, which are or might be available for consumption in the United States,

(B) the costs of transporting these fuels,

(C) the factors which may inhibit the exploitation and availability of these fuels, including but not limited to such factors as the effects of federal, state and local tax structures; the impact of federal, state and local regulations; the Mandatory Oil Import Program; and merger and concentration trends affecting the fuels industry,

(D) the sums of money which have been expended since January 1, 1960, by persons in the fuels industry and persons using large quantities of fuels to reduce air contaminants in fuels and to develop pollution control devices for facilities using fuels, together with an analysis of the results which have been achieved as a result of the efforts of such persons,

(E) any additional information which the Administrator determines should be brought before the Congress in connection with its legislative oversight of this Act, and

(F) the Administrator's recommendations regarding the legislative, administrative and executive steps necessary to achieve a coordinated national fuels policy consistent with environmental protection and the general welfare.

(2) For the purposes of this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $5,000,000.

SEC. 3. The Clean Air Act is amended by striking section 111 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"NEW SOURCE STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE

"SEC. 111. (a) For the purpose of this section, the term—

"(1) 'stationary source' means any building, structure, facility, or installation which emits or may emit any substantial amount of any air pollution agent or combination of such agents so as to cause or contribute to the endangerment of the public health or welfare;

"(2) 'new source' means any stationary source, the construction or modification of which is begun on or after the effective date of any standard of performance applicable to such source;

"(3) 'construction' means any placement, assembly, or installation of facilities or equipment at the premises where such equipment will be used, including preparatory work at such premises;

"(4) 'modification' means any construction (other than pollution abatement facilities as determined by the Administrator or appropriate State agency) which alters the nature or increases the amounts of air pollution agents or combination of such agents emited by a stationary source; and

"(5) 'owner or operator' means any person who owns, leases, operates, control, or supervises a new source.

"(b)(1) The Administrator shall, within sixty days after the enactment of the Clean Air Amendments of 1971 and from time to time thereafter, publish in the Federal Register a list of categories of stationary sources which shall be subject to standards of performance established under this section.

"(2) Within one hundred and twenty days after the publication of such a list or revision thereof, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register proposed regulations, in accordance with section 553 of title 5 of the United States Code, establishing Federal standards of performance for new sources. Such standards shall be based on the greatest degree of emission control which the Administrator determines to be achievable through application of the latest available control technology, processes, operating methods, or other alternatives. The Administrator shall afford interested persons an opportunity for written comment on such proposed regulations. After considering such comments, he shall promulgate, within ninety days after such publication, such standards with such modifications as he deems appropriate and shall notify the States of such promulgation. The Administrator may from time to time revise such standards following the procedure required by this subsection for such standards.

"(3) Standards of performance shall become effective upon promulgation.

"(4) The Administrator may distinguish among classes, types, and sizes within categories of new sources for the purpose of establishing such standards.

"(c) The provisions of this section and the standards of performance promulgated thereunder shall apply to any new source owned and operated by the United States, unless a more stringent emission requirement is required for such source to implement any applicable air quality standard.

"(d)(1) The Administrator shall, within ninety days after enactment of the Clean Air Amendments of 1971, promulgate regulations, in accordance with section 553 of title 5 of the United States Code, establishing a procedure for certification of compliance with any standard of performance promulgated pursuant to this section. Such procedure shall include—

"(A) provisions for preconstruction review of the locations and design of any new source;

"(B) provisions for performance tests after commencement of operation of any new source;

"(C) methods to identify and abate violations of such standards of performance; and

"(D) methods to insure that any certified new source shall not prevent implementation of national ambient air quality standards or national ambient air quality goals promulgated under this title.

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (e) of this section, upon application by any owner or operator of any new source the Administrator shall certify such source if he determines, in accordance with the provisions of this section, that such source complies with the applicable standards of performance promulgated under this section.

"(e)(1) Each State within one hundred and eighty days after promulgation of regulations pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, or at any time thereafter, may develop and submit to the Administrator a procedure for certification of compliance with any standard of performance for any new source located in such State. If the Administrator finds the State procedure is at least equal to the requirements established by subsection (d) of this section, he may delegate certification authority provided in this section to such State.

"(2) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Administrator from (A) reviewing and suspending any State certification to assure compliance with any applicable standard of performance promulgated pursuant to this section, or (B) acting to enforce any applicable performance standard promulgated pursuant to this section.

"(f) Every owner or operator of a new source shall (1) establish and maintain such records, make such reports, install, use, and maintain monitoring equipment or methods, and provide such information as the Administrator may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such source is in compliance with this section and regulations established thereunder, and (2) upon request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Administrator permit such officer or employee at reasonable times to have access to and copy such records, reports, or information. Except for emission data, upon a showing satisfactory to the Administrator by such owner or operator that such records, reports, or information or particular part thereof, if made public would divulge trade secrets or secret processes of such owner or operator, the Administrator shall consider such record, report, or information or particular portion thereof confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, except that such record, report, or information may be disclosed to other officers or employees of the United States concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act.

"(g)(1) After the effective date of standards of performance promulgated under this section, it shall be unlawful—

"(A) for any owner or operator to operate any new source without certification issued under this section; or

"(B) for any owner or operator of any certified new source to operate such source in violation of any standard of performance applicable to such source; or

"(C) for any owner or operator to fail or refuse to permit access to, or copying of, records or to fail to make reports, or to fail to install monitoring equipment or methods, or provide information required under this section.

"(2) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to restrain violations of paragraph (1)(A) or paragraph (1)(C) of this subsection. In any action to restrain violations, subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a district court in any district may run into any other district.

"(3) Any owner or operator who violates paragraph (1)(A) or paragraph (1)(C) of this subsection shall be liable to a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each offense which shall be assessed by the Administrator after an opportunity for a public hearing. Each day of violation shall be a separate offense.

"(4) Any violation of paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection shall be subject to abatement pursuant to section 113 of this Act. If any owner or operator of a certified new source does not act within seventy-two hours as provided in any order issued pursuant to section 113(a)(1) of this Act to abate such violation, the Administrator shall suspend any applicable Federal or State certification. Failure to suspend operation of such source after such suspension shall, upon conviction, subject the owner or operator to a fine of at least $5,000 for each day of operation after such suspension. Penalties provided in this subsection shall be in addition to any penalties provided in section 113 of this Act."

SEC. 4. Section 114 of the Clean Air Act is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out subsection (a) and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 114(a). Pursuant to any function vested in the Administrator under this Act—

"(1) the Administrator shall require the owner or operator of any emission source to (A) establish and maintain such records, (B) make such reports, (C) install, use and maintain such monitoring equipment or methods, (D) sample such emissions (in accordance with such methods, at such locations, at such intervals, and in such manner as the Administrator shall prescribe), and (E) file with the Administrator any and all information regarding such emission, including, but not limited to, the sources, composition, amount, duration, and any other information regarding the emission that the Administrator deems necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities pursuant to this section."

"(2) the Administrator shall, within ninety days after enactment of this section, issue a reporting form to persons operating facilities deemed by the Administrator to be significant sources of air pollution. The reporting forms shall require the recipient to disclose the type and amount of pollutants emitted from all facilities operated by the recipient. The reporting forms may also require the disclosure of such other data as the Administrator might reasonably require. Chapter 35 of Title 44 of the United States Code shall not apply to reporting forms issued under this subparagraph.

(2) Strike out subsection (c) and insert in lieu thereof:

"(c) Any records, reports or information obtained under subsection (a) shall be available to the public, without regard to any other restriction or limitation in law."

SEC. 5. Section 202 of the Clean Air Act is amended by adding the following subsection (C) to section 202(b)(1) after subsections (A) and (B).

"(C) The Administrator shall immediately commence the testing of all types of propulsion systems for motor vehicles other than the internal combustion engine to determine which has the most satisfactory emission characteristics and performance. If, based upon the analysis of data derived from such tests, the Administrator determines that a propulsion system other than the internal combustion engine has emission characteristics superior to the internal combustion engine, he shall set standards based upon such characteristics. These standards shall be at least as stringent as those required by section 202(b)(1)(A) and (B). These standards shall be published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable but no later than December 1, 1972, and shall be applicable to all new motor vehicle engines produced beginning with the 1976 model year."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 209 of the Clean Air Act is amended to read as follows:

"STATE STANDARDS

"SEC. 209. (a) Nothing in this part shall preclude any State or political subdivision thereof from enforcing emission standards for motor vehicles or motor vehicle engines that are more restrictive than the standards set forth by the Administrator and nothing in this part shall preclude, deny, or limit in

any manner, the power of any State or political subdivision thereof to control, regulate, or restrict the use, operation, or movement of motor vehicles conforming to the terms of this part.

"(b) Nothing in this part shall preclude any State, or political subdivision thereof, from prescribing or enforcing any control or prohibition respecting the use of a fuel, or a fuel additive, or an aircraft fuel that is more restrictive than any control or prohibition imposed by the Administrator, and nothing in this part shall preclude, deny or limit in any manner, the power of any State, or political subdivision thereof, to control, regulate, or restrict the use of any fuel, fuel additive or aircraft fuel which otherwise conforms to the requirements of this part.

(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (c) of section 211 of the Clean Air Act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. The Clean Air Act is amended by striking out section 233 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 233. Nothing in this part shall preclude any State or subdivision thereof from enforcing aircraft emission standards more restrictive than the standards set forth by the Secretary."

SEC. 8. The Clean Air Act is amended by redesignating section 303 as section 303(a) and by adding subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, whenever the Administrator finds that a pollution source or combination of sources (including moving sources) create a severe air pollution problem which will not otherwise be abated quickly, he shall bring a suit on behalf of the United States in the appropriate United States Court to immediately restrain the persons causing or contributing to the alleged pollution. As part of his suit the Administrator shall submit to the court a plan for the abatement of the air pollution which, if found by the court to be reasonable in view of the purposes of this Act and the declared national goal of environmental protection, shall become part of the court's order. Violations of any provisions of such plans shall be punishable by a civil penalty of $10,000 per day.

LAWRENCE S. FANNING

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened by the news of the death of a good friend, an outstanding journalist and one of Alaska's most imaginative citizens. Lawrence S. Fanning, editor and publisher of the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily News died suddenly at the age of 56.

Mr. Fanning had the vision and sensitivity to initiate progress and lead men to better things. He was never satisfied with things as they were, but he envisioned for Alaska things she herself could not conceive.

Larry was a giant among journalists and his reputation spread from coast to coast. Journalists from across the country knew Larry to be strong, indefatigable, and imaginative.

Alaska owes much to Mr. Fanning. When he came to Alaska in 1967, he came with the hope and drive to help solve some of Alaska's most pressing problems. He soon became friends with all parts of Alaska's population. It was Larry Fanning who brought the problems of the Bush to the people in the cities of Alaska and to the urban areas of our country. Similarly, Larry was able to bring to the Bush a fair and accurate account of how things were across the country, and all over the world. He was able to mesh the best of two different worlds by opening and supporting communication links between vastly different people.

Larry was the first publisher and editor to bring the issues of the native land claims to the attention of a broad spectrum of the population. He was a good friend of our native citizens and understood their problems well. Mr. Fanning was in the forefront of the fight for a just solution to Alaska's most important social and economic issue.

Last year, the Anchorage Daily News under his superb leadership was awarded the Scripps-Howard award for his paper's reporting of conservation issues. He was keenly aware of the problems of not only Alaska, but of the Nation as well.

He was a responsible liberal voice in the great land. He spoke out forthrightly against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, for a deeper understanding of the social issues of the day, and in general, gave a national voice to his Alaskan community.

Larry's career in journalism is marked by his close association with many noted reporters. He hired the first native columnist and gave support to many other highly qualified and talented people.

When a man like Lawrence Fanning dies, he takes a bit from us all. More importantly, though, he leaves something with us that we never had before.

FISH FARMING ACT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a bill today that both my colleague from Mississippi, H. CHARLES GRIFFIN, and I introduced toward the end of the 91st Congress. The bill is the Fish Farming Assistance Act of 1971. This bill combines two basic approaches. First, it would place all responsibility for marketing and research, for technical assistance and equipment development under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. The Bureau of Sports Fisheries of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce through the National Marine Fisheries Service are presently doing a capable and efficient job.

However, because of a great amount of growth and interest we should start considering fish farming in its rightful place—a genuine livestock industry.

I believe that by working through USDA and Merchant Marine and Fisheries, we have the opportunity to avoid costly duplication of Government interests and operations.

The second portion of this legislation would authorize the Federal Government to make various forms of financial assistance available to fish farmers throughout the Nation. Under this bill the Government would participate to the extent of 90 percent of the cost of a proposed venture, but would limit the direct loans to 50 percent. The balance of the governmental assistance would come in the form of guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, fish farming is no joking matter, it is a relatively new industry with high profit potential. Many farm producers are entering this field to bolster their sagging farm income.

In a few days, CHARLES GRIFFIN and I are going to reintroduce this bill and we would be pleased for any our colleagues to join us as cosponsors.

CURE FOR CURRENT ILLS?

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in this time of inflation, when the States and cities are suffering from high unemployment and complain of insufficient funds to continue many community programs, the administration has proposed a plan for Federal revenue sharing. While all share a desire to see municipal budgets adequately funded, this problem is complex and its results far reaching, and the arguments which either support or criticize the plan must be carefully examined before the Congress decides whether or not the plan offers a substantial measure of a cure for the current ills of the Nation's cities. In particular, we must consider possible discriminatory effects upon our own States and also the capacity of the Federal Government to finance this problem on top of existing commitments.

I should like to submit for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Naugatuck Daily News for January 18, 1971, and which offers considerations which must figure prominently in our final decision.

The editorial follows:

NO REVENUE TO SHARE

Revenue-Sharing is a spending gimmick whose time has come, in the thinking of White House officials.

The idea behind revenue-sharing is that the federal government should raise the revenue and then share it with the states and cities. What the Nixon administration hopes to gain from revenue-sharing it is hard to understand since it would have the unpopular task of taxation while the states and cities would have the pleasure of expending funds they don't have to bother collecting.

Mayors and governors, led by big-spender Nelson Rockefeller, who has managed to bring New York State to the point of bankruptcy, quite naturally are pushing revenue-sharing. Many are afraid to ask for any higher state or local taxes from a public already fed up with increased spending and decreased services.

Proponents of revenue-sharing often forget that it can be financed in only three ways: by reducing expenditures in some other federal programs, by increasing the federal debt or by increasing federal taxes. The first would irritate the bureaucrats and any recipients

of federal aid, in many cases the very cities and states that think revenue-sharing is their panacea. The second would heat up the inflation which proved damaging to the GOP in the 1970 election. The third would hurt the Republicans in the 1972 election, for which the President already is gearing up.

Further, only the politically naive could think that Congress would raise funds and then allow them to be spent for programs of which it disapproved. And, too, should the federal government find itself in a financial pinch, it well could end the program on short notice which could prove disastrous to the recipients.

There also is the more immediate fact, as pointed out by Rep. John Byrnes, ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, that there is no revenue to share. Uncle Sam is worse than broke. He's in debt.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important aspects of our efforts to secure better treatment for an early release of our prisoners of war is to let the men who have suffered this fate know we have not forgotten them. This was why so many of my colleagues and I have joined in the introduction of the resolution to designate a National Week of Concern, March 21–27, for American prisoners of war and those missing in action.

Long before I was able to get behind this effort in such a concrete way, the Honorable BILL BROCK, now junior Senator from Tennessee, was providing leadership in this humanitarian endeavor as Representative of Tennessee's Third District. He is a cosponsor of the resolution in the Senate this year. I am pleased to join hands with Senator BROCK as we strive to get the message across to the leaders in Hanoi about the necessity to observe universally accepted standards of decency and human concern.

The importance of what we are doing was cited in an editorial in the Chattanooga, Tenn., News-Free Press on January 25. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this editorial, "Lest We Forget" appear in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD. The editorial follows:

LEST WE FORGET

Rep. LaMar Baker of Chattanooga has chosen a worthy subject for his first measure introduced in Congress. Sen. Bill Brock of Chattanooga has chosen well in joining in Senate sponsorship. The two local men have called on Congress and the nation to give special attention to the plight of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia by designating the week of March 21–27 as a "national week of concern for American prisoners of war and missing in action."

It was on March 26, 1964, that the first American was captured by the North Vietnamese. He is one of some 1,500 Americans known to be in Red hands or simply listed as missing. The Communists say they hold only a little more than one-fifth of those we suspect they have. The Reds violate the Geneva Convention for proper treatment of prisoners and will not even give a full accounting or allow international inspection of prison camps.

The doves and their allies in this country, some eagerly and some reluctantly, are supporting a phasing out of American military action that might leave those American prisoners still in Red hands.

Let us not forget them. Rep. Baker and Sen. Brock are joining a nationwide effort to keep them in our minds. Let us all join.

THE ART OF GIVING

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, our attention is drawn, and perhaps too infrequently, to singular examples of the true meaning of humanity—man's kindness to his fellow man in the art of giving. One such example has recently come to light in the area which I represent, Connecticut's Fourth District. I would hasten to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the doer in this sense did not seek the publicity he has received nor has he ever sought the thanks of anyone for the kindnesses he has performed. Credit, for bringing this matter to our attention, must go to Mr. Peter Prichard, an enterprising reporter for the Greenwich, Conn., Time and Mrs. Helen Anderson, a volunteer worker for the Greenwich Red Cross who suggested the story to Pete.

And that, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the person involved, a man I know the Members of this House would like to join me in saluting, Mr. Philip Westerman, of Byram, Conn.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Westerman knows and lives the true spirit of human fellowship. I could tell you of Mr. Westerman but his story is best told by Mr. Prichard whose account appeared in January 28, 1971, editions of the Greenwich Time and the Stamford, Conn., Advocate. Mr. Speaker, that account follows:

BYRAM MAN AIDS 21—LITTLE MONEY, BIG HEART

(By Peter Prichard)

BYRAM.—Philip Westerman doesn't have the biggest pocketbook around, but he does have a big heart.

With his pension and what he receives from Social Security, the 66-year-old Westerman supports 21 persons in four foreign countries under the Foster Parents Plan.

For 40 years, the Byram resident was a "cutoff man" for Con Edison in Westchester County. He turned the electricity off when people failed to pay their bills. Sometimes, if he found a particularly destitute family, he would pay the bill himself.

MADE DECISION

"But I couldn't do that when my wife was alive," he says. Westerman's wife, who had a bad heart, died in his arms when he came come from work one day in 1963. "I decided then when I wasn't paying off the doctors, I would help the poor," he said.

In January 1968, Westerman adopted his first child under the plan, Kim Wae Soon, who lives in Korea. Wae Soon was fatherless, and her mother earned 49 cents a day selling vegetables. One child in the family was mentally retarded, and another could not attend school because of the family's poverty.

Westerman intended to pay the standard $16 per month each Foster Parent pays under the plan by using what he saved when he stopped smoking. But he soon found that his adopted family took more and more of his time, and he adopted another child. By mid-summer of 1968, he was supporting the Korean family, and families in Greece, the Philippines and Colombia as well.

In each of the families, the father was unable to serve as the breadwinner. The father of the Greek family was in a mental institution, and the mother made 88 cents a day as a charwoman. The Filipino father had tuberculosis. The mother in Colombia supported a blind father and several children in a hut that kept falling down.

Westerman soon found he was spending more than the required $16 per month for each family. In all, he sent $163 a month to "his families"—to help pay for food, clothing, housing, and the cost of educating the children. He spends his entire Social Security check and a good part of his pension each month on his families.

Last year, Westerman had a strange, troubling dream, he said. In the dream he was in the Philippines.

"I was trying to get to my family," he said, "but I couldn't make it. You know how those things are in dreams. There was destruction all around me. My heart began to hurt—I have a bad heart—and I woke up."

The next day he called the Foster Parents office in New York and learned that a typhoon had struck the Philippines, and the family's home had been destroyed.

Westerman reached into his savings and bought the family a new home, for $1,000. It has a concrete foundation and mahogany walls. When the next typhoon hit the Philippines, the neighbors came to stay in the new house because it was strong and safe.

To get the Filipino family on their feet economically, Westerman sent the mother to fashion school and bought her a new sewing machine. She sews at home to supplement her income. He sent the oldest daughter, Elenita, $400 for all four years of high school. He sent it all at once, "so if something happens to me, she'll get an education."

For his Korean family, Westerman also bought a new house, for $1,000. Then he bought an entire vegetable business for the mother, for another $1,000. The mother's income rose from $33 per month to $70. Wae Soon is attending school and taking "hard piano lessons." Westerman has paid for the lessons through 1972.

After the Colombian family's shack fell down again, this time while the blind grandfather was in it, Westerman spent $1,500 for a new home and land. He recently sent $106 for the mother's operation for a double hernia, but the mother is superstitious and reluctant to enter the hospital. But besides generous financial aid, Westerman has given 21 people hope in the midst of poverty. "There's nothing more in this than giving a scrap of food to the poor," he says. "I get into it so deeply, they become like my own flesh and blood. And it's the hope you give them. That's the main thing."

To those who would say we should help our own impoverished children first, Mr. Westerman says: "A child is a child. It doesn't matter which side of the ocean the child was born on."

His children know the nature of this man's help. Wae Soon wrote: "Our living is so much richer and easier than we used to know, and we owe all these to your help to us. We thank our God for sending his loving hand to us through your lovefilled heart."

Westerman's goal is to make each family self-supporting. "If the older children get good educations, they can help the younger ones," he says. "I won't be here that long. When I'm gone, perhaps they'll give the child to a Foster Parent who won't do as

much, and then they'll be back where they started."

"I don't expect to go to heaven because I help the poor," the retired bill collector says. "You're supposed to do these things—you're supposed to feed the poor."

Westerman may not think there is much unusual about being generous—but his children do. The Filipino girl, Elenita, wrote him, "We pray to God to give you a longer and fuller life to finish our studies in school."

He is happy with the improvement his families have made. "There's no more suffering for them now," he says.

JOBLESS NEED—COOPERATION

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months I have been working closely with a group of scientists and engineers in my district in an attempt to develop new ideas and approaches to the critical problem of unemployment which has affected so many of their colleagues in Massachusetts. This group, known as the "Lexington Seven," has performed diligent and extremely effective service, and I am most pleased to note that its labors have now received public recognition in an article published by the Boston Globe on February 1. Because I believe that this group can serve as an inspiration for other citizens to increase their participation in the process of Government in expectation of attaining meaningful results, I wish to share the article with my colleagues.

The text of the article follows:

JOBLESS NEED—COOPERATION

(By Donald White)

When MIT physicist, Brian Schwartz, talks about manpower problems and the plight of jobless scientists and engineers, he is apt to use the "Tragedy of the Commons" as an analogy.

The commons in question were grazing grounds for British cattle.

"There would be," Schwartz explains, "perhaps 100 farmers with 10 cows each using the common as grazing grounds and everything would be fine.

"But then one farmer would consider adding a cow which, from his point of view, was reasonable because it would increase his production by 10 percent.

"However, other farmers felt justified in doing the same so eventually there were no longer 1000 cows on the common but 1100 and the grazing could no longer support them and—for a variety of reasons—they all died."

The point of his analogy is that an operation can suceed through cooperation but fail through self interest. That is one of the major problems afflicting Greater Boston's technological manpower, he claims.

He note, for example, that:

Universities are more concerned with being production centers of students than providing "relevant education."

Industry hires and fires specialists rather than educating technological types in other disciplines.

Technologists job-hop without qualms in good times.

Professional societies stick too rigidly to technical disciplines and fail to acknowledge that today's problems cut through all disciplines.

Government compounds the whole mess with its stop-go funding.

Schwartz contends that the technological manpower crunch will never be solved unless approached on a cooperative basis by all factions involved.

That is what he, an employed scientist, is trying to accomplish—has been for the past three years, in fact. "I saw the problem coming."

He has stepped-up his efforts recently as one of a group that calls itself the Lexington Seven, an organization that has established working rapport with Republican Congressman F. Bradford Morse.

Other members of the Seven are: Herb Sherman, an engineer with Lincoln Laboratories and Beth Israel Hospital; John Sampson, Raytheon physicist; Wayne Lees, an unemployed physicist; Harold Goldberg, engineer with Analogic Corp.; Eric Clarke, a vice-president at Technical Operations, Inc., and Ephraimm Weiss, a Raytheon physicist.

The Seven came into being after Morse had suggested he would welcome suggestions about the manpower problem. One result was that Morse himself commissioned a jobless technologist to undertake a month-long study of where such unemployed might be used on the problems of the City of Lowell.

One short-term remedy for the jobless problem being studied by the Seven is direct government agency funding for engineers and scientists who submit individual proposals relating to specific technological problems.

Such funding, which would provide short-term work almost on a consulting basis, would permit those out of work to "hold the line and live a life of dignity," Schwartz said.

One of the agencies Schwartz has approached with the suggestion is the Department of Transportation's research center in Cambridge. The response was less positive than he had hoped because such funding, it was explained would require legislative changes.

Nevertheless, a DOT spokesman will be on hand in Lexington's Town Hall at 8 p.m. Wednesday when the Seven will hold a meeting with other groups from surrounding communities to discuss the economic crisis facing the technological jobless.

Says Schwartz, who is concerned about the psychological effect upon the unemployed: "We must try to give them hope."

THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to establish a select committee to study and investigate all energy resources in the United States. Citizens in the Northeast corner of the United States have endured power shortages and extremely high power rates.

For example, the town of Newington in my district has experienced a number of total electrical blackouts. From currently available information there seems to be little concrete planning for meeting present and future power needs. Thus, it is imperative that all levels of government be concerned with this issue. In the Northeast, the problems of oil and electrical power are well known by resident and public officials. Something must be done. It is my feeling that a committee responsible to the people and not to one governmental figure will effect solutions that will minimize this continuing power crisis.

This select committee to study power resources would report on these topics: First, the availability of all sources of power; second, identify the ownership of these power sources, the reasons for delays in new starts; third, effect of pricing practices by owners; fourth, effect of import of low sulfur fuels; fifth, equipment needed for more efficacious transfer of fuels; sixth, measures to eliminate electrical energy crises; and seventh, detailed study of the ecological effects of electricity industry.

I hope this measure will receive prompt consideration.

HELP OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

The problems of the more than 26 million senior citizens in this country who are on social security requires both immediate and long range action.

It is with this in mind that I have sent the following letter to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1971.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I was pleased to learn that your committee intends to take action on Social Security funding increases early this session.

A significant rise in benefits to the more than 26 million Social Security recipients who are so particularly hard hit by inflation is badly needed. But, at the same time, any rise in Social Security benefits voted by Congress this year should be considered only an interim step toward a totally revised Social Security System, a system more realistic and more responsive to the needs of our Senior Citizen.

More specifically, I would urge that you and your committee consider Social Security benefits which will vary as the cost of living varies. This would avoid the almost annual Congressional battle on this matter and would at the same time, avoid the necessity of making our Senior Citizens suffer under their fixed incomes each year.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I urge you and your committee to give continued support to raising the maximum allowable income from $1680.00 to a figure which more realistically approaches the necessities of today's living. It makes no sense to penalize a Senior Citizen because he or she goes out and gets a job and earns more than previously authorized.

The recent findings of the Senate Select Committee on Aging, that one in every four Senior Citizens in America is living in poverty, is one that must weigh heavily on the minds of all Americans. Senior Citizens have worked too hard and too long in making this country great for us to forget them. As matters stand now, Senior Citizens are indeed "forgotten Americans."

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

PETER A. PEYSER,
Member of Congress.

THE RELEVANCE OF SPACE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in October 1970, the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics held its seventh annual meeting. Dr. Arthur Kantrowitz, director of the Avco Corp. Research Laboratory and vice president of Avco Corp., presented a paper discussing our unlimited opportunities to improve the quality of life through the utilization of space. Dr. Kantrowitz, a practical visionary, points to the major contributions to be made by our national space program for the betterment of life for this Nation and the people of the world. I recommend this important commentary to all my colleagues and to the public:

THE RELEVANCE OF SPACE

(By Dr. Arthur Kantrowitz)

A generation ago people growing up in America were imbued with the idea of progress, that mankind could continuously improve not only the material conditions of life, but mankind itself. One of the important elements of that belief is that there are no visible limits that we could not surpass. I was shocked when in a college philosophy course I first discovered that many philosophers called this view of life "naive optimism." Today we hear a great deal about the limitations to mankind's capabilities. It is very fashionable to make facile predictions of imminent disasters resulting from technological advances and such predictions have received wide currency even though they are frequently based on a very superficial look at the potentialities of a creative approach to our problems. I would like to call this view of mankind's future naive pessimism. It is perfectly clear that, just as naive optimism has had an enormous impact as a self-fulfilling prophecy, the same would be true for naive pessimism with deadening consequences.

The pessimism that most affects the space program is the limited vision of the utility of space to mankind. It is my purpose today to exhibit as clearly as I can that present fixing of any such limits can be nothing but naive. Consider, for example, the extreme proposition that the real answer to the dilemma set by the population explosion might be that a substantial and increasing fraction of mankind will find living in space attractive and that there will be a mass emigration into space. Years ago there was considerable discussion of the possibilities of large manned space stations with many people living not on other astronomical objects but in space itself. However, in recent times mentioning such far fetched propositions is distinctly unfashionable. I would like to see if there is a solid reason why this hope cannot be seriously put forth. Is there something that has been discovered that indicates the possibilities for such a migration are fanciful or that it requires completely new scientific discoveries or great new inventions? I would like to divide this question into three parts:

1st, is there anything we know that indicates that space cannot be made an attractive place to live?

2nd, has it been established that great decreases in launching costs cannot be achieved with presently foreseeable technology?

3rd, is there any information to indicate that even large "cities" in space could not be made economically viable?

Notice that all these questions are put negatively. I will not, of course, be able to demonstrate that we can do these things. I will simply maintain that there are no demonstrations that we cannot, and that the lack of discussion of this possibility is a consequence of our currently fashionable naive pessimism.

It is not yet clear that space is any more than an attractive place to visit, but maybe nobody would ever want to live there—something like New York City. I would submit, however, that if technology is allowed to continue advancing we can first assure that long duration living in space will not impair health, and later work toward making it comfortable and enjoyable. The environment that we now live in is so far removed from the state that evolution prepared us to live in, that it seems the further changes brought on by living in space, perhaps in a weightless situation, would be small compared to the changes in man's environment that we have already made. Certainly the success we have had thus far with people living in space for many days would lead us to approach the next steps with considerable enthusiasm. The Skylab Project will give us the opportunity to extend this period to at least 56 days. It is certainly much too early at the present time to be pessimistic about the attractiveness of space as a place to live so that defects with the extreme proposition must be found in other areas.

It might well be argued that even if it were desirable to live in space we could not afford to send more than a very small, select group of people to live there. Indeed, if the cost of launching a pound into an appropriate orbit is like $1,000 or a substantial fraction thereof, then this would be true. However, it is worth looking at where the real limits are to the cost of putting a pound in space. If we consider the energy necessary to place one pound in a low orbit, that energy can be expressed as kilowatt hours, and the number is about 4.5 which costs about two cents at wholesale rates. If we can learn to put mass in orbit for 50 or even 500 times this cost, a dollar or ten dollars a pound, it becomes clear that we can supply a mass of say 10,000 pounds per person which ought to be enough to making living in space healthy, comfortable and attractive. Present launching techniques with reusable vehicles give promise of cost reduction of one or even two orders of magnitude. However, to approach the fantastically small costs quoted for ground power, it may be necessary to devise techniques in which energy is transmitted from the ground to the launch vehicle. This might require power transmission of the order of 1,000 MW to launch even a relatively small space shuttle. And if we consider beaming powers of this order of magnitude over hundreds of miles, this clearly is not yet here. On the other hand, the power available from lasers has been going up rapidly since their invention, but we still have five or six orders of magnitude increases required. It seems to me, however, that it is likely that the coming decade will see this appear as an important possibility. I would maintain that nothing we now know rules out this potentiality.

Perhaps even if it is attractive for people to live in space and we could economically put them into orbit, we might ask whether such orbiting villages or cities could be economically self-supporting. First, it would be necessary for them to have nearly closed ecosystems so that they will not rely on importation for all their needs. The real question is what can they return to the earth which will compensate for the remaining necessary importations. We have heard something about the unique possibilities for manufacturing processes in space, but the suggestions that have been made refer to processes whose economic value is not clearly comparable to the costs of space operations. I would like to submit, however, that there is one activity which could be carried out in space and which is a significant part of the gross national product, like ⅓, and most rapidly growing. I refer to the generation, processing and transmission of knowledge. In parts of this great segment of our economic activity space groups would not find themselves at any economic disadvantage compared to their earth bound competitors. They might, in fact, have a slight advantage in the easy transmission of enormous amounts of information through space. I would submit, therefore, that here also it is naive to assert that space cities could not be economically viable.

Naive pessimism about the role that space can play in exhibiting the possibilities for unlimited progress is in my view one of the important bases for the present move to restrict space activity. I think it is important that we emphasize that any limits that people can now set are naive. The opportunity for the growth of new worlds in space with all of the advantages that people have gained from fresh starts in creating new societies, is among the potentials of space. I submit that a space program directed toward exhibiting that there are no visible limits to man's future in the universe could be a most important help in reviving faith in the idea of progress. I can imagine nothing more relevant to our current problems.

ESTABLISH A ROLL OF HONOR FOR AMERICAN INVENTORS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation, in which I am proud to be joined by our esteemed colleague the Honorable BOB WILSON of California, to establish a roll of honor for American inventors.

Throughout the course of our almost 200 years of history, the U.S. Government has given little recognition to our great inventors, save for the grant of the letters of patent themselves. It is hard to conceive what sort of people we would be today without the ingenuity and toil of these many great Americans. It could almost be said that our industrial might and advanced technology exists today because of these unsung heroes.

It is estimated that since the Patent Office began issuing patents in 1790, more than 500,000 persons have received patents. Of these, about one of every thousand, or about 500, have received 25 or more patents.

We have all heard of Thomas A. Edison who had 1,093 patents, and most American schoolchildren have heard of Eli Whitney, the Wright Brothers, Cyrus McCormick, Alexander Graham Bell, and Goodyear. But many great inventors are unknown to most of us.

Many who have made major contributions to the greatness of this Nation have never been properly recognized by what should be a grateful Nation. I consider it appropriate, therefore, that these individuals, known and unknown, be afforded a permanent place of honor in recognition of their contribution to our technological advancement.

My bill provides that the Commissioner of Patents shall establish a roll of honor for American inventors, and include thereon each American inventor whose

name appears as the patentee in 25 or more U.S. Patents; or whose name is selected by unanimous vote of an honor roll board and that those so honored may file sole applications for patents without payment of fees otherwise required.

EXPERT CHRISTMAS FREELOADER SAM PRATT TALKS TO R. G. G. PRICE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article from Punch on a slightly different subject nevertheless contains much advice that would be useful to new Members of Congress:

EXPERT CHRISTMAS FREELOADER SAM PRATT TALKS TO R. G. G. PRICE

I have never failed to live without working, at any time of the year. Indeed, I once ate three chef-cooked meals on a Good Friday. But it is during the run-up to Christmas that I really show my expertise. In December, it's not just a matter of whether you eat and drink—but where. Let me give you a practical exercise in discrimination.

Within easy reach there are a combined Independence Day and Christmas Party at the Legation of some smallish, newish State, a Reception at the Embassy of a Big Power, the Annual Dinner of the Geological Survey and the executive-level Banquet of a vast engineering group. Which do you pick?

FREE FOOD

Certainly not the Big Power. They don't need to make friends to influence people, legislative pressure back home may have made the building dry and the security staff is too large and bored and tends to confuse gate-crashers with spies. Don't turn down the Geologists out of hand; they may include keen gastronomes. *But* they will easily spot the non-geologist, not just when he tries to break the ice by commenting on the marble walls of the restaurant, but at sight. You simply won't be able to counterfeit that look of a learned tortoise combined with an outdoor man, especially if you've come on from a winetasting.

My bet would be the *arriviste* nation. They might easily be only too anxious to impress with the splendour of their hospitality. (Trying to make the guest-list by planting articles praising their Head of State in obscure magazines means working for your refreshment and I consider this amateurish.) They will be too glad to see the party filling up to fuss over invitation-cards, though it is always a good idea to walk in with an MP if you coincide with one. Afraid of cutting a constituent, he will take your arm. Be prepared, just in case there should be a check, with a document in some obscure language. If it is rejected, apologise for confusing them with a state they obviously dislike. Terrified of a diplomatic incident, they will rush you to the buffet.

Firms' dinners are generally nourishing and often lavishly alcoholic. All you need to do is shift round a few place-cards. Nobody is going to miss anything that's going on by checking with the table-plan. The odd man out will be fitted in. Head waiters worry over serving schedules far more than over the occasional extra portion. Conversational danger can be met with a merry cry of, "No shop! Where are you spending your holidays?" Leave before the Chairman's speech gets under way.

FREE DRINK

One useful type of accessible hospitality is the film press show. Generally, though far from always, security is lax. During the drinks afterwards, the public relations staff circulate to edge opinion tactfully the right way. A heated condemnation of the film can lead to above-average refills.

Christmas is not only guzzling. Firms give away all kinds of things, from ashtrays praising the donor in obtrusive lettering to real loot at the end of the scale where you would be operating. In his piece last week about the gifts that sweeten the toiler in the communications world, William Hardcastle surprised me by the modesty of the handouts his colleagues cheerfully accept. A few bottles of hard liquor from a theatrical manager makes a paltry offering in a world where you can get a service of gold plate from an oil company by having grazing rights over a hopeful stretch of desert, a world in which companies of the kind I deal with hire Glyndebourne to give their retailers a night out and are always ready to buy the Chairman a grouse moor so that he can return hospitality.

FREE EVERYTHING

Don't, by the way, hope to get a clerical job and add your name to the mailing-list during the lunch break: you would lose cast in the profession by working and, anyway, the better its presents, the more likely a company is to be proud of its personnel-selection techniques. It is much more effective to send them a present yourself, hoping this will programme some computer in your favour. Operate from somewhere rural and inaccessible, as more and more firms do these days. There's no need to form a company of register under the Business Names Act. All you want is notepaper headed, in deprecating type, with your surname followed by the word "Associates."

Your present should be frankly cheap but look as though it had been lovingly tracked down. Any much-riveted plate will do, perhaps accompanied by a slip in a scholarly hand saying that it is, just possibly, an early copy, without saying an early copy of what. This ought to be good for anything from an *Epicure's Hamper* (Non-economy size) upwards.

By early in the New Year, you should not merely have put on weight pleasurably, but be well stocked with usable, better still saleable gifts. You might even be able to throw a small party yourself.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, to many the name of J. Edgar Hoover is synonymous with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At the age of 76 he is one of America's most respected law enforcement officers and perhaps one of the most controversial. Hoover has served under eight separate Presidents. He has withstood pressures from many people, groups, and government officials and has still managed to keep the FBI in the highest public regard.

In recent years, Mr. Hoover has come under vicious attacks from many sides. Last year, for example, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark questioned his power stating that Hoover was a man with an ego problem. I view any attack on the Director's character, loyalty, or ability as extremely unfortunate. He has proven to be a strong leader; one who, in the last 47 years, has seen our country through the gangland era of the 1920's and 1930's; one who has had a hand in limiting the internal spread of communism and subversive activities, and one who has now taken up the fight against organized crime. Mr. Hoover is an expert in the field of crime and crime prevention. America today has a drastic need for the type of professionalism displayed by both Mr. Hoover and the Bureau.

My personal admiration for J. Edgar Hoover is shared by others. As stated in the Orlando Evening Star:

Mr. Hoover is admired by millions of grateful Americans . . . The Evening Star has long been a strong supporter of Director Hoover and has said so many times in editorials.

In closing let me say Director Hoover has done an outstanding job and deserves the support of all Americans.

THE NEW SOUTH

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Henry Grady, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, once delivered perhaps the greatest address of any southerner when he stood before the New England Society in New York City and delivered the now-famous oration entitled "The New South." Many years later a President of the United States stood in an area not far from Grady's Atlanta and referred to the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. Today, however, the South of Henry Grady is coming to being and the South is the No. 1 area of economic opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the Anderson, S.C., Daily Mail, one of the most outstanding and progressive newspapers in the Southeast, annually publishes an outstanding review of our area's industrial, civic, and cultural progress entitled "The New South." This year's edition of "The New South" is a splendid record of the continuing progress of our area. It details the past record of achievement and points the way to future growth. I am proud to commend to my colleagues' attention the following Daily Mail editorial which appeared in the 21st annual edition of "The New South."

The editorial follows:

THE SOUTH'S NEW IMAGE

There's no better teacher than nature, and one of her most universal and convincing lessons is that most things function best when periods of dynamic growth and expansion are followed by intermittent seasons of relative inactivity and rest.

That's been true with the nation's economy following the soaring '60s.

Most of the nation has undergone a mild recession.

Here in the South, and more especially in the Southeast, it has been more of a "mini-recession" if the dip can be called a recession at all.

South Carolina's economic expansion, as shown by the Machovia Bank and Trust Company, indicates a five-year growth (1964–'69) of over 68 per cent.

The decline from late 1969 through 1970 has been 2.5 per cent—a ripple perhaps, but certainly no tidal wave in the economy.

At the beginning of 1971 every indication is that the great New South simply underwent a needed period of somewhat reduced activity, a year for consolidating gains, a year for allowing new industries to become well rooted, and a time for planning ahead for a new surge of dynamic growth.

That is not to say industrial growth has been halted in the past year.

On the contrary, South Carolina likely outstripped many other states in the nation, but it did not reach the annual half-billion dollar mark in industrial growth that marked the late '60s.

What was true in South Carolina applies generally to the entire region.

And so the advent of 1971 finds the area in readiness as industries resume construction of new plants or start making plans for new branches, or the expansion of existing facilities.

This twenty-first annual edition of The Daily Mail is published for the single purpose of summarizing past progress, and outlining opportunities for the future.

We hope that tens of thousands in our area and perhaps a multiplied number of thousands of business, industrial and financial leaders across the country will set aside several hours, at least, to read, to inspect, to evaluate progress and opportunities described within its pages.

South Carolina is approaching the period of growth ahead with a capable, alert, imaginative and thoroughly progressive State Development Board. It is headed by a new executive director, Bonner Manly, a product of Clemson University and a man who has already had a successful career in industry.

He is, therefore, keenly aware of the needs and requirements for a successful industrial operation. Even before joining the state board, he had indirectly participated in assisting large corporations find good locations and establish profitable operations in the state.

When the position of director became vacant he was a natural choice because of his wide background of experience, and his intimate knowledge of what industry needs and of what the state has to offer.

Leaders in business and industry will find in Mr. Manly an individual upon whose judgment they can rely, and from whose knowledge and experience they can benefit.

Now, what of the Anderson area?

Industrialists who may formerly have looked at this immediate vicinity as a possible location for a plant site should, perhaps, make a new check.

The area's water problem has been largely solved.

Many suburban and other county areas that formerly had only limited industrial potential because of a lack of an adequate water supply now have that basic necessity in an abundance.

Most of this water comes from Lake Hartwell, which is fed by streams flowing out of the Blue Ridge foothills—water of the finest quality to be found in any location.

The great Duke Power Company's gigantic nuclear-powered plant, situated in a vast area of parks, lakes and hunting preserves, is being completed in adjacent Oconee and Pickens Counties—within a 45-minute drive of Anderson.

It will add to the Carolina Piedmont's already enormous electrical energy potential, making this area even more secure from power failures and "brown-outs" that have plagued many parts of the nation.

The area has no air pollution problem, and any minor pollution in streams is rapidly being eliminated.

The great Lake Hartwell is a veritable sleeping giant awaiting future development.

The reservoir, one of the largest inland bodies of water in the Southeast, last year had over 5 million visitors (twice the state's population) yet much of its shore line is unsettled area, ready for development as one of the great recreational and residential sections in the Southeast.

The area's tourism potential is still largely untouched.

Yet, from a base at Lake Hartwell, the tourist and vacationer is within a few minute's drive of Pendleton with its anti-bellum residences, its quaint square, its historic churches, its ancient halls and graveyards.

An hour and the visitor can be in the midst of the scenic grandeur of the Blue Ridge with its towering peaks, its waterfalls, its colorful mountain villages and other scenic and cultural attractions.

Industrially, Anderson has much to offer corporations looking for expansion sites.

It is, as we have said, rich is its water supply; it has available natural gas from Texas or from the Gulf Coast; it boasts excellent highways, including one of the Southeast's great traffic arteries, Interstate 85, Washington to Atlanta and beyond, and it is an area as free of labor troubles and unionism problems as any to be found.

The new South?

It is that and more.

The South is a section of the nation, once poverty-stricken, once blighted by ignorance, once held back by discriminatory laws and practices, but which has now broken these shackles.

Read the story told in current statistics—a per capita gain in income, a per capital wealth increase that is in excess of the nation at large.

Look at its modern, gleaming cities—among the most beautiful and thriving in the nation.

Travel its fine highways, sample its accommodations, talk with its people.

Add it all together and you find not merely the "New South" of two decades ago but a section that now stands on its two feet, that grows and prospers ahead of most of the nation—a true land of today and of tomorrow in this great America!

MRS. HENRY "KAY" PETERSON

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret and sorrow that I inform this House of the passing, on January 16, of Mrs. Kay Peterson.

During her seven terms as chairwoman of the Seventh District Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party she provided strength in time of defeat and spirit in time of victory. She was a truly great lady, a truly great leader. She was loved by all who knew her and she will be sadly missed:

Her mirth the world required;
She bathed it in smiles of glee.
But her heart was tired, tired,
And now they let her be.

Her life was turning, turning,
In mazes of heat and sound.
But for peace her soul was yearning,
And peace now laps her round.

Her cabined, ample spirit,
It fluttered and failed for breath.
Tonight it doth inherit
The vastly hall of death.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD CHINA: STATEMENT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE MARSHALL GREEN

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in his testimony last October before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Marshall Green discussed the evolution of U.S. policy toward Communist China during the past 21 years of Maoist rule.

In particular, Mr. Green called attention to some of the "altered circumstances of 1970" with which our China policymakers must deal. He summarized the specific, unilateral measures initiated by President Nixon to provide for an eventual normalization of relations between our two countries when circumstances permit. It is to be hoped that the hearings on this subject will serve to broaden public understanding of our policy and the complex issues involved.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Green's statement on U.S. policy toward China. I commend it to the attention of this body. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY GREEN BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I welcome the opportunity to appear before this distinguished Committee to review United States policy toward China. I am sure that the hearings on this very important subject will serve to broaden understanding of our policy and of the complex issues with which it must deal. These hearings indeed may well prove helpful in the further refinement of our policy as it evolves in the light of a changing Asian context.

October 1 marked the twenty-first anniversary of the establishment of the People's Republic of China. During these 21 years the whole Asian scene has undergone changes of a kind and degree which could not have been predicted two decades ago. Mainland China itself has methodically, and at times frenetically, gone about destroying the vestiges of its two thousand year-old Confucian social order, attempting to replace it with Chairman Mao's brand of communism—a brand designed to rest on nothing less than basically reconstituted human nature. The convulsions resulting from this attempt have presented one of the most remarkable spectacles of modern history. In fact Peking's preoccupation throughout this period with a long series of overlapping campaigns to insure political purity on the part of 800 million Chinese undoubtedly has slowed progress toward the modernity so deeply desired by both government and people. That progress has been spotty, and out of step with promising developments in much of the rest of Asia.

On the People's Republic's twenty-first birthday it is emerging from the four-year Great Cultural Revolution which encompassed, among other things, a bitter power struggle, a serious and at times venomous policy debate, an attempt in many fields to destroy the old and adopt the new, and in general to refashion the very character of the Chinese people, in order that the continuation of revolutionary fervor might be assured in the younger generation. The emi-

nent scholars who have preceded me in these hearings have depicted these developments in some detail insofar as they can be viewed by the outside world, and I shall not elaborate on them here. In any event, I am sure there is general agreement that it is too early to offer a satisfactory appraisal of the results of the Cultural Revolution. The important factor from the standpoint of policy considerations is that policy differences evidently still persist in Communist China even after the ouster of former Chief of State Liu Shao-ch'i, the purge of vast numbers of lesser officials and the consequent apparent reconsolidation of Maoist control.

Over the past 21 years there have been fundamental changes not only in China but throughout the Asian setting, and indeed in the world as a whole, which have affected the way in which we have viewed the "China problem." Policies adopted during the first few years after the inception of the Communist regime, particularly in connection with the Korean aggression, have clearly not all been suited to a greatly altered circumstance today. Beginning in the early 60's, however, those policies began to evolve, in line with changed Chinese, regional and world conditions. The evolution of our policies has accelerated over the past year or two, but the pace, for a variety of reasons, is still a measured one. Some believe the pace to be too slow, some believe it to be too fast. It appears that virtually no one, however, would have it remain static in the face of a rapidly changing world.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF PAST MORE RIGID POLICIES

Let us take a brief look at the circumstances under which our more rigid policies of the past took form, before we examine the reasons for both the direction and the pace of the changes in that policy which have come about more recently.

In the early 50's:

Our postwar hopes for a constructive relationship with our wartime Soviet ally had been destroyed by the Communist occupation of Eastern Europe, leaving the two main centers of the world power in opposing, antagonistic camps bidding for the allegiance of those attempting to remain neutral.

Soviet power was augmented by close collusion with the new Communist China, and both appeared determined to enlarge Communist spheres of control or influence by force of arms if necessary.

Communist China was heady with the success of its unexpectedly rapid takeover of the mainland, and was a largely unknown quantity. There were scant data on which to assess its intentions with respect to its neighbors.

Most of the rest of East and Southeast Asia had suffered widespread devastation from the most destructive war in history, and this weakness was compounded by the emergence of a dozen newly independent states inexperienced in governing, lacking in measures of self-defense, and most of them with growing problems of insurgency which seemed to invite outside exploitation. The Chinese colossus appeared to cast a long dark shadow.

Peking was threatening imminent "liberation" of Taiwan.

There was massive Chinese intervention in the Korean war in which we suffered over 33,000 fatalities.

Throughout the 50's Communist China was making remarkable progress in industrial development, with increasing emphasis upon military preparedness.

At the same time, Peking's hostility to the United States became progressively more blatant, from the proclamation of "leaning to one side" in 1949 and the announcement in 1957 that the "east wind is prevailing over the west" to the renewed calls for global revolution against the "imperialist" powers headed by the United States.

As with the postwar Soviet Union, we originally had hopes of a constructive relationship with the new regime in Peking. We left a large number of our official diplomatic and consular personnel on the mainland for several months after the Communist regime came to power, until the authorities made their position untenable. The Korean war then made impossible any regularization of our relations with Peking for the foreseeable future.

I realize that the above list of conditions in the 50's is well known to this Committee. I have presumed to reiterate these points, however, as a reminder not only of the context in which our more rigid policy of that time arose, but also of the reasons why that policy persisted as long as it did. I understand that a number of the China experts who have preceded me in these hearings have questioned whether the measured changes in our policy have not come later than they should have, and some consider that those changes should have been greater in degree. Judgment in these matters is of course moot.

THE ALTERED CIRCUMSTANCES OF 1970

Let us take a brief look at the altered circumstances in 1970 with which our policies must deal:

World power today is polycentric, and becoming more so. The deep schism between the two Communist giants has had a profound effect upon the Asian balance of power. They have found such serious points of difference that each is viewed even as a potential military threat to the other, though large-scale warfare between them does not appear likely. At the same time Japan is emerging as a fourth major power in Asia and the Pacific, along with the Soviet Union, Communist China and ourselves.

Today we have a better basis on which to judge Peking's military doctrine and probable intentions. Peking will abet so-called "people's wars" and furnish limited material assistance, but it claims that its policy is to have no troops stationed outside its own borders.

It is not today considered to pose a "juggernaut" type threat to its neighbors and has been prudent in facing United States power in the area. Of course U.S. power undoubtedly has deterred China and helped to produce the prudence to which I have referred.

Much of the rest of Asia meanwhile has made remarkable progress in stability and prosperity, as well as in self-defense. In Japan, South Korea and Taiwan progress has been dramatic. Indeed with the exception of the tragic conflict in Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia, where we are striving for an honorable settlement leading to a dependable peace, the prosperity and relative stability of the rest of Asia is in marked contrast to the demoralization, fear and hopelessness of the early 50's. Furthermore, in recent years growing regional cooperation in many fields among the non-Communist nations of Asia seems to portend an acceleration in the evolving stability of the region.

Despite earlier prognostications, China has by no means fulfilled the developmental promise of its first decade, and has therefore not become the model for developing countries to the degree which earlier seemed possible.

Peking has nevertheless given high priority to acquiring strategic weapons as a deterrent against attack as well as for the political leverage they afford. Achieving a nuclear capability will not necessarily make the Chinese more aggressive; I believe they will continue to be deterred by overwhelming U.S. and Soviet power. Nor is there evidence that the Chinese would consider their interests served by attempting crude nuclear "blackmail" in East Asia. But the fact is that the world is now faced with a nuclear China which is determined that its voice be heard.

EVOLUTION OF U.S. PERCEPTIONS OF CHINA

The above considerations, plus lesser ones which I have not enumerated, have caused some evolution in our perception of the intentions of the People's Republic of China with regard to Asia and the rest of the world. There is no question that Communist China continues to pose a potential threat to non-communist nations wherever its power to undermine their governments can be effectively applied. There is still genuine fear of the Chinese collosus on the part of the smaller Asian nations on its periphery. They are troubled by China's possession of nuclear power as well as by Peking's advocacy, and in some instances current support, of so-called "peoples wars." Furthermore, in most of these countries there is a sizeable, economically powerful overseas Chinese element in the population. While the business acumen and entrepreneural skills of these Chinese are valued, there is continued uneasiness about their political loyalties, however unjustified that concern may be. Nevertheless the nature of the threat on China's periphery is less direct than many supposed it earlier to be, and the capacity of others to deal with the threat, especially among China's non-communist neighbors, is generally greater than in the 50's.

PEKING'S MOUNTING DIPLOMATIC OFFENSIVE

With the denouement of the Cultural Revolution we have also witnessed a mounting diplomatic offensive by Peking, during which some 28 ambassadors have been sent abroad, as contrasted with only one at post during much of the Cultural Revolution. Peking has received a parade of visiting delegations, many of whom have returned home with trade or aid agreements, and the Chinese have reciprocated a number of these visits. Premier Chou En-lai, who has played the leading role in China's diplomacy, is expected to make an extended tour late this year and early next year, during which he may officiate at the inauguration of China's most ambitious of numerous aid projects in Asia and Africa, construction of an 1100-mile railroad in Tanzania and Zambia. Peking for the first time in many years has shown interest in becoming a member of the United Nations, but it retains, of course, as a condition for its entry the ouster of the Government of the Republic of China, which we and many other U.N. members find unacceptable. Peking's diplomatic initiatives are meeting with some success. Much of this response can probably be attributed to sheer relief that this quarter of mankind has apparently put aside the seeming near-madness that many saw in the Cultural Revolution. More basic, however, may be the concern that some of the world's most urgent problems cannot achieve definitive solution without the active participation and cooperation of the People's Republic of China.

These trends, if they continue—and there is reason to suppose that they will—obviously have a substantial effect upon the thorny issue of Chinese representation in the United Nations. The Chinese return to more normal diplomatic conduct probably has been too recent for changing sentiment on the issue to be accurately reflected in the voting at this General Assembly. Many commitments have already been made. Peking has repeatedly denounced the authority of the United Nations and insisted upon the ouster of the Government of the Republic of China as one of its conditions of entry. While we have recognized the importance of Peking's participation in the international community, we have consistently opposed its entry into the U.N. if it were to be at the expense of the seat of a responsible present member. The Republic of China has lived by its charter obligations, and the population of Taiwan, I might point out, is larger than some two-thirds of the existing members of the U.N.

Changing circumstances in China and in East Asia have increased concern throughout the world, including our own country, at the length of time nearly a quarter of mankind has been isolated from most of the mainstream of international intercourse. The Administration shares that concern—although we and the outside world have but little leverage on the course of developments in Communist China.

IMPROVING RELATIONS WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Moreover, the very real security concerns of other Asian nations and our security commitments to a number of them, as well as other U.S. interests in the area, are factors that we must take into account in shaping our China policy. We consider it in everyone's interest, nevertheless, that China become more closely associated with attempts to solve many of the pressing problems of global concern. At the same time we would also welcome improvement in our bilateral relations with Peking.

Over the past 15 years we have met with the Chinese 136 times, first in Geneva and then in Warsaw, in bilateral talks at the Ambassadorial level. While fundamental improvement in our relationship has not been achieved, these talks have been very useful in a number of ways, including clarification of our positions and intentions and in handling certain practical problems at issue between us. Owing chiefly to their isolation from the mainstream of world affairs, the Chinese have been deeply suspicious of the intent of others. Through these talks, as well as the care with which we have exercised our military power in the area, we believe we have been reasonably successful in convincing the Chinese that most of their suspicions, at least those related to our intentions, are unfounded.

In the past few months we have noted tentative signs of a somewhat less fanatically ideological approach in Peking's domestic and foreign policies.

It is partly with this in mind that we resumed the talks with the Chinese at Warsaw in January 1970 and stand ready to continue them. Looking further ahead we want to keep the talks going as a vehicle for more constructive negotiation which we hope may become possible.

Sometimes we hear the accusation that, while we have gradually changed our posture toward Peking, we have not commensurately changed our policy. To a certain extent this is true inasmuch as it takes two to change a relationship so far as effective implementation of policy is concerned.

UNILATERAL STEPS ON CHINA TRADE AND TRAVEL

As an earnest of our desire to induce a constructive relationship we have taken a series of small unilateral steps on trade and travel:

In July 1969 we permitted noncommercial tourist purchases of up to $100 of Chinese goods.

At the same time we relaxed restrictions relating to travel to permit almost anyone with a legitimate purpose to travel to mainland China on an American passport. (We have validated over 900 passports for this purpose.)

In December 1969 we permitted unlimited tourist purchases of Chinese goods, enabling tourists, collectors, museums, and universities to import Chinese products for their own account.

In the same month we permitted American controlled subsidiaries abroad to conduct trade in non-strategic goods with mainland China.

In April 1970 we announced selective licensing of American-made components and related spare parts for nonstrategic foreign goods exported to China.

In August 1970 we lifted the restriction on American oil companies abroad bunkering Free World ships bearing nonstrategic cargoes to Chinese ports.

We have other steps under consideration, all of them in the general area of contacts and trade.

So far we have noted very little tangible indication of response from Peking to these moves. Peking finds high utility in the so-called "devil's role" in which it has attempted to cast the United States. Our assuming the "devil's role" has utility to Peking for purposes of maintaining domestic cohesion in the face of an alleged foreign threat, as well as in the very vital global context of communism's "anti-imperialist" struggle.

It is possible in fact that when, in its view, we act "undevilish" we present real problems to Peking. Although its controversy with the Soviet Union may cause Peking to seek some lessening of tensions with the U.S. as an expedient, we must face the possibility that we must indeed await some resolution of the Taiwan question before our relations with Peking can improve appreciably. In other words, such improvement may have to await the time when Peking sees greater value in a fundamental reconciliation with the United States than it now derives from our highly valued devil's role. As one scholar has aptly put it, Peking may be reluctant to release the United States from its "inimical embrace."

RELATIONS WITH THE GRC ON TAIWAN

Admittedly there are anomalies in our present attitude toward the immensely complex China question, and these will remain for some time. In international dealings, where other sovereign nations are involved, it is not always possible to resolve anomalies except with the passage of time and the changes brought about by maturation of some of the inherent problems. It is obvious that we cannot be fully responsive to satisfying some of our interests—in this case improvement in our relations with the People's Republic of China—when we recognize the compelling demands of other interests such as our military commitment to our ally, the Republic of China on Taiwan. As repeatedly stated by our leaders, we stand by our commitments and obligations.

One cannot realistically consider our policy toward the People's Republic of China in isolation from our policy toward and relations with the Government of the Republic of China. Under the terms of the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1954, we are committed to assist in the defense of Taiwan and the Pescadores. We are not, I might add parenthetically, committed to the defense of other territory now controlled by the Republic of China although the 1955 joint resolution authorizes the President to act in defense of such territories if he considers this "required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores" or to assist the Government of the Republic of China in returning to the mainland. We have provided substantial material assistance designed to maintain and strengthen the defensive capabilities of the Republic of China's armed forces. For its part, the Republic of China has cooperated with us in making available bases and facilities on Taiwan in support of our military forces in Viet-Nam.

As important as our military relations are and notwithstanding the strategic importance of Taiwan to ourselves and our allies, our policy toward the Republic of China involves other and, in longer-range terms, perhaps even more important considerations.

During the period from 1951 to 1965, we extended substantial economic assistance to the Republic of China. In no country has such assistance been used more effectively, as attested by the uninterrupted and remarkable economic growth of Taiwan even after our economic aid was terminated. It is fair to say that among the countries of East Asia, the Republic of China stands in the front rank of those which have met successfully the challenge of rising economic expectations among their people for a better life. The combination of imaginative and effective government economic planners and administrators, combined with the considerable talents of a hard-working people, create a potential for the further economic and social development of Taiwan to the stage of a modern industrial society.

As admirable as such an achievement is in itself, perhaps more important is the fact that the accumulated experience of Taiwan with the problems of development now constitutes a valuable resource for the Asian community as a whole, a circumstance which has added a new dimension to our relationship with the Republic of China. Over the past five years, we have worked closely with the government as it has expanded its active cooperation in developmental programs not only with the countries of East Asia but in Africa as well. In addition to contributing to our own foreign policy interests, such cooperation has earned the Republic of China new respect as a constructive and contributing member of the international community.

THE ISSUE OF TAIWAN

Our association with the accomplishments of the Government of the Republic of China and its people over the past twenty years and our shared interest in strengthening the security and progressive development of the East Asian region as a whole, together with our treaty commitment to the defense of Taiwan and the Pescadores, are the bedrock of our relationship with the Republic of China today. These considerations are also the basis for our continued support for the Government of the Republic of China internationally. However one may view the Government of the Republic of China's claim to be the only legitimate government of China, the record of accomplishment on Taiwan and the constructive role which that government and the people on Taiwan are playing internationally merit, we believe, a rightful place for the Republic of China in the community of nations.

On this point, of course, we are in basic disagreement with Peking. The People's Republic of China continues to insist that it will "liberate" Taiwan and in the past at least has refused to renounce the use of force in achieving that goal since it regards this as an "internal" matter. Peking also has insisted that there can be no improvement in U.S.-P.R.C. relations until the United States ends what is customarily described as our "occupation" of Taiwan.

It is not clear precisely what Peking seeks in making this demand. In all probability, it seeks the removal of our military presence from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait area, although it must know that our forces on Taiwan are small. Our limited military presence is related to Viet-Nam war needs and constitutes no threat to Peking. While we may be able to ease this particular point of tension with Peking, we will not want to do so in a manner which would weaken our commitment to the defense of Taiwan and the Pescadores or rupture our close relationship with the Republic of China.

The United States cannot hope to resolve the dispute between these two rival governments. We do strongly believe, however, that these issues should be resolved without resort to the use of force.

Both our word and our national interest require that we stand by our treaty commitment to the Republic of China and continue to be associated with that government in pursuit of those goals we hold in common. We hope Peking can be persuaded, on this basis, to set aside the issue of Taiwan so that we can explore the possibilities for

removing other sources of tension and improving relations between us.

WILLING TO REMAIN RESPONSIVE TO PEKING

For our part, we will continue to reiterate our willingness to remain responsive to any indications of reduced hostility from Peking, to cooperate in removing tensions and to enter into a constructive dialogue eventually leading to more normal relations. We will attempt to convince Peking that we are not seeking to "contain and isolate" China and that we favor China's emergence from isolation.

Meanwhile we shall weigh carefully and deliberately any additional steps which will result in net advantage to the overall United States interest. One area, for instance, in which we must constantly weigh the advantages against the disadvantages is in the matter of trade in nonstrategic goods. It is no secret that a number of friendly nations, notably Japan, Great Britain, West Germany, France, Australia and Canada derive considerable comfort from the fact that they do not have to contend with United States competition in China's growing trade with non-Communist countries.

Some of the steps we have taken, or may take in the future, with a view to improving relations arise from our recognition of changed circumstances since the time of the Korean war. Some of the restrictions relating to travel and trade, for instance, today result in little or no restraint on the Chinese and constitute disadvantages to us. Others are designed simply to untie our hands, so that we may be in position better to bargain with the Chinese on a basis of reciprocity. Finally, some of our courses of action may stem from the increasing quadrilateral nature of Sino-Soviet-Japanese-U.S. relationships.

We do not, for example, seek to exploit the hostility between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Each is highly sensitive about our efforts to improve relations with the other, but we cannot allow these apprehensions to deter us from seeking agreements with either of them where those agreements are in our interest. Moreover, emerging relationships in the area will require careful balancing if misunderstandings are to be avoided and tensions minimized. The fact that the United States and Japan have an intimate security relation and many other objectives in common causes concern to the other two major powers in the area, however unfounded that concern may be. Under these circumstances it is all the more important that we maintain a constant and effective dialogue with Peking as well as with Moscow. Increased trade and travel could contribute to the better understanding which we seek, but today more than ever before the powers of this world also require closer, clearer and speedier communication amongst themselves.

A CHANGE IN OUTLOOK ON COMMUNIST CHINA

I did want to add just one point about policy and that is that in the course of the last five or six years there has been a change in our outlook toward Peking. When I was Consul General in Hongkong back in 1962 and 1963 there was a considerably more rigid attitude toward mainland China, but even at that time we professionals believed strongly that we should be moving in the direction that, under President Nixon, we have begun to move in; namely, to open up more contact, more dialog, to start relaxations on trade and travel.

I am very glad to see at long last the changes that have been made within the past year or so. More changes, of course, we can consider, but we stand at a point in time in history where I think we do understand more about mainland China and its motivations.

Some of the misunderstandings we have had in the past become relatively clarified with time. As we peer into the future, I think we do have a more flexible base on which to operate.

TIMOTHY BLECK—REMEMBERED

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, Tim Bleck who was a reporter with the St. Louis Post Dispatch died at the age of 30. I said of Tim at that time:

He demonstrated integrity and honesty, but more than that, he sought not just facts, but to understand what made them so. He was sensitive to the human condition, to justice and to truth.

Recently, an article appeared in the St. Louis Journalism Review capturing the thoughts of many who knew Tim. The black and the poor knew him well since he spent a year and a half covering poverty and race relations in St. Louis. Those who are quoted in this article have summed up just how we felt about Tim. His qualities of courage and compassion brought him close to those he wrote about. The blacks looked upon him not as a reporter who just observed them but as one who really understood their problems and wanted to right the wrongs which existed.

I find it fitting at this time to bring this article to my colleagues' attention. The article follows:

TIMOTHY BLECK—REMEMBERED

When Timothy Bleck of the *Post-Dispatch* Washington Bureau died at the age of 30 last month, there was shock and sadness among newsmen and public figures who knew him. Those sending condolences to the family included President Nixon.

But there were other expressions of sorrow that Tim would probably have prized even more. And these came not from editors or national leaders but from the Black and the poor in St. Louis.

Tim Bleck had come to the *Post-Dispatch* in 1966. Before going to Washington he spent a hectic year and a half in 1967–68 covering poverty and race relations. It was already getting rough, at the time, for a white reporter to cover the ghetto. It was to become rougher still. Black people were—and are—tired of pencil-pushing dudes who look and leave.

But Tim wasn't an ordinary white man—or an ordinary reporter. One of his gifts was writing with a human touch. Another was relating to people. Despite the tensions of the time and without being paternalistic, he won the trust and respect of St. Louis' black community. And in the streets he walked and wrote about, they remember Timothy Bleck.

"The thing about Tim was, he *cared*," says Macler Shepard, who heads a group called Jeff-Vander-Lou in one of the city's worst poverty areas. "Some of the others—well, they wrote what they thought people wanted to hear. They'd pad it. Or dress it up. But Tim had to see for himself.

"Somehow the city never seemed to hear our community's deepest cry. But Tim Bleck heard. And made others hear it, too."

Percy Green, chairman of ACTION, says "Man, I was shocked. I really thought something of him. When you talked to him, you felt he understood what you were trying to say."

Andy J. Brown, the city's human relations commissioner, remembers: "Many times I'd walk into a black militants' meeting and there would be Tim in his topcoat, working away at his notepad and being accepted as no other reporter would have been. I don't know anybody—from the NAACP to the Black Liberators—who didn't like him."

Tim Bleck had other qualities, too. One such quality was courage.

Not many know that Tim's predecessor, Richard Jacobs, had quit the race relations beat in a fury over what he felt was the paper's rigidity and insensitivity—and lack of aggressiveness—on racial matters under then managing editor Arthur Bertelson. Tim, of course, was aware of that. But to his credit he went ahead anyway and told it like it was—objectively, but with no punches pulled:

The place is two stories tall and 87 years old and 14 persons live in the four rooms downstairs. The roof leaks, the windows are falling out, the back stairs are rotted, there has never been any hot water or even a bathtub. Two little white dogs compete with eight Negro children for scraps of food. . . .

Thus began a 1967 story about poverty on Thomas Street. A story in 1968 further showed the combination of a novelist's sense of place and a journalist's sense of outrage:

There are no fancy motels with revolving restaurants there. No glittering high-rise apartments with swimming pools on top. No new office buildings with wrap-around balconies. No stadium. No Arch.

In the blocks just west of the Pruitt-Igoe housing project in north St. Louis there are alleys occupied by junked cars and winos and immense piles of litter. There are decaying brick structures filled with rats and babies and building code violations. There are rotted apartments and rutted streets—the broken pavement and broken promises of years of downtown neglect.

Or a story about the 1967 Detroit riot, which he compared to an earlier riot in 1943:

. . . A quarter of a century later Detroiters saw black faces in the restaurants and in the government and corporate business offices downtown and thought things were better. They were different, but they were not better. . . .

I think Tim always cared about the average guy—the guy who didn't get the breaks," says Dr. James H. Erickson, an old friend and fraternity brother of Tim's at Bradley University, Peoria, and now an assistant to Bradley's president.

"Everybody remembers him at Bradley, too. He was editor of the school paper, and it got an all-America rating. He was a leader in our fraternity and helped it triple in size. He was president of SDX, president of the English Club, and made Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities."

For one so young, Bleck was a big success. In Washington he had written, at various times, about Richard Nixon and the space program and Vietnam and dozens of other national issues. Richard Dudman, chief of the *Post-Dispatch* Washington Bureau, said in a statement quoted by the *Washington Post*: "Tim Bleck's death is a loss to journalism. He had the combination of curiosity, compassion, and energy, together with the habit of fairness and painstaking accuracy, that makes a great reporter. He was just beginning what I am sure would have been a brilliant newspaper career."

And St. Louis's first black Congressman, U.S. Representative William L. Clay, paid a personal tribute in the Congressional Record. "Tim Bleck had brought distinction to himself and to his profession in his 30 years. But I cannot refrain from saying that he was destined to give so much more," Clay said.

"He demonstrated integrity and honesty, but more than that, he sought not just facts, but to understand what made them so. Tim was sensitive to the human condition, to justice and to truth."

Long before he went to Washington, however, Tim's abilities were recognized. Other reporters used to study his examples. "I learned more from reading his copy than from anything else," comments Dana Spitzer, who now covers education for the *Post-Dis-*

patch. There were awards—an AP prize in 1965 in Ohio for his coverage of the Selma march, the Con Lee Kelliher award in 1967 after Detroit. And there were wry features about people like Wood Lineback, parachutist; Tim Grimm, world hitchhiker; and James (Big Town) Gorman, who rode the rails.

But what lingers longest is his sense of social commitment. One of his most powerful pieces came out of Memphis in 1968 after Martin Luther King, the civil rights leader he admired, had been murdered by a sniper's bullet. His story, sad and low-key and deeply moving, pointed out the mixture of hate and love, heroism and hypocrisy in that city. It ended with the Rev. Ralph Abernathy's description of the final moments:

. . . "I rushed out of the room and there was Martin lying there," said the Rev. Mr. Abernathy. "For an instant I thought he was just ducking and then I saw the blood.

"I caught up his face and I said, 'Martin, Martin, it's me, Ralph.' He couldn't speak, but he gave me a good strong look. He wasn't afraid."'

Neither was Timothy Bleck.

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. Eileen Markowski, of Abingdon, Md., suffered a great disappointment over the Christmas holidays this year when her brother's leave from Vietnam was canceled at the last minute. Mrs. Markowski has written the following "open letter to Congress" to express her feelings about this matter and has asked that I convey her message through the RECORD:

DECEMBER 28, 1970.

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

With the reconvening of Congress, I should like to bring to your attention a situation which occurred on December 20, 1970, that being specifically, the cancellation of the 14 day leave to the United States of some of the G.I.'s in Vietnam. I am not speaking of the refusal of the South Vietnamese to allow the landing of the 747; but of the South Vietnamese government's refusal to clear a plane for landing in Chu Lai to pick up the boys of the Americal Division who had acquired this leave.

After 7 long days and nights of anxiety and worry, of running down blind alleys from Pan Am to our congressman's office, to Army installations, to the Red Cross, to the news media and to the Pentagon for a confirmation of this story, we were told that the Pentagon had nothing to substantiate the same and to assume that these boys were in transit. On Sunday, December 27, by a telephone call from the Pentagon to my home, it was disclosed that the story was correct and leave had been cancelled and therefore could expect none of these servicemen home for the holidays.

I don't understand why this was allowed to happen. How many times must we take the form of a jackass before we stop talking of humiliation and realize that we've already been humiliated from the shape of the Paris peace table to the POW situation to the simple clearance of a plane. We have sacrificed thousands of lives and spent billions of dollars in aid only to be told that this is a backward country, unable to cope with the internal problems of their own nation. To the contrary, 'tis a smart man who can get another to do his job, finance it, and he call all the shots. I don't see any other nation contending with the United States in sending in more manpower, arms or dollars in order to swing South Vietnam in their direction.

With all the talk of protecting the G.I. and preserving his morale, you certainly afforded them some Christmas gift! It really is strange that with shipping 20,000 or more a week over there, we had such a tough time getting 6,000 home in a month.

I don't expect many of you to agree with me, after all, I'm looking at this from the opposite side of the fence. Not one of you happen to be sitting in the boonies.

History is made up of the past tense and whether we like it or not, someday it will be recorded. What is right today may have been wrong ten years from now; and what may seem like a wrong decision today may be adjudged right ten years from now. Time alone can be the determining factor.

Perhaps this last session of Congress has been termed as a "Lame Duck Session" not because of the November elections but because some members of Congress have been sitting on their hands too long! For the sake of the American people, stand up and do something about it.

What justification do I have to voice an opinion of this nature? I can only paraphrase it by saying that I am one of the thousands of American people "who have cared the most because we sent our very best". As far as I'm concerned, that's all the justification I need.

Very truly yours,

EILEEN M. MARKOWSKI.

ABINGDON, MD.

HOMOSEXUALITY—THE HOLY BIBLE VERSUS THE WASHINGTON POST

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, immorality in our country continues to constitute the gravest threat to our society.

Perversion in our permissive society is sought to be advanced as if it has suddenly become respectable and tolerable.

A local newspaper carried an editorial urging fairness for homosexuals. This is what the Washington Post in its February 2, 1971, editorial had to say:

FAIRNESS FOR HOMOSEXUALS

When the private lives of men or women embrace associations or activities of which they are ashamed—or the exposure of which would be profoundly embarrassing to them—they become vulnerable to blackmailers who may discover their secret. It makes sense, therefore, to exclude such persons from public employment involving access to classified information. This has commonly been cited as a justification for barring homosexuals from jobs which are sensitive from a security point of view. Often, however, this justification has been a mere pretext for denying employment to homosexuals.

The American Civil Liberties Union has served the cause of decency as well as fairness by going to court in behalf of a man denied industrial security clearance solely because he is a homosexual. The man cannot conceivably be considered more subject to blackmail than other men for the simple reason that he has made no attempt to conceal his homosexuality. For more than 10 years he has been an avowed homosexual, a member of the Washington Mattachine Society; he acknowledged all this quite candidly in filling out a security questionnaire, balking only at what he deemed prurient, intrusive questions about his private sexual habits bearing no relation whatever to his trustworthiness in handling classified material.

Persecution of homosexuals is as senseless as it is unjust. They may have valuable gifts and insights to bring to public service. If they are qualified for a job in terms of intelligence, experience and skill, if they conduct themselves, like other employees, with reasonable circumspection and decorum, their private sexual behavior is their own business; it is none of the government's business so long as it does not affect their independence and reliability. Like anyone else, they have a right to privacy, a right to opportunity and a right to serve their country.

This is what the word of God, from the Holy Bible, when the Lord spoke unto Moses, says about homosexuals:

Leviticus 18:

Verse 22: Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination.

Verse 26: Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations; neither any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth among you.

Verse 27: (for all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled;)

Verse 28: that the land spew not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spewed out the nations that were before you.

Verse 29: For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people.

And what did the Lord tell Moses was the penalty for acts of immorality?

Leviticus 20:

Verse 13: If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death: their blood shall be upon them.

What has happened because the people have not obeyed the word of God, but rather have gone the way of the immorality of the Washington Post and other similar opinion influences?

The Mattachine Society of Washington, a national organization of sexual perverts who strive for full equality as a matter of law now announce that they have organized a political party in Washington, D.C., and are fielding a candidate for the District of Columbia Delegate election.

The candidate estimates that 10 percent of the people of our Nation's Capital are homosexuals—he does not indicate whether or not he has included State Department employees in his count.

In nearby Maryland, a law has been introduced to abolish the centuries-old Maryland law prohibiting unnatural sex acts between consenting adults.

It is little wonder that normal God-fearing people suffer from the greatest threat of immorality and violence ever experienced in the history of our Nation. Too many do not know and obey the teachings of our Lord.

There will be no return to morality in our land until our people learn the truths of God's word by reading the Holy Bible—instead of founding their opinions on newspapers and pornographic promotions. This may help ex-

plain why sex indoctrination has replaced prayer in our schools. Many have forgotten that one of the principal purposes of education and the main reason for the founding of our early schools was to teach our children to read so they could read the Holy Bible.

I include several newspaper clippings:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1971]

MATTACHINE FIGURE RUNS FOR DELEGATE

Frank Kameny, founder of the Mattachine Society of Washington, announced yesterday that he was running as an independent candidate for D.C. delegate.

Kameny, 45, said his campaign would "provide a forum for the first-hand presentation to the public of the feelings, problems and concerns of the sexually oppressed."

He estimated that 10 per cent of the District's population is homosexual and urged the board of elections to include "gay" registrars to register homosexuals for the March 23 general election.

Kameny joins a field of about 20 independents who have announced. The independents must file the signatures of 5,000 registered voters on nominating petitions by Feb. 22.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 4, 1971]

ASSEMBLY BILL WOULD MODIFY SEX LAWS

ANNAPOLIS.—A bill that would abolish Maryland laws that prohibit unnatural sex acts between consenting adults was scheduled to be introduced today in the House of Delegates.

The measure is sponsored by Del. Arthur A. King, D-Prince Georges, who already has introduced legislation that would liberalize divorce laws and would repeal the criminal adultery statute.

In his latest bill, King says that persons over 18 who consent to engage in sodomy or other "unnatural or perverted" sex acts shall not be guilty of a crime.

The laws now carry penalties of a minimum of one year in jail or $1,000 fine and a maximum of 10 years in jail. Consenting adults would be exempted, under the King bill.

The pending divorce legislation would permit divorce on grounds of incompatibility and reduce the residency requirement from one year to six months. The adultery bill would simply do away with adultery as a crime. It is now legally punishable with a $10 fine.

NIXON'S LEVEE FUND CUTBACKS UNWISE

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's budget for fiscal year 1972 is deficient in many ways, but nowhere is it more grievously deficient than in the area of hurricane protection and flood control.

The people of southern Louisiana live in close proximity to large bodies of water, including Lake Pontchartrain, the Mississippi River, and the seasonal source of vicious storms, the Gulf of Mexico. It is no exaggeration to say that hurricane protection and flood control are matters of life and death for our people.

The Congress has recognized the urgency of our situation, for it has consistently authorized and funded public works projects to protect our lives and property. The administration, in contrast, has callously hampered the progress of these vital projects by budget freezes, the imposition of budget reserves, and now, the final indication of their attitude, budget requests, reduced by about 50 percent.

This was the topic of a recent editorial in the New Orleans Times Picayune which articulately voices the concern of our people. I am inserting it in the RECORD and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON'S LEVEE FUND CUTBACKS UNWISE

After Hurricane Camille's devastation in Plaquemines Parish and the Mississippi Gulf Coast, Vice President Agnew flew down to assure that President Nixon's budgetary freezes did not apply to disaster relief.

He added that he felt the same was true about preventive measures like hurricane protection projects.

But time and the imposition of "budgetary reserves"—holding back on appropriated funds—have proved Mr. Agnew was mistaken.

In fiscal 1970 President Nixon would not permit the United States Army Corps of Engineers to spend the $2.5 million which Congress allocated above his budget recommendation of $6 million for the vital Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Hurricane Protection Project.

In fiscal 1971, which ends in June, the President favored using $8.25 million in addition to the carryover, while lawmakers ordered $12 million more. Thus, of a total $14.5 million available, he had his way and "reserved" $3 million.

The spending restraints, it was claimed, would not delay the late-1978 completion date of the $216 million undertaking because contracts could be let on the double once engineering was done.

But now comes President Nixon's fiscal 1972 budget recommendation of $4.6 million for the project—less than half of the corps' maximum capability of $11 million for next year. Or, including the reserved $3 million, it's slightly more than half of $14 million.

Either way, the President is making a tragic mistake by skimping on this metropolis-guarding, life-saving work.

As members of Louisiana's powerful Washington delegation declared, they are going to work—as they successfully have in past years—to have Congress increase the President's budget figure to the full amount the engineers can use.

That will not prevent Mr. Nixon from holding back on a few million dollars again, of course, but the federal responsibility for courting disaster with the New Orleans area will at least be thrown squarely on the President's shoulders.

However, there's a local responsibility too which the people of Louisiana, even those directly affected by the hurricane safeguards, did not meet when they categorically rejected the 53 constitutional amendments last year in a fit of frustration, perhaps, over state government.

Among the propositions were authorizations for 2½ mills of property tax to raise the 30 per cent local cost-sharing in the federal construction. So those ready to rail against Mr. Nixon should remember our own financial delinquency.

Nevertheless, it seems astonishing that the President does not see both the human and political wisdom of differentiating between traditionally designated "pork barrel" public work—which can readily be stalled or cancelled with little harm done—and those like the Lake Pontchartrain works which must be completed at the earliest possible date.

CEYLON INDEPENDENCE: 23D ANNIVERSARY

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the 23d anniversary of Ceylon's independence is today, February 4, 1971.

At the Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference in Singapore a few days ago, the Prime Minister of Ceylon stated:

> We in Ceylon in some respects are proud that we have established for ourselves a strong democratic tradition which has flourished since independence for over 22 years. In this decade we have shown that it is quite possible for the concept of parliamentary democracy to take root and thrive effectively in Asia. We have changed governments five times by means of peaceful elections within these 22 years.

Mr. Speaker, there are few countries in the world that can make the same claim. Ceylon is one of the most stable parliamentary democracies in the world, especially in Asia. Her record in maintaining democratic freedoms compares favorably with those countries who have been independent for longer periods of time. It was perhaps partly in recognition of this that His Holiness Pope Paul VI during his brief visit to Ceylon in December 1970 stated:

> Lanka must be a beacon of peace throughout Asia, in all the lands bound by the Indian Ocean and throughout the World.

Parliamentary elections in Ceylon have been based on universal adult suffrage dating as far back as 1931, and a few years ago the age for voting rights was lowered to 18. This has been possible because of the considerable progress Ceylon has made in curbing illiteracy and, in fact, the literacy rate is the highest in the countries of the region with the exception of Japan. This in turn is the result of education being brought within the reach of everyone by making it free from the kindergarten through the university.

The rule of law is firmly entrenched in the country. An active parliamentary opposition and a free press is further testimony of the vitality of the democratic process in Ceylon.

The present government which came into office after a general election in May 1970 under the leadership of Prime Minister, Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, has given the highest priority to economic development. While it favors a socialist economy, it is committed to preserving democratic traditions.

Ceylon has had to face a difficult balance-of-payments situation owing to the decline of her foreign exchange earnings. In the last 4 years there has been a steady decline in the export price of tea—which is the country's largest export. The export price of natural rubber—which is the second largest export—has also declined due to competition from synthetics.

In the past 5 years Ceylon has received economic assistance from an aid-to-Ceylon group of friendly countries that had been convened annually by the World

Bank. The United States has been one of the foremost supporters of this aid group. The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have also given assistance to Ceylon by extending standby credit and by making soft loans for development projects. The Government of Ceylon has expressed its appreciation to the I.M.F., the World Bank, the United States and other countries in the aid group that have continued to have confidence in Ceylon, and has expressed the hope that with the help of these friendly countries Ceylon will be able, in a few years, to develop her economy without reliance on external assistance.

I insert in the RECORD herewith the text of remarks made by the Ambassador of Ceylon, Neville Kanakaratne, upon the occasion of the presentation of his credentials to President Nixon on September 21, 1970, and the text of the President's response:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have the honour to present to you my Letter of Credence by which Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth The Second, Queen of Ceylon, accedits me as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Ceylon to your Government, and also the Letter of Recall of my predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Oliver Weerasinghe.

It would not be inappropriate, Mr. President, to recall on this occasion the traditional friendship that has characterized relations between our two countries in the past. We, in Ceylon, have held in high regard the great and many achievements of your country and its people and at the same time have genuinely appreciated the friendship and cooperation that your country and its people have extended to Ceylon.

Mr. President, since 1948 we have sought to build in Ceylon a society in which freedom, liberty and justice will prevail for all the people. We have been, and remain, dedicated to the ideals of democracy and freedom and to the realization of these ideals in practical life. It was only recently that with a unanimous voice the House of Representatives of Ceylon voted to function as a Constituent Assembly to draft and adopt a new Constitution which will declare Ceylon to be a free, sovereign and independent Republic pledged to realize the objectives of a socialist democracy, including the securing of the fundamental rights and freedoms of all its citizens.

With a deep awareness of the fact that political independence without economic progress and social advance does not meet the aspirations of our people, we have been in the past seeking to strengthen our national economy. It is our hope that in the years ahead we shall be able to develop all branches of the national economy to lay the foundation for a society which provides for the maximum happiness and welfare of all its citizens. In our past efforts at economic development we have received the support and assistance of the United States and its people. We are grateful for this past assistance. We look forward to a continuation of this cooperation between our two countries in the future.

We have, Mr. President, in the field of foreign relations followed a policy of non-alignment. The Government of Ceylon will continue to pursue an independent foreign policy guided by Ceylon's national interests based on the principles of nonalignment with any military or power blocs, and of the maintenance of free and mutually beneficial relations with all States that respect Ceylon's independence.

Relations between our two countries have been characterized by cordiality, friendship and goodwill. We have no reason, Mr. President, to believe that in the future too these attributes will not prevail in the relations between our two countries.

In assuming the high responsibility of this office I am deeply aware of the wish of the Government of Ceylon that good relations between the United States and Ceylon will be further strengthened. I shall spare no pains in discharging the responsibility that has been placed upon me and I feel convinced that I can count on the sympathy and support of your Government and of yourself personally during the tenure of my office as Ambassador of Ceylon to the United States of America.

I thank you, Mr. President, for receiving me with so much courtesy and kindness.

PRESIDENT'S REPLY TO NEWLY APPOINTED AMBASSADOR OF CEYLON

MR. AMBASSADOR: It is my great pleasure to receive from Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Ceylon, her Letter of Credence accrediting you as Ceylon's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States.

The tradition of friendly relations between our two countries is based on our common dedication to the principle of obtaining liberty, justice and a better life for our peoples through the operation of free, democratic institutions. The people of Ceylon have, during this past year, again reaffirmed their trust in the democratic system by electing a new government in accordance with the finest traditions of free elections. The American people join me in expressing our respect for this commitment to peaceful change and the democratic process.

A goal common to both our countries is that of working to provide for the needs of our peoples and attempting to fulfill their expectations and aspirations. I have followed with great interest the strenuous efforts of the government and people of Ceylon for economic development. This desire to develop the national economy in an attempt to fulfill the desire of the Ceylonese people for happiness, freedom and social justice is laudable. I am gratified that the United States has been able to assist in these developmental efforts in the past. I am hopeful that the American government and people can continue to assist Ceylon in its attempts to attain this difficult but necessary goal.

As I stated in my report to the Congress on United States Foreign Policy for the Seventies, the foreign policy of the United States is based on our conviction that the pursuit of peace depends on creating a structure of stability within which the rights of each nation are respected. I believe Ceylon, which has derived so much inspiration from the peaceful way of the Buddha, shares with us the desire for the establishment of a just peace throughout the world. I hope that we can work closely together toward that goal during your tenure as Ambassador in Washington.

I welcome the wish of the Government of Ceylon that the good relations between our countries be further strengthened and your personal commitment to achieving this result. I hope that your stay in this country will be personally rewarding and will advance our mutual desire for further development of our relations.

Although it has been several years since I visited Ceylon, I still carry with me warm memories of its great beauty and its gracious and charming people. I hope you will convey my personal greeting and best wishes to your government and through it to the people of Ceylon.

FRAGMENTATION IS THE BANE OF OUR LAND

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and of both liberal and conservative persuasions might find some food for thought in the following incisive editorial from the Spartanburg, S.C., Journal of January 4, 1971. One would think, at this moment in our national progress, that we would all have but one identical desire: to pull together at the oars of our ship of state, but apparently it is not to be so. I have even noticed that here in the House, especially in our organizational days, we have shown a tendency to proportionalize and to fragment and to divide in our choice of decisionmakers on the several great issues, rather than to unify, to gather one and all together, to represent the great country as a whole.

The editorial follows:

WORLD FRAGMENTATION COMPLICATES PROBLEM

The fragmentation of most parts of the world into smaller and smaller groups along ethnic, tribal, racial, religious etc. lines continues while experience teaches that larger groups lead to greater prosperity.

Latin America's common market efforts have helped that region while the outstanding example has been Europe's six-nation Common Market (France, Italy, West Germany, Luxemburg, Belgium and the Netherlands). But even in this highly successful economic Western European organization leaders (the late Charles de Gaulle being the outstanding example) have held to strong nationalistic views and have resisted union other than on an economic basis.

The steady unfurling of new flags in the underdeveloped world after World War II heralded a new age of nationalism, of the forging of nation-states out of formerly subject peoples.

That process continues, but already we seem to have gone beyond it into an age of micronationalism, of fragmentation of existing nations into even smaller units.

Place a finger at random on the map of the world. The chances are good that the country touched, whether it is an old, established one or a newly created one, contains some kind of minority group struggling either for independence or autonomy or "a piece of the action."

These groups exist in the tiniest of nations as well as the largest. They range from the racial, as in the United States and other areas, to the linguistic and ethnic, as in Canada for example, to tribal as in Nigeria, to the religious as in the Soviet Union and elsewhere.

The internal struggle runs the gamut from terrorism, as in the actions of Quebec's extremists; to periodic riots as between French-speaking and Flemish-speaking Belgians, or Catholics and Protestants in Ireland; to official repression as practiced in some areas of Spain; to attempts of minorities just to build power bases from which to obtain greater concessions.

An example to the latter is the formation of a political movement by Eskimos in Canada's Yukon and Northwest Territories. The "Committee for Original Peoples Entitle-

ment" demands a bigger share of the Arctic's mineral wealth for the region's inhabitants.

Example could be piled upon example. However, there is strong evidence that the direction most of these groups are taking is the wrong one.

The closer the world is brought together by advances in communications and travel, the more crowded and interdependent mankind becomes.

The forces of technology and the growing awareness that we all share a very small spaceship call for better understanding and cooperation. Yet, the world seems to be headed in just the opposite direction.

NATIONAL SERVICE ACT EXPLAINED

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the 91st Congress, I joined with 24 of my colleagues in cosponsoring the National Service Act introduced by Congressman JONATHAN B. BINGHAM. This proposal, which would replace the Selective Service System with a limited National Service System, was reintroduced on the first day of the new Congress—H.R. 1000—by Mr. BINGHAM, and I am proud to once again be a cosponsor of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the January 16, 1971, issue of the New Republic carried an article by Congressman BINGHAM in which he discusses the need to replace the current selective service law, the background and principal features of the National Service Act, and the outlook for comprehensive draft reform in the 92d Congress. Since many of my constituents have expressed an interest in and raised questions about the National Service Act, I would like to include the full text of this article in the RECORD at this point:

A LIMITED NATIONAL SERVICE SYSTEM: REPLACING THE DRAFT

(By Jonathan B. Bingham)

(NOTE.—JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, a Democrat, has represented the 23rd District of New York since 1965 and is the co-author, with Alfred Bingham, of Violence and Democracy (World Publishing Co.).)

Before the present draft law expires next June 30, the Congress seems virtually certain to extend it. That is what the Administration wants, while hoping eventually to reduce draft calls to zero. Even the Gates Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force favors leaving a selective-service system in being on a standby basis. But if the draft is to be extended in one form or another, the system could be made far more workable as well as equitable. The way to do it is to give young men the option of choosing civilian service instead of possible service in the military and thus also provide manpower to meet acute public needs.

The draft today is patently unjust and widely hated; at the same time, it is performing badly the task it is assigned. Four years ago, former President Eisenhower was dismayed by "the rising tide of rancor engendered by our draft system." Today, a high proportion of America's young men are unwilling to go along with Selective Service regulations. Last April, for example, over 12,000 men failed to report for their pre-induction physicals, and nearly 2000 failed to comply with notices for induction. The draft call issued for that month by the Department of Defense was for only 19,000 men. To produce that number of draftees, the Selective Service System had to send out over 36,500 induction notices. Although quotas for 1970 have been running about 50 percent below those for 1969, the proportion of failures to report has gone up. A few of these failures are accounted for by men who will go to jail rather than serve in the military; many more leave the country or simply disappear. In fairness, it must be pointed out that approximately half of those who fail to report for a physical or for induction do so for reasons other than resistance to the draft; perhaps they didn't receive the notice or forgot the appointment. But this leaves half of those who fail to show up, willful violators or persons whose no-show status is unexplained.

A more important reason so many men must be called to meet even low draft quotas is that a large number don't pass their physicals. The national failure rate for the pre-induction examination is 45.2 percent. A surprising number who pass the pre-induction exam fail the test given at the time of induction—17.8 percent in the first half of 1970.

Of course, these statistics are a sad commentary on the health of our young men, but they are also a commentary on the unwillingness—no doubt in many cases an eagerness—to obtain medical disqualification from military service. Last October, *The New York Times* reported that more and more potential draftees, especially college students, were using letters from their personal physicians to get disqualification on real, exaggerated, or, in some instances, fictitious grounds. One New York psychiatrist was said to write about 75 letters a week at a reported fee of $250 "cash in advance," diagnosing young men as "manic depressive." While Selective Service doctors may suspect the validity of such letters, they are inclined to accept them, not only because of the short time available for each examination, but because they are hesitant to dispute a qualified physician (if a draftee is later discharged for a condition that is found to have existed prior to induction, the Selective Service doctor may have to explain why he failed to detect it).

Only five percent of those found physically unfit in New York are thought to have used such fraudulent evidence. Nevertheless, young men are increasingly willing to seek and use any condition, however slight, that might mean a 4-F or 1-Y deferment.

This has produced a skyrocketing failure rate—double and triple what it was in World War II. And in every state the failure rate for whites is higher than for blacks, whereas in World War II the percentage of blacks who failed their physicals was twice as high as whites! When young men are eager to fail, there is a distinct advantage in having been regularly under a doctor's care and in being articulate about any possible defect. One physician boasted that he could find a legitimate disqualifying condition in any young man sent to him.

Clearly this situation compounds existing inequities under the Selective Service system, favoring the advantaged over the disadvantaged. While deferments have been ended for work in such occupations as teaching, and for most graduate-level education, college deferments continue. And the possibility of establishing conscientious-objector status, which has always been greater for the well educated than for the poorly educated, will be even more so after the Supreme Court decision of July 15, 1970, in *Welsh vs. United States*. In that case, the Court ruled that in claiming CO status, a young man need not prove that his opposition to war is based on religious belief, but merely that it is "sincere" and "deeply held."

In an attempt to help local draft boards make such subjective and extraordinarily difficult decisions, National Headquarters of the Selective Service System has sent out guidelines to local boards. Curtis Tarr, the new Director, said that a young man's beliefs must be more than a personal moral code and must involve the thoughts of wise men. He further stated that a man must show evidence of activity comparable in rigor and dedication to traditional religious training. When asked whether or not these guidelines would work to the advantage of youths who have had a college education and could thus more easily demonstrate a knowledge of the thoughts of wise men learned in a course of rigorous training, Dr. Tarr responded that there "always has been an advantage to the intelligent man and I think neither you nor I would want to change that." Many of us would indeed "want to change that."

The Supreme Court decision in the *Welsh* case, however logical, has made the already hard job of Selective Service just about impossible. A drastic change in the law is needed. The task of the Congress, as well as of the Executive Branch, is to try to find an equitable and workable way of meeting our military manpower requirements, while allowing the individual young man the maximum amount of choice. So long as the draft exists, the most practical course seems to be to abandon the subjective "conscientious objector" test altogether; indeed, let our young men decide for themselves that their opposition to military service is so strong that they would be willing to do what COs now do; that is, undertake a civilian assignment in lieu of possible military service.

In mid-1969, during hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the Peace Corps, I was struck by the fact that under the law Peace Corps service is expressly not to be regarded as an alternative to military service. It seemed to me that a term in the Peace Corps or as a VISTA volunteer was a very real service to the country and should be accepted as fulfillment of a man's obligation. From this conclusion emerged the thought that, when he reaches draft age, a young man should be given three options; sign up for military service, sign up for some form of acceptable civilian service, or take his chances on being drafted under the lottery.

There were many problems raised by this idea: What form would such civilian service take? What would be the effect on labor standards? Would the needs of the military be met? How would any such program be administered?

To probe these and other questions and to assist me in drafting a detailed bill, my son Timothy volunteered to call on some of his fellow students at the Yale Law School. Eight third-year law students and two second-year students were recruited. Professor Daniel Freed agreed to serve as a faculty adviser. They were given course credit for their work. Also assisting the group was Alfred Fitt, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, then serving as an aide to President Kingman Brewster. For a full half-year, the seminar worked on the project. I met with them on November 8, 1969, but essentially they were on their own. Although a majority never became sold on the idea, a complete, detailed bill and accompanying explanatory statements were prepared.

In March, 1970, an open meeting was arranged in Washington for members of the Yale seminar to meet with congressmen, staff, and interested groups. Timothy and William Heckman outlined the proposal and answered questions about it. Thereafter, my staff and I, assisted by the Legislative Counsel, made a few, mostly minor changes in the bill that had been suggested at the meeting and in subsequent discussions, and on June 10, the "National Service Act of 1970" (H.R. 18025) was introduced with the support of nine Representatives.

The response was surprising. Letters started coming in from Alaska to Florida. The mail ran about ten to one in favor of the proposal, and a number of other congressional offices began to ask for information. Gallup conducted a special national survey of opinion on the basic idea—a three-way choice. The results, released last July 4, 1970, showed that 71 percent liked it, 20 percent were opposed and nine percent had no opinion. (In the 21 to 29 age bracket, the youngest age group polled, 80 percent were in favor, 18 percent opposed and two percent had no opinion.) In contrast, a Harris Poll showed only 52 percent favoring the all-volunteer army plan. On July 13, *The New York Times* editorialized:

"The merit of the Bingham plan is that in most cases it would relieve the draft boards of the need to judge the sincerity of a young man's beliefs. The CO could demonstrate his sincerity by foregoing the chance of escaping national service altogether and opting to undertake some useful civilian task, usually for a period longer than ordinary military service. The burden of proof would fall directly on the potential draftee, not on his board. This should not be too much to ask of young men of sincere conviction."

I thereupon reintroduced the National Service Act last July 21 with 16 new cosponsors. Altogether the 26 sponsors are by no means agreed on all aspects of the military manpower problem. Some favor the all-volunteer approach; others have misgivings about it. But all of us agree that our National Service Act would be a great improvement over the present draft law.

In spite of its perhaps too imposing title, our bill calls for a distinctly limited national service system. In drafting it, we never gave serious consideration to the idea of universal National Service, although we drew heavily on the studies made by Donald J. Eberly, the Executive Director of the National Service Secretariat. Some highly idealistic students of the problem believe that all young Americans, female, as well as male, should be required to put in a term of service to their country, as is the case in Israel today. There is much to be said for this view, both in terms of manpower, needs and in terms of a valuable experience. But there are two overwhelming counter-arguments: (1) the expense and the bureaucracy required to administer such a vast program would be enormous, and (2) compulsory national service for all would run afoul of the constitutional prohibition of "involuntary servitude" contained in the 13th Amendment. (Since the Supreme Court has held that a draft for defense purposes does not contravene the "involuntary servitude" provision, our legal experts concluded that a limited national service program would not be held unconstitutional.)

When the idea is first broached of allowing young men to opt for civilian service as an alternative to being drafted, many people ask whether almost all young men would not choose this course?

This would be a very serious problem if the potential draftee were allowed to opt for civilian service after being selected for induction. But that is not what we propose. Under our three-way choice scheme, the temptation for most young men will be very strong not to sign up for either military or civilian service, in the hope that they will not be caught in the lottery for the draft. Most young men are naturally optimistic enough to elect this course, especially during a period when, as now, draft calls are low and going lower, so that the chance of any given individual being inducted are not very great. (Under the bill, deferments for extreme family hardship as well as for physical or mental disability would, necessarily, be continued.) Moreover, the term and conditions for civilian service would not be especially attractive. Volunteers would receive a living allowance and pay comparable to that now received by Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers. The Director of the National Service Agency would be given the authority to set terms of service appropriate to the different varieties of civilian work, but in general these terms would be longer that the two years required of a draftee. Thus it is our expectation that only those who have strong objections to serving in the military or are idealistic about performing some useful civilian service would opt for that course.

The first, and most obvious, category of civilian service under the program would be in highly selective government programs such as Peace Corps and VISTA. These would continue to operate much as they do now, except that those young men who applied and were accepted, and who satisfactorily complete their term of service, would not be subject to the draft. The high standards for admission would be maintained. I asked the Director of the Peace Corps, Joseph H. Blatchford, whether in his judgment the idealistic spirit of the Corps would be adversely affected by the element of compulsion implicit in the National Service Act. He replied in the negative, pointing out that many applicants for the Peace Corps are already subject to a similar compulsion, in that they feel they are not as a practical matter likely to be drafted if they serve in the Peace Corps. (Statistically, they are correct, though the Peace Corps Act specifically provides the contrary.) Mr. Blatchford told me he would welcome the National Service approach on the ground that it would strengthen Peace Corps recruitment.

Most of the civilian-service enlistees would work in approved jobs for public and private employers, as is now done by conscientious objectors.

At an early stage of their deliberations, the Yale Law School seminar concluded that every effort should be made to avoid setting up a huge bureaucracy to operate the Civilian Service program and that, accordingly, the federal government should not be the sole, or even the principle, employer. On the contrary, the objective should be to have as many as possible of the civilian enlistees working for private or public employers engaged in on-going constructive activities, such as hospital and health services, education, child and geriatric day care, public safety, and environmental protection. Employers in such fields who were eager for more manpower would apply to the National Service Agency to qualify specified jobs for participation in the program. The National Service Act proposal sets forth certain criteria for approval of such jobs, such as that they be of substantial social benefit and that employment of Civilian Service registrants would not interfere with the labor market or job standards.

In order to avoid any temptation for employers to hire such registrants as "cheap labor," the bill also specifies that the employer will pay the going rate for the services rendered, with the registrant receiving only his subsistence level pay, and the balance being retained by the federal government as a partial offset to the cost of the program. (This is an ingenious provision worked out by the Yale law group. While perhaps difficult to administer, some such device would appear to be necessary if those in civilian service are to be paid only a subsistence wage. It can be argued that they should be paid the going rate, as conscientious objectors are now performing similar service.)

The bill also lists several categories of employers that would be specifically excluded from the program, including political-party organizations, labor unions, religious organizations (to avoid a church-state question), domestic or personal-service companies, and commercial enterprises. (If the National Service concept were to catch on and continue for some years, the exclusion of all commercial enterprises might eventually have to be reexamined; many jobs which are necessary may become increasingly hard to fill if the affluent society is extended to more and more Americans. For instance, how many coal miners will we have in 20 years if the young men in mining areas are given real opportunities for alternative employment, which in justice they ought to have?)

A third category of civilian service would be in a specially created Civilian Service Corps. Many kinds of useful work could be done by young men organized along the lines of Franklin Roosevelt's CCC, including forest management, soil conservation, and short-range assignments such as city clean-up campaigns. Former Interior Secretary Hickel has suggested formation of just such a Youth Conservation Corps.

The Civilian Service Corps program would have an important training component, designed to improve the future employment opportunities of the registrants, as well as to meet manpower needs in scarce skills. After six months or a year in the corps, many young men might then be able to complete their civilian-service term by transferring to an approved job on the outside.

The question of whether or not to grant deferments to enlistees for college or other training is difficult. The bill provides that volunteers for military or civilian service would be permitted to defer their term of service pending four years of college education or approved training. This was the one major question on which I differed with the Yale law students who, after long debate and several reversals of position, had finally decided to recommend against deferments. They were concerned that deferments would tend to discriminate against the disadvantaged, who might not be able to use the opportunity. However, it seemed to me that the injustice to the disadvantaged could be minimized by providing that approved training programs, including apprenticeship and on-the-job training, could also be grounds for deferment.

Some of the law students objected to the deferment idea because it might stimulate an undue rush to sign up for civilian service by smart operators, who would figure they could choose a time of low to zero draft calls later on to drop out of the program and take their chances on being drafted. This argument has some merit. On the other hand, the possibility of abandoning the civilian service option at any time reduces considerably the element of compulsion in the proposed National Service Act—the very element which the law school group found most troublesome.

In any case, the really compelling reason for allowing such deferments is that the service performed, whether military or civilian, would be so much more valuable after education and/or training. Many more types of employment could be brought into the program in this way. Indeed it is difficult to see how such enterprises as Peace Corps and VISTA could be included if educational deferments were not provided for. Not only would the country benefit from this greater flexibility, but the registrants would get much more out of their term of service and make a greater contribution.

While declarations of war have gone out of fashion since World War II, the possibility has to be faced that the United States might someday again be involved in a war duly declared by the Congress. The bill makes provision for that contingency: young men who had escaped the lottery during their year of eligibility would be again subject to call, and likewise men engaged in approved civilian service (those with the least service being called first). Military service could be avoided absolutely only by the young men who could establish their conscientious objection to all war.

This provision, incidentally, furnishes an additional safeguard against an overwhelming sign-up for the civilian service option, since it would be made clear to registrants that such enlistment would not provide a firm guarantee against being drafted at some time.

The National Service Act would replace the present Selective Service System, including draft boards, with a National Service Agency. Three divisions within the Agency would be concerned, respectively, with the military aspects, including the lottery, with registration and placement of civilian enlistees, and with the operation of the civilian service program, especially the Civilian Service Corps. The Registration and Placement Division would be geared to counsel young men of 17 in making their choices at age 18 and to assist civilian enlistees in finding employment in approved jobs. Disciplinary procedures are provided: the main sanction for a civilian enlistee who failed to perform would be released from the program, so that he would be subject to the draft lottery for one year. Procedural safeguards are also incorporated, including rights to hearings and appeals for those adversely affected by administrative decisions.

As drawn, the National Service Act proposal is based on the assumption that a lottery draft would be needed and would remain in effect, though actual draft calls might go way down. The bill could be modified without great difficulty to fit the Gates Commission proposals for an all-volunteer recruitment program, based on improved pay and other benefits, with a stand-by draft. In this situation, those young men who performed approved civilian service would be credited with having performed their obligation if the draft were reinstituted. As a practical matter, the number of volunteers for civilian service at subsistence pay levels would probably drop very low, except for programs such as the Peace Corps and Vista with a high intrinsic appeal, but the opportunity would be there. If the purely volunteer system proved inadequate to meet defense manpower needs and selective services were reinstated, the civilian service option would be available for those young men being subjected to draft liability for the first time.

Unfortunately the outlook is not bright for major changes in the selective-service law to be enacted by the 92nd Congress, or for its being given careful study. The House Armed Services Committee, which has been the dominant congressional voice on draft policy, has been inclined to resist basic reforms. The last extension of the selective-service law occurred in mid-1967, after hearings in both houses of Congress. *Congressional Quarterly* summarized that year's action: "Public pressure for change in the draft system resulted in a major Administration push for draft reform in 1967, but most of [President Johnson's] program foundered in Congress, largely as a result of action by the House Armed Services Committee."

When that committee brought its own bill to the floor of the House on May 25, 1967, the then Chairman, Mendel Rivers, made full use of his extraordinary powers as manager to put the bill through just as he wanted it. By motions to limit debate, discussion of important proposed changes was choked off.

In 1969 the House Armed Services Committee reversed itself on allowing the President to institute a lottery system (which the 1967 bill had prohibited), but it was determined not to allow the House to consider any other change. This decision was met by a storm of criticism on the floor of the House from members who had important amendments to propose. After discussion of the fact that the Armed Services Committee had held no hearings (Rivers said there had been no time to do so), the Chairman promised that in 1970 "the committee will undertake a complete review of this subject. The Members of the House have indicated that they want it, and I am perfectly willing to undertake it. . . . I give you my word that we will have a review next year." So reassured, the House passed the abbreviated bill unchanged. At the time, no one supposed that a "complete review" could be accomplished without open hearings at which proponents of draft reform could appear and testify.

But when 1970 rolled around, that was not the Chairman's interpretation of his commitment. In July he directed his Special Subcommittee on the Draft, chaired by Rep. Hebert (D, La.), to conduct a closed-door review of the "administration and operation" of the present law, with Executive Branch witnesses only. Believing that this was not in accord with the prior commitment, as understood by the Members, Rep. Robert L. Leggett, a member of the Armed Services Committee, and I initiated a joint letter to Chairman Rivers, pointing out that a "review" could not be "completed" without consideration of alternatives to the present draft, and urging that congressmen and others be given "the opportunity to present their views in open session. . . ."

The letter went forward on August 4, signed by 55 Members of Congress. A prompt reply was received, but it was largely negative: the hearings would continue closed and concerned only with "administration and operation" and no outsiders would be heard; only Members were invited to testify. Some Members did testify, but the two Members of the Special Committee who attended displayed scant interest and asked almost no questions. In appointing this Special Committee, it seemed to us Mr. Rivers did not try to select members who would represent various points of view in the House, or even on the committee. Members of the committee who were known to favor draft reforms were left off the subcommittee.

Presumably the new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee (in all probability Mr. Hebert) and Senator Stennis, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, will arrange full-scale, open hearings on the draft and alternatives in the late winter or spring of 1971. But it seems unlikely that a drastic reform such as our National Service Act will be given serious consideration in either House or that the kind of Executive Branch studies needed to evaluate the proposal will be requested, unless at least one of the Armed Services Committees can be galvanized into action by pressure from the media and the public.

The difficulty of overcoming the naturally conservative bent of most Armed Services Committee members, and their suspicion of social programs, is compounded by the inflexible manner in which bills are referred to particular standing committees. A proposal such as the National Service Act presents many questions of civilian manpower needs and of the operation of civilian programs by the federal government, questions which ought to be considered by interested members of committees other than Armed Services. Ideally, it seems to me, a bill like ours ought to be referred to an ad hoc committee composed of members with expertise in the various fields affected (this was the procedure in the early days of the Congress). But under present rules, with strict jurisdictional lines frozen into the structure, there is no way to accomplish such a result. Occasionally a Special Committee is set up for the consideration of a particular problem, but such Special Committees are normally not given the essential power to report out legislation. The drive to secure thorough and objective consideration of the proposed National Service Act and other alternatives to the draft can and ought to be part of a broader drive to make the congressional committee structure more representative, more responsive and more responsible.

FARM LABOR LEGISLATION

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill that would extend the National Labor Relations Act to cover agricultural workers.

I have sponsored this bill for many years, and believe that it is just as needed now—probably more needed—than at any time.

The plight of farmworkers in general and migrant workers in particular has long been known to the people of this country, and I need not recite here the long list of ills and injustices these patient, hard-working people have undergone for years on end.

As a member of the Texas State Senate, I had the honor to be the first member of that body to introduce a package of legislation to protect and benefit farmworkers. I ask Texas to enact laws requiring crew leader registration, setting up a minimum wage, setting standards for transportation and for housing, and establishing safety standards.

These bills met with the most vigorous kind of opposition, and I had very little success with them.

Therefore, when I came to Congress, one of my earliest interests was in Federal legislation to protect farmworkers, and it remains so today.

I joined with Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS and others in sponsoring and obtaining the enactment of the Federal statutes that have at least begun to make the promise of hope for farmworker justice. As a result of these statutes, we do have some minimal help for farmworkers in the way of crew leader registration; but more important than that there is a substantial amount of money in the Office of Economic Opportunity to pay for programs especially designed for migrants; there are others as well—health and educational programs, and through extension of some OEO activities, even a little legal help.

But one of the basic problems of farmworkers has always been that they have never had a body of law under which to organize.

The National Labor Relations Act does not extend to agricultural workers, so anyone who attempts to organize these workers does so in a legal vacuum. There is no way to assure the uniform elections are carried out, that the rules which may apply in one place also apply in another—or even that there are any rules at all. So the farmworker is at the mercy of those who would strongarm him, either to join or not to join a union, and at the mercy of those who would deny him his rights as a free citizen.

The chief farmworker organization, the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, strongly supported legislation to bring farmworkers under the National Labor Relations Act when I first introduced the measure some years ago. Reports have reached me indicating that this may no longer be the case. If it is, then I would be most surprised at the

turn of events, and would welcome a full explanation of the change.

Whatever the position of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, or of any other organization on this bill, it seems to me at this moment that the only way to protect the rights of farmworkers is to spell those rights out in law, and to create the authority to see that those rights are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a long time that this bill be enacted. I ask it again, and I seek early action, so that the sides can be known and Congress can decide the issue.

NEW TOWNS IN MINNESOTA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, many of us are coming to realize that the development of new towns must be encouraged if we are to relieve the pressures on our overcrowded, problem-ridden central cities.

In Minnesota, work has begun on three types of new towns:

The Minnesota Experimental City, now in the planning stages at the University of Minnesota, will be a freestanding new town located between 100 and 150 miles from Minneapolis.

Jonathan, a satellite new town, is already under development on the outskirts of the Twin Cities metropolitan area. This project received the first federally guaranteed loan under the new communities section of the 1968 Housing Act.

Cedar-Riverside, a Minneapolis inner-city development, hopes to be the first "in-town new town" to receive assistance under title 1 of the 1970 Housing Act.

The following article from today's New York Times provides a progress report on these latter two projects:

NEAR MINNEAPOLIS, TWO NEW TOWNS BORDER ON SUCCESS

(By John Herbers)

CHASKA, MINN.—Clyde Ryberg skidded his utility wagon to a halt on a snow-covered meadow and pointed to a cluster of buildings under construction—houses up to $50,000 and apartments for low-income and moderate-income families.

"We believe people of different backgrounds who will live here will get to know each other," said Mr. Ryberg, an outdoorsman who is project coordinator for the new community of Jonathan. "And when they get to know each other, we think they will support each other."

Twenty-five miles to the northeast in the heart of Minneapolis, an ambitious effort is underway to rebuild a rundown section of the city into a diverse community of 60,000 people without chasing out the present residents.

"We want to keep the winos and the school dropouts," said Mrs. Gloria M. Segal, one of the principals in the Cedar-Riverside development adjacent to the University of Minnesota.

NEW TOWN PROJECTS

These two "new town" projects in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area show some promise, in the opinion of national urban authorities, of reversing trends that have brought agony to metropolitan centers across the nation—the mass movement of whites and wealth into suburban compounds and the concentration of minorities, poverty and social problems in the central cities. And they point up how recent Federal legislation on new communities is intended to work.

Jonathan, which is being built on rolling farmland just outside the suburban ring, seeks to avoid the sprawl and sterile homogenization that marks most suburbs built since World War II. Designed to become a self-contained city of 50,000 on 5,000 acres, it was the first project approved for Federal assistance under the New Communities Section of the Housing Act of 1968.

Cedar-Riverside, which will offer high-density living on a 59-acre triangle of blighted land bordered by the Mississippi River and two interstate highways, is employing private and public resources to make the central city livable and attractive for all ages, races and economic status.

The first stage of 1,260 dwelling units, from public housing to luxury apartments, has been approved for construction, and the sponsors are hopeful that Cedar-Riverside will become the first "in-town new town" to be approved under the expanded new communities law enacted in late 1970.

The law, sponsored by Congressional Democrats was passed over the opposition of the Nixon Administration, which sought to delay it for budgetary reasons. President Nixon, however, signed it Jan. 2 and George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Development, embraced it because it embodied ideas favored by the Administration.

New communities, which blossomed in Europe in recent years, have hardly begun in this country. The 1968 Housing Act contained a section designed to spur their development by making long-term loan guarantees to private developers.

But the Nixon Administration declared it insufficient. In addition to Jonathan, only the following projects have been certified for new community assistance: Park Forest South, Ill., near Chicago; St. Charles Communities, Md., near Washington; Flower Mound New Town, Tex., between Dallas and Fort Worth, and Maumelle, Ark., near Little Rock.

Better known new cities such as Reston, Va., and Columbia, Md., were begun several years ago with private financing and the older Federal aid programs.

The new law continues the loan guarantees and adds several new categories, including direct long-term loans of up to $20 million for each community and grants for planning the project.

Extra money is authorized for community services such as water and sewer systems and parks. A community development corporation, to be set up in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, will have authority to build new communities on surplus Federal land and to help both private and public developers acquire land for new communities.

U.S. APPROVAL EXPECTED

The Administration has not indicated how fast it will move under the new law, but a substantial number of planned projects are expected to win Federal Housing approval for one form of assistance or another during the next few months.

Both Jonathan and Cedar-Riverside, in the opinion of Federal officials, embrace the kind of planning and commitment sought in the Federal guidelines. Developed separately, both are now headed by Henry T. McKnight, a former State Senator who is a conservationist, a real estate developer and a Republican with considerable political and financial connections.

In the mid-nineteen-sixties, Mr. McKnight quietly began buying land around a farm he owns near the town of Chaska, population 4,000, which lies in the path of metropolitan growth. In 1967, he announced plans for Jonathan, which would be incorporated into Chaska and thus take advantage of an existing government and its services.

PASSION FOR CONSERVATION

Construction got under way but bogged down a couple of years later when interest rates rose and money became scarce. Mr. McKnight turned to the Federal Government, won certification under the 1968 act, and last October sold $8 million in guaranteed debentures for land development. The project is now moving briskly.

"We were fortunate in that our planning fit perfectly with the H.U.D. guidelines," said Robert J. Dahlin, general manager of the Jonathan Development Corporation. "For example, the plans from the beginning were to try to have the same economic and racial breakdown as the metropolitan area."

Mr. McKnight, who comes from a pioneering real estate family, has a passion for conserving the Minnesota countryside. He named the project for Jonathan Carver, an early explorer of the area.

The lakes and woods were left in their natural state and the community of Jonathan was planned between them. The park system has fingers extending to every back door.

"We will connect with the state park system," said Mr. Ryberg, "so that a boy who lives in Jonathan could step out his back door and go all the way to South Dakota without leaving the parks."

Jonathan has several industrial plants, ranging from a computer center to a grain research facility, a few hundred families living in wide variety of housing built by a number of companies, and cultural centers.

Experimental housing is being built by different companies. One project called the "tree loft" features a vertical apartment that has a bedroom as a balcony over the living room and a rental price of about $130 a month. Several variations of federally subsidized housing for families with low incomes are under way.

Another project features modules that can be added or deleted as the family grows or shrinks.

The town center is to be a giant megastructure, which, it is hoped, will provide rapid transit to downtown Minneapolis and St. Paul.

"The important thing," Mr. McKnight said, "is for people to have a choice."

BARS AND TENEMENTS

While Mr. McKnight was developing Jonathan, the Cedar-Riverside project was evolving under Mrs. Segal and Keith R. Heller, a former faculty member of the University of Minnesota Business School.

The university, which now has 45,000 students, spills over the Mississippi River from St. Paul into the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood, once the home of European immigrants and now a conglomeration of bars, tenements, experimental theaters, high-rise buildings for the aging and rundown houses occupied by students, dropouts, vagrants and poor families.

No one is quite sure how the Heller-Segal partnership managed to buy all the private land in the area. It started one evening several years ago when Mrs. Segal, a housewife and mother of four, drove to the symphony at the university and could not find a place to park. With Mr. Heller's advice, she bought a lot for parking.

Thereafter they bought several lots with the idea of putting up one new apartment building and the new-community concept grew from there. In the process, they found themselves landlords of several hundred people.

While planning the new community, Cedar-Riverside Associates, Inc., operating out of an old ice cream factory, hired social workers and a platoon of maintenance men to help the tenants who will be gradually relocated into the new buildings.

RICHNESS OF THE OLD CITY

"We want to retain the richness and diversity of the old city," said Mr. Heller. Old landmarks will be retained.

Mr. McKnight was brought in and made chairman to coordinate the necessary financing and an application has been made for assistance under the 1970 act. Some $200,000 already had gone into planning.

The plans call for conglomerations of buildings of various shapes and sizes, underground parking, plazas on various levels and shops and theaters.

Coordinating all this with the various state, local and Federal governments is a constant juggling act, especially because Cedar-Riverside is in an urban renewal area. A chart of all the government clearances required for Stage One is a complicated maze.

But Donald A. Jacobson, the chief planner, thinks this complex mesh of private and public efforts may in the end be able to accomplish what neither has done alone in most cities.

The Minneapolis-St. Paul area is more conducive to this kind of development than most cities. It has a Metropolitan Council with power to make regionwide decisions. It has only a 3 per cent black population and not much poverty.

A Federal housing official pointed out that both projects would take 10 to 20 years to complete and that there was no way to know whether they would accomplish what they were expected to.

"We believe that these kinds of developments get to the root of our urban problems," he said. "And it is high time we had some successes."

ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1863 POLISH INSURRECTION

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it would be most unfortunate if, in the rush of organization business during these opening days of Congress, we were to overlook the significance of the anniversary of the 1863 Polish Insurrection which our Polish American friends and free Poles everywhere have been recently observing.

In these days when all too many people seem to feel the urge to deprecate freedom and devalue patriotism and valor, all of us can benefit by recalling the events which took place in Poland a little over a hundred years ago. One would have to search minutely the pages of history to find examples of heroism and gallantry equal to that of the Polish patriots who sought to throw off the shackles of serfdom imposed by Czar Alexander II and his Russian henchmen. But such a search would produce the startling evidence of a duplication of contemporary Russian political oppression and economic strangulation equal to that imposed by the czar.

Even more startling is the similarity of the mass revolt of the Polish patriots just weeks ago in the port cities of Gydnia, Gdansk, and Szczecin which not only shook Poland and the Kremlin but sent a tidal wave of hope and sympathy throughout the world.

A century ago the Polish patriots decided to rise up and fight against the increasing political and economic repressions being forced upon them by the czar. They took this action knowing full well that the odds were overwhelmingly against them. Through a clever use of the then little-known guerrilla tactics, they waged a telling blow against the czar's forces.

Just before Christmas today's Polish patriots launched a similar revolt against the Red Communist bosses whose increased acts of oppression became unbearable. Polish people, suffering from hunger and want of the necessities of life, rose up in defiance of Gomulka and their Kremlin slave-masters in protest to the Communist demands that food and other critically needed items be sold at fixed prices of less than cost to feed the hungry and greedy Russian bear. The time had come when they had to voice vigorous protests at being denied the chance to buy essentials even at the exorbitant increase in prices fixed by Gomulka and the men in the Kremlin. Polish workers reached the limit of their endurance in having to succumb to virtual slavery controls imposed on their jobs and their job earnings.

Mr. Speaker, every American should realize that today Poland is as much of an enslaved Russian colony as it was under czarist domination a hundred years ago. Let us not forget that today Poland as well as all the other captive nations, suffers from the same ruthless domination and exploitation as was true in those terrible days in 1863.

The superior strength of the czar suppressed the insurrection and eliminated the secret national government set up in Warsaw. Now the superior strength of the Communists ruling Poland has similarly halted the revolts but not until a drastic shakeup in the Russian imposed government hierarchy had been made.

In 1863 the Russian tactics employed to subdue the insurgents were replete with torture and wholesale slaughter. In the period following the quelling of the uprising there took place a reign of terror and inhuman treatment of those who had dared the czar. Recently the Communist forces were equally ruthless against the Polish strikers, using machineguns, tanks, helicopters, and every modern killing device to disband the unarmed protesters. Yet in spite of the mad chattering of machine guns from armored cars, from rooftops, and from helicopters, Polish patriots tore down a door and laid on it the body of a boy who had been killed on his way to school. Disregarding a virtual rain of bullets they dipped a Polish flag in the slain boy's blood and set off toward the townhall. Along the route they were joined by hundreds of others. They stormed the townhall seven times, seeking an explanation of the shooting of unarmed people. This demonstration ended in a massacre of a score of innocent people. Since that day further bestial acts on the part of the Red police and militia have been reported—acts resulting in the death and injury of hundreds of Polish people.

Mr. Speaker, I called this tense situation in Poland to our attention. I asked then as I ask now that all of us be fully alert with regard to what is happening to the people of Poland. We must give utmost support to our loyal Polish American organizations which are doing their utmost in behalf of their friends and relatives in Poland. We should fully endorse the resolution transmitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations by the Polish American Congress in condemning Soviet military terror in Poland and asking that the human rights of the Polish people, brutally violated by the Warsaw regime, be protected and the matter be brought before the Security Council for appropriate action.

We who are privileged to enjoy freedom and for whom liberty is accepted as an inalienable right must keep reminding ourselves that there are millions of people who love liberty as much as do we but are deprived of it. We must constantly remember that the fetters of slavery still bind our Polish friends and that their freedom today is as limited by the Communists and Kremlin bosses as it was under the czar.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot escape the responsibility nor should we seek to avoid it for doing our utmost to restore to these captive people the freedom which is their just right. Let us not be wooed by compromise or the smooth words of psuedostatesmen who would seek to convince us that Poland is now free. We know this is not true, just as the people of Poland, particularly those in the port cities who so recently voiced their protests, know it is not so.

Even though these current demonstrations in Poland show the complete collapse of the Communist system imposed by the USSR upon the Polish people, we must renew our determination to pursue vigorously the task of restoring independence to the descendants of the Polish patriots who a century ago so bravely fought for it. Until Poland becomes truly free, we must keep faith with the brave men and women who asserted themselves so gallantly in Poznan in 1956 and again throughout Poland so recently. May all of us do our utmost to make a reality of the historic Polish battle cry "Poland is not lost—as long as we are alive."

INDUSTRIALIZED HOUSING

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to tell you a success story.

Last week I visited George Air Force Base, which I am proud to say is in my district, and inspected a prototype, industrialized, housing project, and saw a variety of attractive, well-built homes that anyone would be proud to live in.

It began nearly 4 years ago when the Department of Defense, as part of an overall plan to make a military career more attractive to young family men, set out to find new and better ways to provide quality housing, good solid homes

at reasonable costs, for the families of our military men.

The DoD decision to explore industrialized housing was brought on by the continuing increase in the cost of residential construction and the accelerated demand for housing which had reached crisis proportions. The Department of Defense issued requests for proposals to a broad cross section of private industry—architects, aerospace companies, the general construction industry, educational institutions, and traditional homebuilders. Participation by aerospace firms was specifically sought in order to tap the reservoir of experience in their systems methods that have been so successfully applied to other extremely large and complex construction and engineering projects.

After a series of design competitions and in-depth studies of different technical approaches, a contract for the design and development of a prototype industrialized housing system was awarded to the General Electric Co. in a joint venture with the architectural firm of Hugh Gibbs, FAIA and Donald Gibbs, AIA.

The objectives of this research and development program were clearly defined from the outset, going well beyond simply the erection of housing units. These objectives were:

Develop housing that could be bought and maintained at substantially less than present cost. Economies were expected to be achieved through the introduction of new materials, fabrication technology innovations, industrialization of the fabrication process, and the introduction of proven, advanced management systems such as those routinely used by government aerospace and defense contractors. Achieve cost reductions at no sacrifice whatever in quality, livability, or attractiveness of the dwelling units.

Successful attainment of these goals would prove not only beneficial to the Department of Defense but could also be of great significance in solving the acute national shortage of civilian housing by developing new volume production techniques.

In June of 1970 the Air Force competitively awarded General Electric Co. and the Del E. Webb Corp. a contract to build and erect a family housing project at George Air Force Base consisting of 16 two-bedroom units contained in two-story flats; 90 each of three- and four-bedroom units in two-story townhouses; and four one-story, four-bedroom houses. Basic to the project was the development and operation of a prototype housing factory to test the key production processes and equipment which would be the basis for a full scale production facility for the fabrication of future military housing. In this factory, located about 15 miles from the base, General Electric is building the modules which are then transported to the site and erected.

I toured this unique facility and watched the raw materials and hardware being combined into modules which provide an amazing degree of design flexibility. A family of these basic modules would provide a variety of residential configurations as well as a multiplicity of exterior and interior finishes.

Some of the innovative features being used in constructing the modules are cast-in-place plaster walls and ceilings, a plaster wall 8 feet high and 35 feet long cast in one piece. The floors are made of stressed-skin panels filled with sound-deadening sand, and a utility chase which contains all the plumbing, heating, and air-conditioning ducting finished in the factory and just plugged in at the site.

Actual assembling at the site is being done by Del E. Webb Corp., who are also responsible for landscaping, roads, and site preparation. The time required to erect an entire house—less than 4 hours. They are substantial houses which present no evidence of factory prefabrication.

Another exciting breakthrough resulting from the industrialized concept is that it makes it possible to factory produce the modules with unskilled labor. The factory environment provides classroom atmosphere which enables management to train hard-core unemployed so that they can make a meaningful contribution to solving this Nation's housing problem. It was proven at Apple Valley that the factory does not have to be on the site, but can be located for example, in the inner city—where the majority of the unskilled workers live—and serve more than one site.

I was also impressed with the cooperation displayed by the various unions on the job. Both site and factory are unionized. Conventional construction trades are represented on the site while in the factory a tri-trades agreement to permit cross discipline utilization of personnel was signed with the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Because of the enlightened policies of the Department of Defense, enlisted men's families will soon be moving into good homes at George Air Force Base. Furthermore, I understand that the experience gained by General Electric is helping our Nation's Department of Housing and Urban Development with its Operation Breakthrough program.

It became obvious to me from my tour of the demonstration site and factory that the successful application of industrialized techniques will result in lower costs through the application of high volume production. The economies are maximized as the total number of units increases.

I have seen the results of a business-like approach applied to the housing at George Air Force Base, and know that the military can, given the necessary freedom, raise housing standards, motivate private industry to use and develop new materials and techniques, and help develop and perfect industrialization of housing with its many benefits.

The big question is just how far can this Nation's housing costs be reduced in the future and its critical housing shortage eased with the aid of lessons learned here.

CONSERVATION—FOR WHOM?

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, my native State, California, abounds in both people and natural resources. As the most populous State in the Nation we are deeply conscious of the need to achieve an accommodation among the material needs, the recreational opportunities, and the spiritual and esthetic desires of our people. We are strong conservationists in California.

The rationale of our approach to realistic conservation and the absolute need to differentiate between public interest and public enthusiasms has been clearly stated by the distinguished dean of the School of Natural Resources and Conservation at the University of California at Berkley. Dr. John A. Zivnuska presented this case admirably in an address January 22 before the annual meeting of the Redwood Region Conservation Council at Eureka, Calif., in my district.

His message, entitled "Conservation—For Whom?" deserves the careful attention of every Member of the Congress and of all Americans. I include the message in the RECORD following these brief remarks:

CONSERVATION—FOR WHOM?

(John A. Zivnuska)

As many of you will recall, Clifford Pinchot was the first native-born American to be educated in forestry. With the warm support of President Theodore Roosevelt, he was the leader of the movement which by 1910 had firmly established the profession of forestry in the United States, had established the basic structure of the U.S. Forest Service which has made it one of the finest public agencies in the nation, and had identified "conservation" with the wise use of resources and made it a household word.

Pinchot was a militant crusader, who saw issues in the strongest tones of black and white. He can be faulted for having failed to perceive the value of National Parks and the aesthetic significance of the forest. I have no doubt he was an easy man with whom to disagree on many issues. However, he was wholly clear that the purpose of forestry was service to people, not to trees. As he himself wrote:

"The rightful use and purpose of our natural resources is to make the people strong and well, able and wise, well-taught, well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed, full of knowledge and initiative, with equal opportunity for all and special privilege for none."

It was a magnificent vision, and he did as much as one man could to move toward it. This strong stream of the conservation movement was clearly humanitarian and concerned with social reform and improvement, yet today in the literature of conservation it is commonly referred to as "utilitarian conservation," often with a somewhat derogatory twist to the term "utilitarian."

There is, I think, some strange aberration or form of tunnel vision involved. Much the same aberration is apparent in the current debate on the allocation of the resources of wildlands. There are certain values of these resources which are normally captured and made available through the operation of the market economy, and there are other values which are characteristically made available outside the market system,

either through public ownership of resources or as externalities of private ownership (that is, as benefits from the private lands which are not internalized through capture and sale by the private owner). In current discussions one repeatedly hears the first group referred to as economic values and the second group as social values.

This is absurd in conception and unfortunate in effect, since it tends to impute a higher value to the second group than to the first. I submit that there are important social values to having lumber and plywood for housing and to having low-cost wood-based printing papers to undergird mass literacy, just as there are social values to an attractive landscape and the opportunity to escape our metropolitan areas. Further, there are important economic values and economic issues in the values obtained outside the market system.

Much the same aberration is evident in the flood of mail which most of us receive from well-intentioned nature preservation organizations exhorting us to save our environment before it is too late. The environment involved is usually illustrated with spectacular photographs of the Florida everglades, the redwoods of Bull Creek flat, or the high Sierra. Now I am quite sympathetic to such causes. Indeed, it was such a concern which led me to a career in foresty. However, the simple fact is that this is not our environment, but only a small fraction of it. The main environment in which we spend our lives is that of our homes, offices, and factories; the cities and suburban areas in which they are concentrated; the immediately surrounding landscape; and the air and water available to them. In these terms it immediately becomes evident that, far from saving our environment, we need to change it and to change it rapidly, on a massive scale, and in a direction opposite to the way in which we are now moving.

A specific example of the issues involved is the current debate over the rate of cutting on our forest lands. This debate has taken its most specific form over the proposed National Timber Supply Act of 1969, which was subsequently revised and redesignated as National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act of 1969. This bill, which was not enacted, provided for a major intensification in timber management on the National Forests, which in turn would have permitted a major increase in the allowable cut from these lands.

Opposition to the bill was spearheaded by a small number of preservationist groups which, while showing increasingly broad environmental concerns, have been primarily dedicated to the preservation of wilderness, national parks, and similar natural areas. In this instance their primary concern seems to have been that such a program would speed up the roading of areas now in a wilderness condition but not designated for wilderness purposes, thus reducing the period of time available to work for the incorporation of these lands into the wilderness system.

Now I have no wish to make a case for a specific bill, but the issue of obtaining increased timber supplies for the 1970's and 1980's is an immediate and important topic. The impetus comes from the nation's need to improve its environment through improving its housing. This need was given specific expression in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, which established a goal of 26 million new housing units by 1978. While this goal may be too precise and too constrained, what is involved is an immediate need for improved housing for one-quarter to one-third of the total population of the nation.

Every serious study has shown that the one good opportunity to increase timber supplies in the immediate future is on the public lands. This has been documented both in the report of the Task Force on Softwood Lumber and Plywood appointed by President Nixon and in the report of the Public Land Review Commission established under a Democratic administration. Opponents of increased cutting have, of course, promptly attempted to discredit both groups as tools of the lumber interests—a charge which strikes me as being overly-generous in attributing political muscle to the lumber industry.

In the resulting battle of words, the charge is frequently made that timber cutting on the National Forests is for the benefit of a few selfish lumber companies, while wilderness and recreation are for all the people. This is such arrant nonsense that it is appalling that the charge persists and has received some credence. Obviously every resident of the United States makes daily use of structures, products, and services based on such forest products as lumber, plywood, and paper. If these services could be obtained without the intermediate step of industrial processing, I am confident this would be done and the lumber companies would disappear. And the charge can not be made that the demand is artificially created by Madison Avenue techniques. There is surely no major industry in the nation which devotes less of its resources and energies to promoting its product than the lumber industry. Lumber is used simply because it is remarkably useful.

In contrast to this universal use of forest products, an unhappily low percentage of the public ever has the opportunity to enjoy the wilderness, while large numbers never enjoy recreation on the national forests. Particularly telling, it is those very groups which need improved housing the most who share in wilderness and forest recreation the least. Let me quote Walter Washington, Mayor of the District of Columbia, one of the most sorely troubled urban areas of the nation:

"It is possible that many of our poor and needy families that may never be able to get to the scenic beauty of our great trees would be able, rather, to get the exposure by looking at cabinets and walls of wood in a decent home in a decent environment in the cities of America. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is part of our American dream . . ."

Opponents of timber cutting also argue that the needed housing can be built of materials other than wood. Undoubtedly this is correct and other materials can and will be used on a greatly increased scale. This, however, begs the entire environmental question. Realistically, there is no way in which we can hope to improve our urban environment and provide better housing for a quarter to a third of our people without major impacts on natural resources and the non-urban environment. If we do not use wood, then we must turn to plastics from petroleum reserves, steel with its requirements for iron ore and coal, concrete with its quarries and cement plants, and so on. It is one world, and we don't change the environment in one place without changing it in other areas as well.

Our real problem is to provide the required building materials in ways in which the adverse effects on other elements of the total environment will be minimized and, if possible, limited in duration. Now forest products are both renewable and biodegradable—two major assets from the environmental standpoint which are not shared in full, if at all, by any of the alternate materials. We have some hard choices to make, and we have an immediate need for a careful analysis of the environmental consequences to be expected from the production of the various building materials which could be used in meeting our urban needs. We cannot come home free, but we can reduce the environmental costs by making an inteligent and informed choice among alternatives.

It is interesting to note that the same groups which oppose increased timber cutting, arguing for use of other materials, also oppose increased power generation. Available evidence indicates that lumber and plywood production are the lowest in power requirements of all of building materials. While these groups like to pretend that power demands arise from the efforts of power companies to promote air conditioners and electrical appliances, the fact is that the real pressure comes from the needs of industries whose expansion they advocate while opposing timber cutting. The new breed of self-appointed ecologists likes to point out that every one thing is connected to every other thing, but they seem wholly unable to realize that this also applies to their own recommendations.

Now it is perfectly true that expanded timber cutting will in itself do little or nothing to solve the nation's urban and low income problems. If the lumber goes into vacation homes for those already well-housed, the resident of the District of Columbia will not be benefited. We cannot achieve a redistribution of income through resource policy, but we can have a resource policy which will facilitate rather than conflict with a total program designed to meet our national needs.

In looking at serious issues of this kind, satire can often be illuminating. Many of us who live in the Bay Area regularly enjoy Art Hoppe's comments on the passing scene. In a recent column he pictured the political suicide of a conservation group. After much hard work, the group had developed arguments which were completely compelling in convincing a man who had two cars that he did not need another car. The fatal mistake was then they used the same argument with men who had no cars.

To look at a more local issue in a similar vein, I would like to suggest that a man who owns a redwood house will prefer a redwood park to a second redwood house—unless, of course, he owns a vacation homesite on the Mendocino Coast. However, the priorities of the man who has neither a home nor the opportunity to visit a redwood park may be very different.

In fact, of course, this region never really faced such absolutes as a final choice between redwood parks or redwood homes, despite extravagant statements from both sides during the heat of the debate. We are dealing with the lasting redwoods, not the last redwoods. At the same time there was never any real prospect of a park so large as to endanger the total redwood industry. We continue to have the industry and we also now have a Redwood National Park which is a significant addition to the very much larger area already reserved in the State Parks.

While the boundaries of the park were gerrymandered to provide a basis for arguing for increases in the park area rather than being set to provide an efficient management unit, the park nonetheless has the potential for permanent existence as a meaningful ecological unit if an effective management program can be funded and administered in the park and needed accommodations worked out concerning the management of the adjacent private lands. One could wish that the groups which pushed for the park would show equal vigor and understanding in pushing for such funding and management. Unhappily any realistic assessment of the costs of management seems to be considered as adverse to their priority goal of acquisition.

In much the same way, we do not face absolute alternatives in the choices among timber, wilderness, recreation, aesthetic values, and other potential resource uses. All can be obtained in some degree. The question is always that of how much more or how much less of each. Through intensive management more of all uses can be provided, but the question of balance will always remain. Here we need to recognize the existence of distinct ethnic, income, age, and geographic strata in what we blithely term the general public. We need to learn the needs and aspirations of each such stratum and to

determine the extent to which this group participates in these various resource values. Only through such knowledge can we determine to whom our conservation is directed.

While I have placed particular stress on the importance of improved housing and a better urban environment for the low income groups, I also recognize the very great importance of uses of the forest other than timber production to large and growing segments of our society. The demand exists, and it is growing rapidly. Our great problem here is to make the demand effective—that is, to provide an effective means of paying for the management of the land resource for these purposes.

It seems to me that those who consider these other values as more important than timber should be provided with the opportunity now available to timber users—to pay for what they use, rather than having to persuade other groups in our society to share the major part of the cost. I have long advocated that private owners charge for the recreational use of their lands and I have also supported a meaningful charge schedule on public lands.

A limited but important step in this direction was taken with the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964. Despite the totally misleading name, the Act is actually designed to establish a system of admission and user fees for recreationists on federal lands, with the receipts to be used to acquire additional recreational lands. When the receipts turned out to be disappointingly low as compared to the many statements of high public demand for outdoor recreation, the fund was supplemented by a portion of the receipts obtained from other resource uses, including the revenues from offshore oil—a small but perhaps significant step on the pathway to the Santa Barbara oil slick.

I believe that such recreational use charges should be increased to cover the costs of effective management of these recreational areas and of providing the services required by the users. This would serve both to provide financing now sadly lacking and to put the main weight of the costs on those who receive the main benefits.

A common argument against this is that it would discriminate against the low income groups of our society. I find this is a shabby argument indeed. Free use of wilderness, national parks, and national forests is a totally ineffective approach to income redistribution. It is wholly obvious that the compelling recreational need for the low income urban groups is for parks within and immediately adjacent to such areas. Anyone who is seriously concerned with the outdoor recreation needs of low income groups could only have opposed the Redwood National Park legislation, since it diverted Land and Water Conservation funds from their intended purpose of meeting these close-in recreational area needs.

Another argument often raised is typified by a recent letter in the Sunday Examiner, in which the writer violently protested the increased charges in our State Parks, contending that equal and better facilities were available at lower cost on private lands. The only possible response to such statements is to urge those who make them to concentrate their use on the private facilities, thus helping both private enterprise and the taxpayer.

There are some important ramifications to this argument that those who receive the benefits should pay the costs, with income redistribution to be achieved by other means. It must be recognized that the users of forest products and most other products of our industrialized economy also do not pay the full costs involved, nor do the producers of these goods. As a nation we have persisted in a frontier attitude toward the environment long after the frontier has passed. We continue to avoid direct payment for some of the real costs of production by dumping the refuse of the operations in the air, in the water, and on the landscape and by following practices which are destructive to the soil, to the landscape, and to our need for quiet. Neither producer nor consumer pays these costs, but instead all society bears them through environmental deterioration, adverse effects on health, and a steady upward pressure on direct production costs for all goods and services.

There are now encouraging signs that as a nation we are moving toward a readiness to pay these costs directly rather than through the degradation of the environment in which we live. Over the long term there is hope that more complete utilization can lead to lower unit costs, but the immediate short-term effect is almost sure to be a substantial increase in the costs of production. And it is equally likely that the major part of such increased costs must be passed forward to the consumer.

Here there can be a problem, for one company going it alone will bear increased costs relative to its competitors, yet cannot expect an equivalent price differential. Thus there appears to be a growing acceptance within industrial groups that there is a need for strong federal standards of pollution control if competitive relationships are not to be disrupted in the process of making the necessary response to a growing and legitimate public demand that the environment be protected.

The recreational users of land should be brought to the same standard. Although the situation is less publicized, here too we have been passing off an appreciable part of the true costs through environmental degradation. Vacation home owners at Lake Tahoe are being made to face some of the realities of these costs as they now must pay thousands of dollars per homesite for connecting into improved sewerage systems. It would be interesting to determine the cost per user which would be involved if equivalent standards of sewage disposal were imposed on our heavily used wilderness area.

In preparing these remarks I became aware that I was achieving neither a breadth nor a depth appropriate to the topic, but time is far more limited than either the concepts or examples I would like to review. We are dealing with highly complex and interrelated phenomena, the outcomes of which have widely varying impacts on various groups within our total society. Our pressure group system of politics seems to lead us to behave as polemicists, yet the very nature of conservation and the environment requires us to muster up all the honesty we can in scrutinizing all of the alternatives open to us and their probable consequences.

Every one thing *is* connected to every other thing, and we never come home free. Which benefit should be sought, and who will get it? Which cost must be borne, and who will bear it? Among all of the questions at which we must look in dealing with conservation issues, I submit that one of the most important is that in this title I have chosen for these remarks: Conservation—for whom?

U.S. LEGISLATURES—HOW THEY RATE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor has performed a notable public service in reporting the results of a study recently conducted on the Nation's State legislatures, and I am pleased to place the article in the RECORD today.

State legislatures are the heartbeat of our Republic.

It is in the State legislature that we find the vigor and vitality of a free people.

I am particularly proud to report to my colleagues that the Illinois Legislature was ranked third in the Nation in overall standing by the study.

The Members of my own State legislature can take pride in the fact that they have provided a legislative structure which gives them the third highest rating in the Nation. Members of the Illinois State Legislature should find this report by the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures a source of great satisfaction.

I am particularly proud that Illinois ranks so high, because there is a tendency—too frequent—to malign and short-change State legislatures.

I am sure the Citizens Conference Report on State Legislatures will be carefully studied by political scientists and the legislators themselves to make continuing improvements in the operation of our State legislatures.

Overall, the report is reassuring because it does show that State legislative bodies do indeed reflect both the will and the needs of the people in their respective States.

I believe the Commission's recommendations are particularly significant and should prove helpful to the State legislators in bringing about even greater reforms.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Members of the Illinois Legislature for bringing to Illinois this high distinction of being rated third best in the Nation's 50 State legislatures.

This distinction honors us all as citizens of Illinois.

The Christian Science Monitor article follows:

U.S. LEGISLATURES—HOW THEY RATE

(By George B. Merry)

BOSTON.—Rank California's Legislature No. 1.

In terms of size, staffing, procedures, and decisionmaking capability, it is without a peer among state lawmaking branches across the nation.

This is the conclusion of a comprehensive 14-month study, the first of its kind, made public Feb. 3 in Washington. State by state and on the scene, it rates New York second, Illinois third, and Florida fourth among the 50 legislatures. Wyoming and Alabama are tabbed the poorest.

The study was conducted at a cost of some $200,000 by the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures. Lawmaking bodies were measured according to their procedures, rules, and operations to determine how capable they are to perform their deliberative functions.

"It was the study's intent to show the people in the states how effective their legislatures can be," explains Larry Margolis, executive director of the conference, which is supported by several national foundations.

INSUFFICIENT TOOLS

The legislatures, even those scoring highest, can be better, and the citizens can make them so, he asserts.

"Most of the shortcomings of a legislature are the result of the citizens not giving it the tools with which to work and the legislature's fear of trying to ask for anything because of low public opinion or public apathy," he says. "If the citizens of a state tolerate—

even compel—the legislature to be mediocre, they should not then blame the legislators."

Rankings were based on five principal qualities considered requisite for an effective legislature. These categories are: "functional, accountable, independent, informed, and representative."

The legislative evaluation study dealt entirely with procedures and operations and did not attempt to measure the product of the state legislatures on the worth of individual legislators. Thus, because a state scored high should not be construed to mean it passes the best laws, it is explained.

INADEQUATE STAFFING HURTS

Mr. Margolis points out that "procedures have a profound effect on the decisions a legislature makes.

"If a legislature is operating only minimally, without adequate staff resources, without adequate facilities, and without a great number of systems which allow it to respond to the modern needs of a state, then it would be difficult to expect that legislature to produce creative, or even adequate, legislation," he emphasizes.

The five criteria on which the legislatures are scored were derived from nine sets of factors regarding the quality of legislative operations. These included time, staffing, compensation, committee structure, physical facilities, leadership, rules and procedures, overall legislative structure, and ethics.

MEAGER COMMENTS

While suggesting specific improvements that might be made by each state to enhance its legislative potential, the report also spotlights things it considers right concerning each lawmaking branch.

In some of the lower ranking states, however, such positive comments were meager.

With few exceptions—notably Florida and New York—the highest scoring legislatures are generally in the Midwest and Far West.

And those rated poorest are largely in the Northeast and South.

Although coming out on top in comparison with other lawmaking bodies, the California Legislature is deemed far from perfect.

Its main weakness cited include too many committees and too many committee assignments for members, lack of published committee procedures, limited participation of the minority party in the decisionmaking process, and inadequate public access to various reports.

QUALITIES CITED

Overshadowing these in the evaluation study was the California Legislature's "outstanding" rating in other respects such as the amount and quality of staffing, adequate physical facilities for each lawmaker and his aides, ample hearing-room accommodations, and high quality prompt production of records and documents.

It was also commended for its level of compensation—$19,200 a year per member—and freedom from time limitations of legislative sessions.

The second-ranking New York Legislature was praised for its powerful resources and staffing, unlimited sessions, authority to determine for itself when to meet and for how long, uniform published rules and committee procedures, frequent recorded roll calls.

To improve its lawmaking capability, the Empire State is urged to reduce its 150-member assembly from the present 150 to 100; cut the number of committees, institute a system of deadlines, improve the work flow, especially near the end of the session, and increase compensation from the current $15,000 to the $20,000-to-$30,000 range.

RECOMMENDATIONS TALLIED

Specific recommendations for most states generally involve:

Smaller legislatures.

Professional staffing of committees as well as individual lawmakers.

Higher salaries.

Improved committee procedures including published roll calls.

Annual legislative sessions unlimited in length and scope.

Better physical accommodations for lawmakers and spectators.

Improved press facilities.

Better bill-drafting procedures including a printed summary at the beginning, setting forth intent.

Elimination of multiple-member legislative districts where present and provision of all single-member districts.

Improved legislative rules and operating procedures.

Tighter restrictions on possible conflicts of interest and lobbying activities.

In scoring top spot in the overall ranking the California Legislature was rated first in only one of the four categories—functional. But it placed second or third in the other four measurement scales.

Second-ranking New York, on the other hand, placed first in two categories—informed and representative—but was fourth on functional, eighth on independent, and 13th on accountable.

Illinois, although third overall, rated from second to 17th in various categories of comparison.

ACCOUNTABILITY CITED

Behind California as the best function is Hawaii. Deemed the most accountable is Nebraska, followed by Kentucky and California in that order.

Behind New York and California on the most-informed list are Wisconsin, Florida, and Iowa.

Florida, Illinois, California, and Wisconsin rated one to four in terms of most independent.

New York, California, and Michigan are ranked in the top three spots on the most-representative list.

In ranking lowest overall, Alabama is 50th in both accountability and independence, 49th in terms of most informed, and 48th most functional. Its highest rating was 41st in the representative category.

Wyoming, a state where there is no legislative staffing, was ranked lowest on the informed scale. Arizona was found to be least representative. And South Carolina is rated least functional.

FUNCTIONING MEASURED

Taken into consideration in determining how functional a legislature is were such factors as:

Time and its utilization, availability of staff assistance, physical facilities, size of the lawmaking body, organization and procedures, continuity and powers of the leadership, order and decorum in both houses.

Under the accountable category the important criteria used include: districting, adequacy of information and public access to it, and diffusion and restraints on the leadership.

Criteria used to measure how informed a legislature could be considered are: time spent both during session and presession; number of standing committees, methods of handling testimony, facilities; interim activities, including structure and staffing, reporting and recording; form and character of bills; professional staff resources; fiscal-review capabilities.

The level of a legislature's independence is measured by: independence from executive branch, legislative oversight and audit capabilities; legislative procedures; interest groups and lobbyists; and conflicts of interest.

OTHER FACTORS NOTED

Factors considered in representativeness were: identification of members and constituents, qualifications, compensation, and voting requirements, member effectiveness, size, and complexity of the legislative body.

States which have an unrestricted annual session such as Wisconsin, New York, and California are cited as having "a clear advantage over those whose sessions are straitjacketed into 60 or 90 days every two years," the report emphasizes.

"To be fully effective, the members of a legislature need the support of competent aides who can help them with the many duties of office, including those that are not strictly legislative," is another point accented. Hawaii, Florida, and California are cited as especially outstanding in terms of providing all lawmakers this support.

Separate office space for individual legislators is urged, with Texas, North Carolina, Hawaii, Florida, and California praised for accomplishments in this direction.

WHAT IS YOUR STATE'S RANK?

Major factors considered under the five categories:

Functional—time and its utilization, availability of staffing physical facilities such as office space, size of the legislature, number of committees, organization, and procedures.

Accountable—districting, method of leadership selection, adequacy of information necessary for lawmaking, public access to voting records and actual deliberations, character and quality of bill drafting, leadership constraints, and treatment of minority party.

Informed—amount of time devoted to legislative process, number of standing committees, handling of testimony, staffing between sessions, reports filing, form and character of bills, and professional staff resources.

Independent—independence of legislative from state's executive branch, frequency and duration of sessions, compensation of members, regulating of special-interest groups and lobbyists, control of conflicts of interest.

Representative—qualification, compensation, and voting requirements of legislators; size and complexity of each legislative body; diffusion and restraints on the leadership; relationship of members and constituents.

Overall rank and State	Functional	Accountable	Informed	Independent	Representative
1. California	1	3	2	3	2
2. New York	4	13	1	8	1
3. Illinois	17	4	6	2	13
4. Florida	5	8	4	1	30
5. Wisconsin	7	21	3	4	10
6. Iowa	6	6	5	11	25
7. Hawaii	2	11	20	7	16
8. Michigan	15	22	9	12	3
9. Nebraska	35	1	16	30	18
10. Minnesota	27	7	13	23	12
11. New Mexico	3	16	28	39	4
12. Alaska	8	29	12	6	40
13. Nevada	13	10	19	14	32
14. Oklahoma	9	27	24	22	8
15. Utah	38	5	8	29	24
16. Ohio	18	24	7	40	9
17. South Dakota	23	12	15	16	37
18. Idaho	20	9	29	27	21
19. Washington	12	17	25	19	39
20. Maryland	16	31	10	15	45
21. Pennsylvania	37	23	23	5	36
22. North Dakota	22	18	17	37	31
23. Kansas	31	15	14	32	34
24. Connecticut	39	26	26	25	6
25. West Virginia	10	32	37	24	15
26. Tennessee	30	44	11	9	26
27. Oregon	28	14	35	35	19
28. Colorado	21	25	21	28	27
29. Massachusetts	32	35	22	21	23
30. Maine	29	34	32	18	22
31. Kentucky	49	2	48	44	7
32. New Jersey	14	42	18	31	35
33. Louisiana	47	39	33	13	14
34. Virginia	25	19	27	26	48
35. Missouri	36	30	40	49	5
36. Rhode Island	33	46	30	41	11
37. Vermont	19	20	34	42	47
38. Texas	45	36	43	45	17
39. New Hampshire	34	33	42	36	43
40. Indiana	44	38	41	43	20
41. Montana	26	28	31	46	49
42. Mississippi	46	43	45	20	28
43. Arizona	11	47	38	17	50
44. South Carolina	50	45	39	10	46
45. Georgia	40	49	36	33	38
46. Arkansas	41	40	46	34	33
47. North Carolina	24	37	44	47	44
48. Delaware	43	48	47	38	29
49. Wyoming	42	41	50	58	42
50. Alabama	48	50	49	50	41

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING NEEDED TO HELP PROVIDE ADEQUATE MIDDLE- AND LOW-INCOME HOUSING

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, a shortage of adequate housing for middle- and low-income Americans continues to be a serious problem despite the promises of two administrations to solve the crisis.

In 1968 the Federal Government announced that 26 million new housing units would be needed by 1978. However, despite this knowledge and the glowing public statements about new programs, a massive housing gap has resulted in the last few years. However, two programs, the section 235 and 236 provisions of the National Housing Act, have been successful, but suffer from a lack of adequate funding.

Last December, this body authorized an increase in appropriations for these programs for the current fiscal year. I have joined with several of my colleagues in introducing a supplemental appropriations measure to provide $25 million for each program among other things. This will bring the funding up to the authorized level of $200 million.

Even at that level, Mr. Speaker, the funding is inadequate. An example of the impact of this legislation if properly funded, is the effect of reduced debt servicing costs on the rent payment. Rent on a two-bedroom apartment can be lowered by about $16 a month for every 1 percent of interest reduction. For some developments in my district this would mean up to $80 a month lower in payments—a tremendous savings to the middle-income city dweller.

To bring about such dramatic reductions, however, substantial appropriations would have to be made. This year when the housing bill again comes up for consideration, I intend to propose that funding for these programs be increased to at least $1 billion annually for fiscal 1972 and substantial increases beyond that for fiscal years 1973 and 1974. At these levels we may begin to make progress in eliminating the housing gap.

Among the most attractive features of this legislation is that unlike public housing aid, it stimulates the private sector to enter the housing market to a degree far in excess of the actual dollar figures appropriated.

Most public housing projects require substantial investments by Government agencies and involve all the inherent risks of management of properties. By providing the margin necessary to keep final rents low through mortgage interest payment subsidies, section 235 and 236 programs allow the limited-profit and nonprofit builder to enter the lucrative middle- and lower-income housing market. The results are adequate housing within the reach of almost all Americans.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee will hold early hearings on the new legislation and report out a bill that greatly expands the programs. Of particular need, are expansion of the section 236 programs that aid limited profit, cooperative development.

Unless we can provide for one of the basic elements of man's existence—shelter—all other efforts are wasted. What good is a space program or an SST or a strong Defense Establishment if man does not have a home to live in, to fly from or to defend?

FLORIDA LEGISLATURE CITED AS OUTSTANDING

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in a report just issued by the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, the Legislature of the State of Florida ranked fourth nationally in terms of size, staffing, procedures, and decisionmaking capability.

This is a great honor for the Sunshine State and a genuine tribute to the members of the Florida Senate and House of Representatives.

States were judged by the citizens conference as part of a $200,000 study supported by several national foundations. Criteria used in the ranking included functionality, accountability, independence, and information. In all these categories, Florida's Legislature was cited as particularly outstanding.

Among all States, Florida ranked first in the category of independence on the basis of the independence of the legislature from the State's executive branch, frequency and duration of sessions, compensation of members, regulation of special interest groups, and control of conflicts of interest.

In addition, Florida was singled out for special praise for the support services and personnel which are provided for its legislators.

Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Florida House of Representatives, I am very proud of my State and its legislature for achieving this level of excellence. The problems which confront State governments today require the attention which only effective State legislatures can provide.

I commend the attention of our colleagues to the text of an article from the Christian Science Monitor concerning the report:

U.S. LEGISLATURES—HOW THEY RATE

(By George B. Merry)

BOSTON.—Rank California's Legislature No. 1.

In terms of size, staffing, procedures, and decisionmaking capability, it is without a peer among state lawmaking branches across the nation.

This is the conclusion of a comprehensive 14-month study, the first of its kind, made public Feb. 3 in Washington. State by state and on the scene, it rates New York second, Illinois third, and Florida fourth among the 50 legislatures. Wyoming and Alabama are tabbed the poorest.

The study was conducted at a cost of some $200,000 by the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures. Lawmaking bodies were measured according to their procedures, rules, and operations to determine how capable they are to perform their deliberative functions.

"It was the study's intent to show the people in the states how effective their legislatures can be," explains Larry Margolis, executive director of the conference, which is supported by several national foundations.

INSUFFICIENT TOOLS

The legislatures, even those scoring highest, can be better, and the citizens can make them so, he asserts.

"Most of the shortcomings of a legislature are the results of the citizens not giving it the tools with which to work and the legislature's fear of trying to ask for anything because of low public opinion or public apathy," he says. "If the citizens of a state tolerate—even compel—the legislature to be mediocre, they should not then blame the legislators."

Rankings were based on five principal qualities considered requisite for an effective legislature. These categories are: "functional, accountable, independent, informed, and representative."

The legislative evaluation study dealt entirely with procedures and operations and did not attempt to measure the product of the state legislatures on the worth of individual legislators. Thus, because a state scored high should not be construed to mean it passes the best laws, it is explained.

INADEQUATE STAFFING HURTS

Mr. Margolis points out that "procedures have a profound effect on the decisions a legislature makes.

"If a legislature is operating only minimally, without adequate staff resources, without adequate facilities, and without a great number of systems which allow it to respond to the modern needs of a state, then it would be difficult to expect that legislature to produce creative, or even adequate, legislation," he emphasizes.

The five criteria on which the legislatures are scored were derived from nine sets of factors regarding the quality of legislative operations. These included time, staffing, compensation, committee structure, physical facilities, leadership, rules and procedures, overall legislative structure, and ethics.

MEAGER COMMENTS

While suggesting specific improvements that might be made by each state to enhance its legislative potential, the report also spotlights things it considers right concerning each lawmaking branch.

In some of the lower ranking states, however, such positive comments were meager.

With few exceptions—notably Florida and New York—the highest scoring legislatures are generally in the Midwest and Far West.

And those rated poorest are largely in the Northeast and South.

Although coming out on top in comparison with other lawmaking bodies, the California Legislature is deemed far from perfect.

Its main weakness cited include too many committees and too many committee assignments for members, lack of published committee procedures, limited participation of the minority party in the decisionmaking process, and inadequate public access to various reports.

QUALITIES CITED

Overshadowing these in the evaluation study was the California Legislature's "outstanding" rating in other respects such as the amount and quality of staffing, adequate physical facilities for each lawmaker and his aides, ample hearing-room accommodations, and high quality prompt production of records and documents.

It was also commended for its level of

compensation—$19,200 a year per member—and freedom from time limitations of legislative sessions.

The second-ranking New York Legislature was praised for its powerful resources and staffing, unlimited sessions, authority to determine for itself when to meet and for how long, uniform published rules and committee procedures, frequent recorded roll calls.

To improve its lawmaking capability, the Empire State is urged to reduce its 150-member assembly from the present 150 to 100; cut the number of committees, institute a system of deadlines, improve the work flow, especially near the end of the session, and increase compensation from the current $15,000 to the $20,000-to-$30,000 range.

RECOMMENDATIONS TALLIED

Specific recommendations for most states generally involve:

Smaller legislatures.

Professional staffing of committees as well as individual lawmakers.

Higher salaries.

Improved committee procedures including published roll calls.

Annual legislative sessions unlimited in length and scope.

Better physical accommodations for lawmakers and spectators.

Improved press facilities.

Better bill-drafting procedures including printed summary at the beginning, setting forth intent.

Elimination of multiple-member legislative districts where present and provision of all single-member districts.

Improved legislative rules and operating procedures.

Tighter restrictions on possible conflicts of interest and lobbying activities.

In scoring top spot in the overall ranking the California Legislature was rated first in only one of the four categories—functional. But it placed second or third in the other four measurement scales.

Second-ranking New York, on the other hand, placed first in two categories—informed and representative—but was fourth on functional, eighth on independent, and 13th on accountable.

Illinois, although third overall, rated from second to 17th in various categories of comparison.

ACCOUNTABILITY CITED

Behind California as the best function is Hawaii. Deemed the most accountable is Nebraska, followed by Kentucky and California in that order.

Behind New York and California on the most-informed list are Wisconsin, Florida, and Iowa.

Florida, Illinois, California, and Wisconsin rated one to four in terms of most independent.

New York, California, and Michigan are ranked in the top three spots on the most-representative list.

In ranking lowest overall, Alabama is 50th in both accountability and independence, 49th in terms of most informed, and 48th most functional. Its highest rating was 41st in the representative category.

Wyoming, a state where there is no legislative staffing, was ranked lowest on the informed scale. Arizona was found to be least representative. And South Carolina is rated least functional.

FUNCTIONING MEASURED

Taken into consideration in determining how functional a legislature is were such factors as:

Time and its utilization, availability of staff assistance, physical facilities, size of the lawmaking body, organization and procedures, continuity and powers of the leadership, order and decorum in both houses.

Under the accountable category the important criteria used include: districting, adequacy of information and public access to it, and diffusion and restraints on the leadership.

Criteria used to measure how informed a legislature could be considered are: time spent both during session and presession; number of standing committees, methods of handling testimony, facilities; interim activities, including structure and staffing, reporting and recording; form and character of bills; professional staff resources; fiscal-review capabilities.

The level of a legislature's independence is measured by: independence from executive branch, legislative oversight and audit capabilities; legislative procedures; interest groups and lobbyists; and conflicts of interest.

OTHER FACTORS NOTED

Factors considered in representativeness were: identification of members and constituents, qualifications, compensation, and voting requirements, member effectiveness, size, and complexity of the legislative body.

States which have an unrestricted annual session such as Wisconsin, New York, and California are cited as having "a clear advantage over those whose sessions are straitjacketed into 60 or 90 days every two years," the report emphasizes.

"To be fully effective, the members of a legislature need the support of competent aides who can help them with the many duties of office, including those that are not strictly legislative," is another point accented. Hawaii, Florida, and California are cited as especially outstanding in terms of providing all lawmakers this support.

Separate office space for individual legislators is urged, with Texas, North Carolina, Hawaii, Florida, and California praised for accomplishments in this direction.

ARMED FORCES JOURNAL TRIBUTE TO L. MENDEL RIVERS

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the Armed Forces Journal for January 18, 1971, contains a very special and unique tribute to the late chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers.

The journal presents a picture of Chairman Rivers by selected quotations by many Members of Congress who knew him and worked with him—occasionally worked against him. The sum total is to give a very singular picture of a very singular man.

The article follows:

LET ME TELL YOU ABOUT MENDEL

"On December 7, the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, Mendel Rivers handled what was to be his last piece of legislation, the resolution in support [of] efforts to rescue American Prisoners of War in North Vietnam. . . . [He] said, among other things:

" 'I want the world to know I would tell that crowd in Hanoi, you will either treat them with dignity or some of you will not be here tomorrow . . . So far as I am concerned, . . . if I were the President of the United States, I would deliver an ultimatum to this crowd and let them guess where the next blow is coming from.'

"That was the kind of man he was. He believed in determining what was the right thing, and then standing up firmly for it." Representative John L. McMillan (D-SC), Chairman, District Committee, Vice-Chairman, Agriculture Committee.

"He was a finished student of the subject matter with which his committee dealt. Few Members have ever known their area of operations in the House as he knew his. . . . [He] was peerless in debate, eloquent, fluent, witty, intelligent, and always in command. . . ." Representative Carl B. Albert (D-Okla), Majority Leader, 91st Congress.

"He believed in his country, its heritage, and its destiny. Every minute of his life was dedicated to the preservation of those concepts.

"I have never known a more energetic person. Every minute of his life was put to useful purposes. So far as I know he eschewed many of the pastimes, the card games, the fishing, and other time-consuming activities, in order to devote those moments to his goals—always overshadowed by his love of country and the maintenance of its security. . . . [His] foresight was uncanny." Representative O. Clark Fisher (D-Tex), Armed Services Committee.

"The American G.I. has lost his all-time favorite and generous champion; his enemies a determined and honorable opponent; his friends, a loyal and powerful ally; his family, a loving, kind, dedicated husband and father." Representative Richard Ichord (D-Mo) Chairman, Internal Security Committee.

"Holding a position of tremendous power in this House, he never abused that power. Yet, he was tough . . . But he was always fair." Representative Thomas G. Abernethy (D-Miss) Agriculture, District Committees.

"One does not have to be a so-called hawk to mourn the death of Mendel Rivers. . . . I knew [him] as courageous, good humored, fair, and characterized by a total lack of vindictiveness." Representative Clarence D. Long (D-Md) Armed Services Committee.

". . . Mendel came here 30 years ago . . . and we stood in this House and took the oath of office. The ranks have thinned since then, and today . . . we find only nine names of that roster of 435 who were on the list at the time we took the oath. . . .

"He never complained. . . . On that day [7 December] when he was here exposing himself to this turmoil and to those turbulent arguments, he should have been in the hospital in Birmingham being operated on, and yet he was six months late getting there. If Mendel Rivers had listened to the advice of his doctors he would have been in the hospital six months ago, and his chances of recovery would have been 80 percent. But yet he saw in his work here the call to a duty that he could not reject. Yes, he did stay on the firing line. . . .

"I must tell you and share this with you: that I think I am the only Member who saw him in the hospital. . . . [The] Mendel Rivers I talked to in that hospital bed was the same Mendel Rivers that you know . . . passionately dedicated to that in which he believed, and barking instructions to me on what to do from that hospital bed." Representative F. Edward Hébert (D-La.) Armed Services Committee.

". . . [One] of the outstanding attributes . . . was his deep concern for the men in uniform. Their well-being was first and foremost in his mind. He wanted them to be well paid. . . . He wanted them to have the best of health care. . . . He wanted them to have the finest equipment possible. . . . He loved his nation dearly and feared for her well-being." Representative Durward G. Hall (R-Mo.) Armed Services Committee.

"He fought for all the military, from private to general. . . ." Representative Ed Foreman (R-NM) Armed Services Committee.

"From buck private to five-star general, from the Air Force to the Coast Guard, the Chairman saw to it that the American military man never had to take a back seat to any other individual in our society or any other. . . .

"I also know that Chairman Rivers was a devoted father and a conscientious family man who cared very deeply about his wife and children. Being the father of four myself, we discussed from time to time some of the different situations that arise in a busy and active family. I learned firsthand of the love and respect which he always gave to those closest to him." Representative Charles H. Wilson (D-Calif), Armed Services Committee, Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service, Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization.

". . . [Can] greater honor be paid to anyone than to have been regarded by so many as 'protector' and 'compatriot'?" Representative Frank A. Stubblefield (D-Ky), Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

"He knew what he was talking about. For about two decades, for 20 years, I sat with him there on that committee, and in this period of time I do not remember ever hearing a military man who came before that committee—for instance, in the field of airpower, types of airplanes or things of that kind—who knew anywhere near as much as the chairman. . . .

"Mendel did not get this information by just listening to other people who knew less than he. He got it by studying, by working, by burning the midnight oil. . . .

"I do not believe I ever saw Mendel, when he was in a relaxed mood, when he did not ask me about my children. I was a bachelor for a long time, and have a young family for my years, and he particularly encouraged me to take time off and to share interests with my children, and he said that I should do these things, because 'They will go before you know it.'" Representative Charles Bennett (D-Fla) Chairman, Armed Services Seapower and Real Estate Subcommittees.

"The American serviceman has lost his most persuasive and effective proponent. From the enlisted men to the highest ranking officers, servicemen knew that they had no better friend. . . . The forceful Congressman withstood constant attacks of the most vitriolic kind on his personal and professional competence. Yet, he was unscarred by these attackers, for he was bigger than such petty prejudices." Representative W. C. Daniel (D-Va) Armed Services Committee.

"Although he never wore the uniform of his country, he was second to none in his love for it. . . . The American in uniform never had a better friend. . . ." Representative William G. Bray (R-Ind) Armed Services, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees.

"Remember the words of Ovid: 'It is not wealth, nor ancestry, but honorable conduct and a noble disposition that make men great.' By this measure, L. Mendel Rivers was a great American." Representative Robert N. Giaimo (D-Conn), Appropriations Committee.

"I knew him well, better than most. He and I came to Congress together in 1941, a long time ago. . . . We have lost a champion among Congressmen. America has lost a great son." Representative Robert L. F. Sikes (D-Fla), Appropriations Committee.

"Eloquent in oratory, vigorous convictions powerfully expressed, and deep, passionate loyalty. A man with cherished roots, loving his home, his State and its people, he was able to extend that concern to the whole Nation. We shall not soon see another of his stature." Representative Edward P. Boland (D-Mass), Appropriations Committee.

"He was a man of deep, spiritual faith and when I traveled with him on various occasions, I noted that on Sundays he always attended church without fail, even in instances when he might have to go far out of his way to do so. . . .

"At times he was maligned and many lies were circulated about him that were without foundation. In public life, he was often the victim of gross misrepresentation, but it never shook his faith in his public calling, and it never caused him to lose faith in the people whom he loved with all his heart. He was a great and good man." Representative Philip J. Philbin (D-Mass), Second ranking majority member, House Armed Services Committee, 91st Congress—thus, the man who likely would have succeeded L. Mendel Rivers as Chairman. Defeated for re-election to 92d Congress.

"Mendel Rivers was no stranger to poverty or to hard work. . . . The elder Rivers died when Mendel was quite young, forcing him to take on more of the farm chores. Later, while a high school student, he would arise at 4 a.m., milk cows, deliver newspapers, and then catch the trolley into Charleston. . . . (His) voting record in the House of Representatives was among the most progressive of all his colleagues from the Deep South. He supported much legislation to help the underprivileged, to help them up the ladder of life. . . . (He) believed that weakness invites disaster and invites war, and that strength promotes peace. . . .

"I would like to tell you something else about Mendel Rivers, about the personal problems which he courageously overcame. For many years he vanquished the heart trouble that only some . . . knew about. We are aware of another personal problem over which he had been totally and courageously victorious. He was successful over this personal problem through the same tenacity and perseverance with which he led his great committee. His victorious battle over this problem is an inspiration to all of us." Representative William J. B. Dorn (D-SC) Veterans' Affairs Committee.

"Although others have suggested a hardness and insensitivity about him, those who knew him knew also of his warmth and his interest in human beings in all segments of society." Representative John S. Monagan (D-Conn.) Government Operations Committee.

"I always regarded Mendel Rivers as a sincere patriot who was interested primarily in the security of his country. He worked hard at his job, he knew what was going on and felt that he had an obligation to take the initiative. . . ." Representative Thomas E. Morgan (D-Pa.) Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee and Special Subcommittee for Review of Foreign Aid Programs.

"Mendel Rivers was a man of his word. . . . He was a hard worker. My office happens to be just one or two doors from the office which he occupied.

"Frankly, I can state that I never arrived earlier at my office than did Mendel Rivers. . . . Just before he left I had a long talk with him about some of our problems and at no time had I ever heard him complain in any way. But on that day he said to me that he had been having a little trouble with his heart . . . little did I realize how serious it was." Representative Hale Boggs (D-La) Vice Chairman, National Democratic Committee, Democratic Whip, 91st Congress, Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures, Joint Economic Committee.

"I read in the newspapers that Mendel Rivers was considered autocratic. . . . On the contrary, he was never autocratic. . . . I remember an incident some years ago . . . when we were getting ready to leave for one of the meetings [of the Military Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly]. . . . When I came on board the big jet, the military aide introduced me to the crew and said, 'This is the chairman.' And the colonel who was the pilot of the plane said, 'The chairman is already on board.' Well, obviously to any military man the chairman was Mendel Rivers and I did not abuse the colonel. Mendel Rivers straightened him out. He said. 'I am the chairman most of the time, but on this trip and on this mission, Mr. Hays is the chairman and I am just one of the soldiers in the ranks.'

"We did not have to agree with him to say that this is a great American. . . ." Representative Wayne L. Hays (D-Ohio) Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman, U.S. Delegation to the NATO Atlantic Assembly.

"He had a magnificent sense of humor, and while he could use it devastatingly in debate, and frequently used it against me, he could also laugh at himself. . . .

"He loved nature, flowers in particular. . . .

"His judgments were not always my judgments, and his priorities were not always mine. I frequently questioned his judgments and his priorities. But I have never ever questioned his motives." Representative Otis G. Pike (D-N.Y.), Chairman, Armed Services Special Subcommittee on Survivor Benefits.

"Here was a man with whom one could have honest differences, as he and I certainly did; and yet maintain mutual respect. . . ." Representative Lester L. Wolff (D-N.Y.), Foreign Affairs Committee.

"Mendel Rivers was the best whether he was with you or against you. . . . He never ducked an issue.

"It was a shock to me . . . several weeks ago when I learned that he had a medical problem that eventually led to his passing. But I think the fact that he never told many that he had this illness was typical of Mendel Rivers." Representative Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich) Minority Leader, 91st Congress.

"He was not arbitrary. He never made a decision without consulting the minority.

"He is said to have been controversial, but not insofar as I am concerned. He was controversial because he stood firm on what he believed. He stood firm on making certain that our country had a national defense second to none." Representative Leslie C. Arends (R-Ill) Republican Whip Armed Services Committee.

"He was always tolerant in his dealings with his fellow committee chairman. . . ." Representative George D. Mahon (D-Tex) Chairman, Appropriations Committee.

"There are many who did not agree with Mendel Rivers, but no one ever accused him of avarice. No one ever had any doubt about where he stood. He believed passionately in the things he defended, and his faith was not doubted by any man, even his most ardent enemies." Representative Henry B. Gonzalez (D-Tex) Banking and Currency Committee.

"He had his strong opinions, but he never shunned inquiry into controversy." Representative Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.) Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

"While we did not necessarily agree upon all matters, I found the chairman considerate, gracious, and always a true gentleman in every sense." Representative Peter N. Kyros (D-Me.) Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

"He told me on our first day that the Armed Services Committee had no place for politics. He was as true as his word, never manifesting the slightest degree of partisanship. . . . His single concern was our national security. Individual members might have taken issue with him on specific points, but at no time did this influence his personal relationship with them. This is a mark of manliness, and I have never seen it displayed by anyone else in such a grand manner." Representative G. William Whitehurst (R-Va.) Armed Services Committee.

". . . [There] probably has never been a man in the Congress who was more severely attacked by outsiders, most of whom did not really understand him. . . .

"For one thing, you never had any doubt where he stood. There was never any equivocation, never any trying to straddle or duck an issue. . . . And although there were Members with whom he differed—and upon occasion I was included in that number—he still made it possible for committee members with whom he did not agree to assume responsibility in the committee, nevertheless, and he

made a special point of recognizing the contributions . . . they made." Representative Samuel S. Stratton (D-NY) Chairman, Armed Services Antisubmarine Warfare Committee.

"While he admitted that he could not always understand their actions he placed the greatest charity upon his enemies. Only a few weeks before his death I heard him comment that he just could not understand why so many reporters seemed to delight in condemning him, even though he was giving his all to his country." Representative Earl F. Landgrebe (R-Ind).

"While our political philosophy on domestic matters was in conflict, he respected my views and I respected his. . . . Many [Members] . . . have frequently expressed to me their personal fondness for Mendel Rivers—despite conflicting views." Representative Melvin Price (D-Ill) Chairman, Armed Services Special Subcommittee on Airlift, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

"He was a man who did not care a little—he cared a lot. . . . I participated as strongly as any of his House colleagues in challenging some of his conclusions. . . . In spite of those differences, I cannot recall any favor or request of mine that he ever denied unless it was for more time in cross examination." Representative Robert T. Leggett (D-Calif) Armed Services, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees.

"He was kind to junior Members, gracious to his adversaries and extraordinarily vigilant for his country. . . . [He] recognized that this Nation cannot make social progress if we do not first retain the basic freedom to pursue it." Representative Louis C. Wyman (R-NH) Appropriations Committee.

This year was to mark his 30th anniversary in Congress. And this issue of the Journal was to be his issue.

It's not easy to describe a man who fought so hard over so many years for millions of constituents in uniform—most of whom couldn't vote for him however much they might have wanted to. It's even more difficult to write about him when, suddenly, he has died—because you remember him so full of life.

People in his district will tell you that Mendel Rivers never changed. There was nothing of the stuffed shirt about him. Contrary to some impressions, he was a humble man. But it's hard to describe him as humble, because he was such a colorful figure, and such a very big man in so many ways. He was a *particularly* big man in all that he did for Servicemen and their families—the many fights he won on their behalf which gained him little or no benefit.

When we talked with Mendel Rivers on December 3, in what turned out to be his last press interview, he named two officers whom he held in "highest regard": VAdm H. G. Rickover and former Marine Corps Commandant General Wallace M. Greene, Jr.

HOW DO YOU JUDGE AN EAGLE?

Just two days earlier, Rickover had introduced the Chairman and his wife at ceremonies in Newport News for the keel-laying of the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate *South Carolina*. Rivers was especially pleased when Rickover introduced Mrs. Rivers in these words: "Only those women who have the misfortune to be married to politicians can have any conception of the patience, understanding, and fortitude she possesses." And the Chairman kidded us for interviewing the wrong person—he said we should have asked to visit with his wife instead.

His Chief Counsel John R. (Russ) Blandford, will tell you, "It's not easy to describe Mendel Rivers." Admiral Rickover put it another way at the *South Carolina* keel-laying: "There is no use trying to explain him by reducing a versatile man to one or two main talents. He cannot be judged in the way some people judge an eagle by not'ng how he walks on the ground."

Rickover tried to describe the real Mendel Rivers: "He has had to fight every mile of his road through life; nothing comes easily to him, not even oratory in which he excels. . . . He does not believe that being serious means going about with a long face. He has always held calmness to be a form of virtue; it is in many cases an extremely difficult form of courage.

"He is one of the most unintimidable men in the United States. He knows that a good leader is doing his job when half the people are following him and half are chasing him.

"He understands the chasm between men with knowledge who lack power and men with power who lack knowledge."

IMPORTANT OMISSIONS

Rivers was an enigma to the press, and often maligned by it. Drew Pearson was one who wrote particularly bitter columns which conveyed, in the early and mid-sixties, a distorted picture of Rivers as an alcoholic. What Pearson never pointed out was that the problem—which Pearson grossly overstated—existed in the early and mid-*fifties*, and Mendel Rivers *knew* he had a problem and fought it and conquered it, that the problem *never* interfered with Mr. Rivers' work on the Armed Services Committee, and that it *never* involved, as Pearson alleged, "security risks." (One senior officer who knew Mendel Rivers especially well called Pearson to tell him, "You're wrong about this man," but Pearson kept on writing.) And as one of his close associates told us, "Mendel fought the problem harder than any man I ever knew. And he licked it, on his own."

One of the most perceptive articles ever written about Mendel Rivers appeared in, of all places, *Women's Wear Daily* (3 June 1969). It said, "Even though Rivers is portrayed too often as a captive of the Pentagon, the truth is that he is his own boss. So much so he gives military men fits when he decides they are playing cute with the taxpayers' money." From our own experience, we know this was an accurate description. On a number of occasions when The Journal printed articles with which Rivers disagreed, he told us (in polite, but convincingly strong and often colorful language) what he disagreed with—and why—but only after he had first taken time to check out all the facts thoroughly. And, as he told us candidly in that last interview, "I've had a lot of *unpleasant* experiences with the military. I've opposed them on many issues, and I've had so much grief over officers coming before my committee with a bunch of bum dope that I've had to develop a basic skepticism about the testimony we get."

The press often portrayed him as a chairman who used his power blatantly for his own political benefit.

But the press forgot that Mendel Rivers got very few votes from his district in South Carolina over his fights for military Medicare and Denticare and for a better survivor benefits program. As one of his closest associates told us, "The military personnel budget doesn't get much copy in the daily press—and that's where Mendel fought hardest for the Serviceman."

Columnists often commented on the number of military installations in Charleston, Rivers' home district, but they failed to note that, while Rivers *was* effective (as every Congressman should be in working for his constituents), the military itself has wanted to move more facilities south, for many reasons. Labor is cheaper, land is cheaper, and the weather is temperate enough to permit year-'round training. For the Navy especially, moving some of its forces and facilities to Charleston has paid substantial benefits: Ships stationed in Charleston (or in Mayport, Fla., for that matter) get to training areas in the Caribbean a full day quicker than do ships berthed in Norfolk or further north in Newport or Boston. They also have fewer training exercises cancelled because of poor weather; and the ships suffer less wear and tear from winter weather.

Russ Blandford will tell you that Mendel Rivers was genuinely amused by all the credit he was given for building up the First Congressional District of South Carolina. (The press always cited, for instance, the Marine Corps recruit training depot at Parris Island. It failed to mention that the post was established in 1891, 14 years before Mendel Rivers was *born*. And the press talked about the Charleston Navy Yard, established *four* years before he was born.)

As Blandford puts it, "The people who were doing their best to defeat him, by giving him credit for all these installations, were probably his greatest boosters—without even knowing it."

Russ Blandford (who is probably as close to F. Edward Hébert as he was to L. Mendel Rivers) describes his former boss this way: "He was the most versatile man, and he had the best sense of timing. And I'm convinced he had extrasensory perception, as well.

"He had the gruffest outside, and the softest heart, of any man I've ever known. He could put a chill into any witness just by looking at him—but he was an extremely kind man. I know many people he helped over rough roads. He was generous, much more so than ever showed.

"His greatest competence was his unfailing memory. If you told him something once, he never forgot it. This can be pretty frightening to a chief counsel or to a member of the staff, because you had to be right the first time. But he was forgiving when you erred, and he didn't make a big deal about it.

"He was non-political and non-partisan—he ran this Committee as non-partisanly as it is humanly possible to do. He never asked a prospective member of the staff about his political affiliation.

"I remember when we looked for the first time at the new Committee hearing room—now called the Carl Vinson Room—here in the Rayburn building. He asked me, 'What are the two waiting rooms to either side all about?' And I told him, 'One is for the majority, one is for the minority.' And he looked at me with fire in his eyes and said, 'We have no majority or minority. All members of this committee are Americans, interested in national security.' There wasn't any audience around; it wasn't a publicity stunt; he was just talking to me. That's why we don't have Democrats and Republicans going out to caucus over coffee—he sealed off one of those rooms and now they go out together."

Blandford, who knew him well, admits that criticism from the press hurt Rivers very deeply. "They twisted his words, they hurt him badly," he says. But he adds, "He lived and breathed the American Serviceman; more than that, he lived this nation. 'The Star Spangled Banner' and 'America the Beautiful' still brought tears to his eyes."

And Blandford described Mendel Rivers' dilemma with the press, as he reminded us of something Mendel said in that 3 December interview: "You can disagree with a man without being disagreeable."

Some of those who started out to be his greatest detractors ended up paying Mendel Rivers his greatest tributes. An October 1970 *Esquire* profile started off with: "No doubt you have seen him in front of the tall doors of the House Armed Services Committee. He is swollen with secrets; all his shadows are washed out by the television lights. He defends the innocence of the troopers of My Lai, suggests the atomization of the North Vietnamese, points out that General Lewis B. Hershey is a loving sort of man."

The article ended with this paragraph: "And he knows that he is not the last who

will have this vision. 'Some old boy' Rivers told me, 'wrote that I said I have a *sense of greatness*. God damn it, that's just what I don't have! I'm just an ordinary Committee Chairman. I'm just an American. And when I'm gone, there'll be another one coming after me.'"

It's hard to tell what Mendel Rivers really was like, or all about. So we've decided, on these pages, to picture him in the words of those who knew him best—his colleagues in the House. As one of them said to us, "Let me tell you about Mendel. . . ."

And *one* way to tell what Mendel Rivers *really* was like is to ask you to read another of his favorite poems—written by an Air Force officer in combat about one month before he gave his life for the nation that Mendel Rivers believed in.

REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD CALLS FOR BLOCK GRANTS TIED TO PERFORMANCE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph Alsop, writing in Wednesday's Washington Post, makes a very strong point on the issue of revenue sharing. And his point is that there are ways to relieve the financial burden of the States and localities other than merely giving them, unencumbered, millions of dollars to spend as they see fit.

As the learned and very able chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee said last week, in his very succinct floor statement which analyzed the real issues involved in revenue sharing, the Congress could easily convert the many categorical grants now offered into several block programs. This would serve to get the money to the States and the localities and relieve them of the present tight Federal spending guidelines.

But let me add a new wrinkle to the plan.

I support the block grant concept but I feel that money should only be released from the Federal Government to the States and cities on the basis of performance.

The plan would work something like this. A locality would submit to Congress a comprehensive plan which might include goals for education, housing, urban beautification, mass transportation and water and sewer lines.

The Congress, on the basis of the plan submitted, would provide initial funds for the project but would release additional funds only on the basis of adequate performance.

We would say to a big city mayor that, we will buy your plan for improvement and provide funds. We will not restrict your use of these funds, but we will not buy a pig in a poke. We want to see some regular measure of performance, or else no more money.

Thus we would shift to the block grant concept, with its inherent savings for the localities, but we could rescind these grants if local officials proved incapable of producing results with their new resources.

I think only on this basis can the Federal Government fulfill its obligation to the taxpayers to see that their money is being spent in the most efficient and productive way possible.

I would like to introduce Mr. Alsop's excellent column into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

MILLS IS MISUNDERSTOOD

(By Joseph Alsop)

It is always dangerous to misunderstand Rep. Wilbur Mills on a really major issue, since the immensely able and powerful chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee has a knack of getting his own way. And it is very clear indeed that Mills' approach to the President's revenue-sharing plan is now being widely misunderstood.

Everyone says that Mills is "against revenue-sharing" and means to kill the plan in his committee, which must incidentally handle about three quarters of the President's strongly innovating proposals. Indeed he is "against revenue-sharing" if this is strictly defined as handing over chunks of federal revenue to the states and local governments with no strings of any kind attached.

But Mills is by no means against converting the huge "categorical grants" to the state and local governments, which are now strictly administered by huge numbers of federal bureaucrats, into "block grants" which would need very few federal bureaucrats to ride herd on them. We shall therefore be hearing a lot about "block grants" in the coming months, and it is well to understand what this conversion my mean.

It will mean, first, that the money will be handed out for specified purposes, such as aid to primary and secondary education. It will mean, second, that there will be a few essential strings attached to the money, such as an obviously necessary provision that illegally segregated schools will get no aid.

But it will mean, third, that after compliance with such minimal provisions, the state and local governments will be free to spend their block grants in the best way they can think up, for the purposes the grants are provided. It can be seen, then, why the block grants system would abolish the functions of vast sectors of the federal bureaucracy if the job is rightly done.

"I have no trouble, none at all, with block grants." Chairman Mills has recently said. "I wouldn't mind making the whole $16 billion the President has labeled for 'revenue-sharing' into block grants."

The President's budgeted $16 billion is in fact composed of $10 billion worth of converted "categorical grants" plus another $1 billion for the same purposes as the converted "categorical grants" plus $5 billion to sweeten the pot. As of now, the $5 billion is labeled for "free" revenue-sharing to the states, without any strings at all.

It is the "free" $5 billion that Mills balks at. But he is against the way the money is being offered, instead of the act of offering it. His present thinking, in fact, is that it will probably be best to re-label the $5 billion as money to aid the states and local governments in carrying the ever-increasing burden of welfare costs.

Over-all, always assuming the job is rightly done, the new approach that Mills advocates ought to constitute an immense improvement. To see why, consider our hideous national problem of the schools that fail to educate both black people and very poor people.

The Federal government's dire and enormous educational bureaucracy is effectively dedicated to the proposition that this great national problem cannot be solved. They say that you must first change white people, or black people, or both—which is impossible. And they also say that you cannot improve the schools sufficiently so that the problem is solved inside the schools.

But suppose the federal educational bureaucracy loses its deadweight of authority. Suppose that the money is passed out to the school districts, to do the best they can with. Suppose, further, that more money is provided for school-aid (as is certainly required) than the Nixon Budget now offers. And suppose, finally, that a sensible system is found for giving the lion's share of the money to the school districts with the most acute problem.

Let us say that a thousand school districts would then have funds to try to improve their schools very radically, so that they truly began to educate ghetto children and other very poor children. In that event, one could predict that 200 school districts would waste the money; and another 750 school districts would spend the money soundly but unimaginatively.

But there would still be 50 school districts that would try to spend the money creatively. Of the 50, two or three would surely succeed. And so, at long last, we would know how to do what we are utterly failing to do at present.

PETER MACDONALD INAUGURATED AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE NAVAHO TRIBE

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on the 5th of January a good friend of mine and a great American was inaugurated as the chairman of the Navaho Tribe.

Peter MacDonald, marine, graduate engineer, and successful political leader, is held in great esteem by those who know him. Perhaps the most eloquent testimony to this esteem and affection was the over 7,500 people who assembled for this outdoor event in 22-degrees-below-zero weather. I am pleased to be able to read his sincere and eloquent pledge because I was so cold when sitting there I found I missed a great deal.

The address follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY PETER MACDONALD, JANUARY 5, 1971

Chief Justice Kirk, fellow Navajos, members of the Navajo Tribal Council, Governors, Members of Congress, Members of the Armed Forces, other distinguished guests: Today we observe a change of leadership in accordance with our Tribal laws and our traditions.

I humbly accept the honor you have bestowed on me as your new Chairman. I accept the responsibilities and the burdens of this office with which you have entrusted me. I do so with a deep sense of humility, commitment and dedication!

Today, many eyes are upon us, for we are a people of destiny, and we have reached one of the great turning points in the history of our people, and the history of all Indian people.

What we do now, this year and over the next years, will be watched not only on this Reservation but by others; by our neighbors, by Indians throughout this country, by Congress and by the White House.

In his historic message of last July 8th, President Nixon said, "The time has come to break decisively with the past and to create the conditions for a new era in which the Indians' future is determined by Indian acts and Indian decisions". So President

Nixon entrusted to an Indian, Louis Bruce, the job of changing fundamentally the direction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Commissioner Bruce has been faithful to that mission. At long last the Bureau has been reorganized from top to bottom, and this new Bureau has now moved to offer every Indian Nation the opportunity to determine its own future. It is in keeping with the spirit of that declaration that the President sends Mr. Bruce to be with us today—not just in his capacity as Commissioner, but as the President's own personal emissary.

The President has defined the challenge. Today, I pledge that the Navajo Nation will take up that challenge and lead the way to self-sufficiency.

Today I have taken this oath of office, not to separate myself from you, but to swear that I am and ever will be a part of you—one among equals, a brother among brothers. The old divisions must pass away. There is no place for them.

The ways of distrust, of recrimination, of acting in the dark, of taking counsel only with oneself—these too must pass. There is no place for them. The old distance between those who vote and those who are elected, between the young and the old, between the people and their spokesmen—this distance too must pass. There is no place for it!

We must close ranks. We must be one. We must speak openly and with a free spirit. There is no place for any way but the way of truth.

Today, I would speak to you of three things; for these will be the goals of my administration:

First, what is rightfully ours, we must protect; what is rightfully due us, we must claim.

Second, what we depend on from others, we must replace with the labor of our own hands and the skills of our own people.

Third, what we do not have, we must bring into being. We must create for ourselves.

These are not dreams. They are a blueprint for action. They are concrete steps, which we must develop together and set in motion together; these are some of the places where we must begin.

I

There is much that is ours by right that has been withheld from us. This must be stopped. Land claim monies are owed to us. We must set about at once to claim them. We are owed special federal funds for education, manpower, highway construction, economic development, vocational education, and for other purposes. We are due a share of these as Navajos and as citizens. In some cases, the statutes give the money to state government expressly for our benefit. These federal funds are ours by right and by law. We must claim them. Here, too, we should mention the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project. That was to be finished in 1970. It is now 1971, and the waters from the San Juan River which we gave up in return for the irrigation of our land have long been flowing to our neighbors. We cannot wait until 1980 for the irrigation project to be completed. We struck a bargain and we are entitled to have it kept promptly.

It is time to lay claim to all that is rightfully ours. This administration shall make no private deals, shall settle for no half payments. We shall not barter away the Navajo birthright for quick profit that will cheat our children, and their children after them.

II

Right now we depend on much from others that we must begin to provide for ourselves. We are forced to depend on others to run our schools, build our roads, administer our health program, construct our houses, manage our industries, sell us cars, cash our checks and operate our trading posts. This must cease.

The Administration has said that the time has come for Indians to contract for the control or operation of federal programs.

For the Navajo Nation, this means we now have the opportunity to control and administer over 100 million dollars in programs.

My past years with the Office of Navajo Economic Opportunity have convinced me that almost all the things we have depended upon non-Indian administrators to do can be done as well or in some instances better by our own people and for our own people.

We have begun to lead the way by contracting to run specific schools. We started with Rough Rock. Now we are pioneering with Ramah School. A further step was taken with the establishment of the Navajo Community College. But that is just the beginning. I hope we can count on the accreditation agencies to understand our very special needs and the courageous effort which our people are now making. We cannot fail any more completely than did the non-Indian experts who had been paid to educate our children.

Our housing is almost universally inadequate. We must accelerate and enlarge our housing program. Water is scarce; many families are still hauling water for miles to their homes. We must bring water to every community.

We have 65% unemployment and two thousand more Navajos enter the job market each year. We must create our own employment service and generate new jobs.

Our infant mortality rate, our life expectancy rate, our state of malnutrition are among the worst in the Nation. We ourselves must improve the system for delivering health services to our own people.

We must throw off the bonds of forced dependency, we must begin to do for ourselves what others have been paid to do for us. We must do it better. We must do it in our own way. And we must start now!

III

Finally, there is much we do not have which we must create for ourselves. We are fortunate in many respects for we have the three classic sources of wealth: We have land in abundance. We have sources of capital (not enough, but some); and we have labor, vast numbers of unemployed Navajos. Yet we live in poverty. Why? What do we lack? Above all we lack privately owned businesses—a Navajo-owned private sector. We lack jobs, good jobs that will keep our finest young people on the reservation. We lack trained specialists and professionals of our own; and we lack credit.

We must move from a wage and welfare economy to an ownership economy. The industries that have been brought to the Reservation have been owned and managed by non-Navajos, and provide only a handful of jobs for us. We must develop more Navajo-owned businesses on the Reservation and devise ways to make this practical for the Navajo people. We must also make sure that Navajos are trained in executive and middle management positions to run those industries now on the Reservation, or those which may come in the future. This takes money. It also takes imagination and creativity, and the courage to innovate on the part of those who are responsible for training. Training should not be limited to manual skills. Everytime someone says how good we Navajos are with our hands, I want to ask: "Why not give us a chance to show what we can do with our minds?"

We lack credit. We own no banks. The Bureau has never provided the loan or grant for economic development on the scale needed by Navajos. The new Indian Business Development Fund is a major step forward. But it is only a drop in the bucket. We must develop our own private sector. We must challenge the Congress, the Bureau and other lending agencies of the Federal Government to do a better job in providing adequate and flexible capital for our needs.

We need two kinds of privately-owned businesses on the Reservation: those that produce goods and services which we now buy from others (such as food stores, appliance shops, barber shops, and dry cleaning shops), and we also need plants owned by individual Navajos or by the Tribe that will produce goods for export, to be sold off the Reservation to bring a profit back to our people. Our economy must have a private sector.

If we can do these three things: protect and claim what is rightfully ours, reduce our own dependency on others, and create a private economy of Navajo ownership, then we will truly be able to fulfill our destiny as a PEOPLE.

I certainly cannot do this alone. I can only share my vision with you. Together we must work and plan and dream. We hope that our neighbors will share those dreams and assist us in achieving them. We need the help of government and business leaders with vision beyond tomorrow. Most especially I will need the help of you, the Navajo Tribal Council delegates, for we cannot be divided any longer.

To be divided is not the Navajo Way. We are a people with hope in our future, confidence in ourselves, and compassion for one another.

We are a proud people, because we are sustained by our heritage, which teaches us great lessons.

Essentially it tells us that planning and innovating without our Creator will lead to unhappiness, for the spiritual aspect of man gives substance and purpose to life. As we strive to achieve a better tomorrow, no person, no home, no community is beyond its call of duty to unite, for our strength lies in our unity. Therefore, let us transform our unity of interest into a unity of purpose.

One Hundred and Three years ago we returned from the Long Walk, 15,000 of us, to claim this reservation as our land. We have multiplied tenfold. We have endured hardship, discouragement and despair. We are destiny's children and we have endured as one People.

We must listen to the many voices of our people—the young and the old, those elected and those not elected, the medicinemen and the elders, the impatient and the militant; for we are all one family. We must walk together as we did long ago.

Our past gave us the present, but the future is ours to forge.

Today we enter upon a second century and we shall realize an even greater destiny, not just to survive—not just to multiply, but to flourish, create, and lead the way so that other people may follow.

For we are the people who walk in the Beauty Way.

And today in Beauty, it shall begin.

FIRST VIOLIN OR SECOND FIDDLE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the vice president and group executive, Mr. Mark Morton, of the General Electric Co., addressed the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce on April 8, 1969. Mr. Morton's remarks were directed to not only what is right in America, but also to the contributions our aerospace industry has made to world technological leadership and to the quality of life in this Nation and the world.

Because of the importance of Mr Morton's remarks, I am including them in the RECORD:

FIRST VIOLIN OR SECOND FIDDLE?

(Address by Mark Morton)

We sometimes concentrate a great deal in America on the things that are wrong—the crime, racial discord, poverty—and certainly these need our urgent attention, but we shouldn't get so immersed in the negative that we forget that there's much that is right about our country and its people.

For example, in this year alone:

Some 30 million teenagers will not be hauled into court as juvenile delinquents.

Over 85 million people will work at paying jobs and 70 million of these would work even if they didn't have to.

Nearly three-quarters of a million freshmen preparing to enter college will not drop out before they graduate.

Consumers who buy cars, appliances, and other goods on time will pay off over 50 billion dollars worth of installment credit.

700 million acres of beautiful forest land will not go up in flames.

And, 70 million automobile drivers will not get traffic tickets.

So, we can find much to be encouraged about, and we all address ourselves to the problems of our country, let's not overlook those things which are turning out well.

From a personal view, representing General Electric, I find much to be proud of, particularly in the talent and dedication of our people working in nationally and in many foreign countries on an ambitious range of worldwide programs. We have had a major or key supporting part in nearly 50 percent of all space flight missions that this nation has undertaken. You don't accomplish this without having outstanding individuals who understand problems and then do something about them.

Historically, we came to Philadelphia not by accident but by intent. We looked at two dozen locations, then decided on this area; because of its skilled manpower market, its educational excellence particularly suited to our business, its air transportation facilities to the West Coast, as well as its proximity to Washington and our New York Corporate offices, and because we thought this city was receptive to the science and technology business. Over the past decade, we've found no reason to regret our choice.

There is no need to belabor the seriousness of the problems in our great urban-suburban centers or the plight of the disadvantaged who live in them. It seems quite clear now—as perhaps it has not been up to now—that the challenge of eliminating these problems is going to be with all of us for some time.

Our responsibilities in these areas are going to be part of—not in addition to—our lives and our jobs, whether these jobs are in industry, government or education. No rapid or temporary infusion of money, legislation or programs will be enough to effect the kind of permanent solution our society demands. And, of course, no single agency or institution can be impressively effective without the support and participation of other community units.

Four-fifths of our population is sharing in the growth and progress of our country and looking back over its shoulder at the one-fifth who have been left out. That one-fifth can never become good customers—nor full citizens—until they are brought into the mainstream as self-reliant, self-respecting and productive members of society. Progress today cannot be measured by taking pride in our present standards, but rather it's measured in how well we can make the success of this life available to the less fortunate around us.

The private sector of our economy can do many things in this situation. But more than anything else, the "something" that the businessman can provide is the opportunity to earn a living—a job for a man or woman who is not now employed or even employable. Also, it must be a job that is productive for the businessman who offers it and self-respecting and productive for the man who takes it.

Last year at the Missile and Space Division, we were fortunate to have a share in setting up Progress Aerospace Enterprises (PAE), a black-owned, black-managed, but integrated aerospace firm here in Philadelphia—and one of the newest economic ventures of the very remarkable Reverend Leon Sullivan. We participated in the PAE project because we felt that the constructive demonstration by minority people, that they could handle this most sophisticated type of business, would illustrate their ability to enter all phases of our economic system.

We think it's a pretty good example of what the aerospace community has to offer—and must offer—in providing new ideas and new approaches to our urban and social problems. In fact, history may show that the great legacy of the space program was that it showed us that we as a nation could solve large, complex problems. And America's urban centers now represent a series of large, complex problems.

Which brings me to my second concern—the alarming decline in America's commitment to maintaining technological leadership in the world.

When I was invited to speak on the space program here today, it was a temptation to break out a full set of words and multicolored slides detailing aerospace progress and impact in the past decade. And then another set of dazzling artistic concepts of space exploration in the future.

There are, of course, some very impressive words and photographs illustrating the truly remarkable achievements of the aerospace program. And there are even more creative words and pieces of art work about the future.

But there will be no such eulogizing with visual aids in my presentation today. Nor do I want to take all my time to present a glowing account of the impact the business has on the greater Philadelphia area. Instead, I want to concentrate on a plea and on some plain talk—talk which should concern all of us who have a professional and personal interest in the future of this nation.

For those of us who know what the advancement of science and technology can do for a nation's prosperity and well-being, we can only view with grave concern, any decline or de-emphasis on research funding. The space program, for example, is periodically subjected to the budget-cutting actions of the Congress. This is an unfortunate trend, not only because the space effort is setting the pace of progress in science and technology, but also because this kind of attitude may well lead to a falling behind in other critical areas of research and development.

If we listen to the lessons of history, we will learn that nations that paced the world remained at the top only so long as they had the vision to develop their contemporary technologies and resources, and not abandon them for solely social improvement—which by its very nature can only be ultimately reached by the very technology advance which was excluded.

What we require is a balanced approach in this nation—an aggressive attack on our social and urban problems, and a parallel emphasis on being number one in science and technology.

Now America stands at the peak of world technological leadership, and I think it's time to ask ourselves: Have we learned anything? Can we stay there? Are we smart enough to handle our domestic and international problems—and also allocate sufficient resources to the advance of our technology to avoid the mistakes of history?

This nation needs a strong, versatile aerospace program in the next decade—a program that not only includes lunar landings and continuing development of earth-orbiting application satellites, but also an active interplanetary exploration program.

There are those who will say that I encourage a great national aerospace effort because I am in that business. Let me correct that thought quickly. I am speaking not as a businessman, but as a concerned citizen—and as an engineer who has seen what aerospace technology can do for a nation.

I for one am not willing to see our technological leadership in the world disappear because we in the business community kept quiet. I do not want to be a part of a generation that built that leadership through creative minds and then allowed it to dissipate through lack of courage and willingness to speak out on the plain fact that today's science is tomorrow's technology and the day after tomorrow's world trade position.

The great concentration of talent, in government, industry, and the universities, now in the space program, is currently working together to apply an abundance of new technology to the problems of our age.

Here in the Delaware Valley the economic impact of aerospace is translatable in terms of a billion dollars in this area, a hundred thousand jobs, tens of thousands of small businesses that are subcontractors and suppliers to firms such as ours, RCA, Boeing, Burroughs, and others.

But beyond the obvious economic value of the space industry as an employer, there are an impressive number of specific areas of space technology application.

In the everyday practice of medicine here on earth, techniques which were developed to permit man to exist in a space environment are having a profound impact. Research discoveries and engineering innovations from the nation's space program have had direct application in the medical field. For example, small precision valves developed for booster rockets have been successfully adapted to replace heart valves damaged by disease. Electronic sensors can now monitor the heartbeat, temperature, respiration, and overall condition of critically ill patients, so that medical experts at a central control point can be informed about the progress of many patients at the same time, in post-operative and recuperative periods.

Systems technology now is helping major blood banks cut down sharply on the waste of their vital commodity. All of these things—and more—have resulted from space technology. So have special pressure suits, ultra fast drills for dental work, transmitters to relay intestinal data, and so on. As we study to prepare man to survive in space, we greatly enhance the state of his health on earth.

Another major area is education. Of course, there are many direct relationships between space explorations and education that can be cited. Science and mathematics curricula, from kindergarten through graduate school, have been modernized. Teacher education has been strengthened. In turn, many of the new educational technologies have been largely a spinoff of space science industries. Among these, information storage and retrieval techniques, computerized learning and educational television have established themselves. Great educational networks that will utilize communications satellites and eventually bring learning to people everywhere are considered an inevitable development within the next decade or so.

Everybody talks about the weather. They always have and probably always will. But today's space engineers are not just talking about it. They're doing something about it. Much of the action has been made possible by the revolutionary weather satellite. The famed Nimbus satellite, designed and built

at our own Valley Forge Space Center and integrating the work of dozens of other Delaware Valley firms, gave new dimensions to weather reporting and predicting, and helped pave the way for the day when meteorologists can predict with accuracy, weather for two or three weeks. Such capabilities would be of obvious value to weather bureaus, airlines, power companies, farmers, fishermen, construction industries, and others; but more importantly, this is the first faltering step to an approach toward ultimate weather control. By understanding the forces that make our weather, we can perhaps develop controls of these forces while they are still incipient.

We speak so much of the urban problems. And now urban leaders are looking more and more to the so-called systems approach developed in the aerospace industry as an effective method of approaching their problems of crime, air and water pollution, transportation, and low cost housing.

Moreover, the entire development of data processing has revolutionized our capability for handling information. Aerospace requirements have forced the rapid arrival into the sophisticated computer age which allows us to assemble, analyze, and disseminate information faster than ever before in history, and this fantastic capability will affect positively just about every facet of man's life.

One week from now, near St. Thomas Island, aquanauts will leave their underwater home, where they have spent two months in Tektite . . . an underwater laboratory designed and built by GE right here in the Philadelphia area. The Tektite project will bring us a great deal of information on the oceans, and help start us on the way toward realizing some of the food, mineral, and other potentials of the sea. Again, it is space-developed technology that is the basis of this effort.

The point of all this is that although Apollo and the moon mission may be the currently publicized and glamourized space program, and rightly so, there is also a great deal of vital effort underway—with less publicity—in communications, in transportation, in education, in medicine, in materials—materials, for example, that may give us breakthroughs in producing a massive amount of low-cost housing. And I'm talking only about the present—the future promise is so great in benefiting mankind, that it would take hours to outline it.

We in the business community should logically be in the forefront of those telling the story of the benefits of space research. And it's a story that must be told to laymen, to business leaders, to educators, to the press, to housewives, to Congress and other government leaders who must face the turbulence of being elected every two or four years, and to those people who are deeply committed to solving the problems of poverty, the cities, pollution, transportation, and disease. Previously, our technological improvement came from wars. The technology boost from World War II is common knowledge—advances in medicine, electronics, materials, jet aircraft, and so on. Now we can have a national objective, other than war, about which we can wrap our advance of technology—the Space Program. We have a rare opportunity—really one of the few times in history—to advance technology forward, around a national goal that doesn't happen to be a war.

Space exploration has given us vast amounts of information. Centuries of beliefs about the universe have been turned around in a matter of a few years. There is a whole new, increasing inventory of knowledge about chemistry, electronics, geophysics, and the biosciences that will materialize in increasingly greater benefit to man.

All of this will flow to mankind from the country pursuing such advancement of science and technology.

When one ponders the history of man on earth, it is sometimes difficult to see how man has come so far, and advanced his civilization, to its present status. It's odd but true that new ideas, new techniques and the advances of technology have always been fought by the majority of people regardless of the century. They seem to feel that if the money involved were spent on themselves instead, they'd be better off. This condition lasts for a very short time, then that country's money has disappeared because its lapsing technology lost trade position or defense posture, and its people end up far worse off than before.

Galileo was ridiculed and imprisoned for suggesting that the earth moved around the sun. The Wright Brothers were laughed at in their early attempts to build an airplane. Everybody knew it was ridiculous to think that anything heavier than air could fly.

People loudly proclaimed the disadvantages and hazards of the new fangled steam propulsion. Automobile pioneers were met with cries of "get a horse." Early television sets were thought to be a nice gimmick but would always be far too expensive for use by the general public.

When Congress was asked to appropriate funds for the exploration and eventual settlement of the Western part of the United States, Daniel Webster voted against the idea saying that it would be a waste of the taxpayer's money because that territory, as everybody knew, had nothing but barren scrub cactus, deserts, high mountains, and uncivilized savages. But, when Congress was forevisioned enough to open up the old Western frontier nevertheless, it spent 10 percent of the gross national product to build railroads through the West. The percentage of today's gross national product devoted to opening up the space frontier is less than one percent, and it is still declining.

But because we have, at least so far, vigorously pursued our technological advance, it's easy for us at this point to look at history and pity the poor, unlightened people who scoffed at the Galileos and the Wright Brothers; but how might future historians view us if we fail to continue to pursue vigorously our scientific and technological research and development—and during the last quarter of this century, we go the way of those countries before us, who embarked on such a course of action, and gave up their world leadership positions in wealth, trade, and standard of living.

In the business sense, the future world trade position of that country today with strong technology advance should be obvious, let alone the defense posture of that country.

We must get across the urgency of the situation, to gain the widespread understanding and support of the public. Otherwise, we certainly will no longer be the most powerful nation in history with the highest standard of living, but we will live by whatever generosity and by whatever grace may be allowed us by the nation, who by its vigorous program of science and technological advancement, takes our position.

Yet, in spite of the lessons of history, there are those who say we should first solve our immediate social problems to the exclusion of the advancement of technology which is a waste of money. Let me read from a commission report on the evaluation of a proposal. The report says:

"The committee judged the promises and offers of this mission to be impossible, vain, and worthy of rejection; that it was not proper to favor an affair that rested on such weak foundations and which appeared uncertain and impossible to any educated person, however little learning he might have."

Now, what I have just read to you was the report of the Talavera Commission in Spain considering a proposal in 1491 by some guy named Columbus, who wanted some financing for some kind of exploration he had in mind. Fortunately, for the world, perhaps, Isabella was a little more forevisioned. Unfortunately, for Spain, however, its subsequent governments were not so forevisioned and used their wherewithal for purposes other than advancement of their contemporary research, exploration, and technology, and by the 16th Century, Spain was headed for a secondary world position with a commensurate standard of living.

But forevision is what we must continue to have in this nation—forevisioned people who understand that we must make room in our minds and in our moneys for the vital things of tomorrow—in addition to the pressing needs of the moment.

What's really on the line for us in America to decide which we want to be in the world—first violin or second fiddle?

BOB McALLISTER AND "WONDERAMA"

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Bob McAllister, host of WNEW-TV's children's program "Wonderama" who, for the past 8 years, has promoted Carnivals Against Dystrophy on his show. In that time, Carnivals has raised much-needed funds in New York—$57,000 of which was contributed last year alone—to help advance the research and patient service programs of MDAA.

Wholeheartedly endorsed by parents, educators, and members of the clergy, Carnivals is a unique project whereby the hosts of popular TV shows invite their young viewers to write for free Carnival kits which explain how funds can be raised to help children afflicted with muscular dystrophy. The kits contain all elements needed to produce a fun-filled Carnival—which the youngsters run in their own backyards. There are many benefits to the children who participate: They learn how to organize and set up a relatively complex project, how to cope with responsibilities and needs outside their own daily lives, and how to meet the challenge of managing a small business of their own. Their approach to these projects brings with it all the energy and enthusiasm of childhood.

Perhaps the greatest benefit these children derive is their intense identification with those for whom the Carnivals are conducted—children who, because their bodies have been weakened by dystrophy, cannot take an active part in such projects. In 1970, youngsters across the Nation held 22,383 backyard Carnivals, raising more than $500,000 for victims of muscular dystrophy.

For many years, Bob McAllister has dedicated himself to the world of children, bringing them laughter and joy while instilling in them a sense of compassion for the less fortunate. I thought our colleagues would like to know how he is contributing to the education of his young viewers and how they, in turn, are helping to better the lives of dystrophy patients.

FINDING JOBS FOR VETERANS

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the President announced the inauguration of a Jobs for Veterans program.

At that time, President Nixon said:

This year over one million servicemen and women will complete their military service in the Armed Forces and return to civilian life. Almost four million Vietnam era veterans have already returned to civilian life. These servicemen and women deserve every opportunity that a grateful nation can provide.

The President went on to say:

Jobs for Veterans is a nationwide effort to highlight the quality of the American Veteran whose blend of skills and self-discipline make him an ideal candidate for employment. He has proved himself in the military—all he needs is the opportunity to demonstrate that he can contribute as much in civilian employment. I want this program to increase the national awareness of the veteran's potential as an employee, and I am confident that public and private employers will meet the challenge by providing veterans with widened job and training opportunities.

The Jobs for Veterans campaign is a national effort to improve job opportunities for returning service men and women. It seeks to accomplish this in two principal ways: By serving as a focal point for existing programs and as a catalyst for new action programs at the local level designed to help veterans find prompt and meaningful employment. The President has asked management, labor, veterans, and private organizations, as well as Federal, State, and local government agencies, to join forces in this undertaking.

I am pleased to note that the news media is lending impetus to this program by editorial comment such as that appearing in the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, on February 3, 1971. The editorial entitled "Finding Jobs for Veterans" is cited below:

FINDING JOBS FOR VETERANS

Appointment of a 100-member "advisory committee" to help find jobs for ex-GIs is a new indication of the growing national concern over the plight of Vietnam veterans.

One of the more valuable members of the committee could be a relatively unheralded young man named Rocky Bleier, a former Notre Dame football captain who somehow managed to reclaim his job with the Pittsburgh Steelers despite a severe leg wound suffered in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, many of the nearly two million GIs who have returned from Vietnam in the last 10 years haven't done so well.

Too often they've come home to a cold reception. Not only is the unemployment rate among veterans running higher than the national average, but some of the returnees are made to feel like strangers in their own country.

This is a shabby way to treat young men whose lives have been disrupted by a thankless war while the rest of us have conducted our business as usual.

The current economic squeeze is particularly tough on ex-GIs because a high percentage of them come from poor families and lack the education and training to compete in a tight job market.

With more than a million servicemen expected to be mustered out within the next year, the situation is likely to get worse before it gets better.

That's why a private group, Jobs for Veterans headed by James F. Oates, recently was organized—to go after businesses, public and private agencies, unions and anybody else who can put people to work.

There once was a time—after World War II, for example—when the nation was eager to do all it could for its veterans. Recently, we've been content to do less.

Yet, one way or another, each of us owes a debt to these men. And making a success of the new job-finding program is the least we can do to show it.

IN MEMORY OF SAL MASO

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it is little solace for me to honor in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the memory of a man for whom I had the greatest respect and admiration, but it is nontheless a fitting tribute to a man who gave everything of himself for the benefit of others. Sal Maso, well known in north Jersey as a labor leader associated with the building trades, respected for his good citizenship in his community, was a man small in stature but big in heart. He exemplified an understanding of and responsiveness to those with whom he associated. Whatever the cause, Sal Maso's conduct embodied the spirit of humanity and his enthusiasm generated inspiration in the task at hand.

Speaking for the community, the Paterson News wrote of Sal Maso:

For the thousands of people who knew him around the country but especially in this North Jersey area, it will be difficult to believe that the strong, vigorous Sal Maso has passed away. Here was indeed a human dynamo, hard hitting, free-swinging in any cause in which he was enlisted. One never had to conjecture on where Mr. Maso stood—his identification was undeniable.

The diminutive labor leader had been ailing for some time, undergoing surgery several months ago from which he seemed to be recovering. Thus long absent from the local scene, he made his first public appearance little more than a week ago, when, accompanied by his labor-active son Kenneth, he attended his first meeting in two years of Forward Paterson. Caught once again in the enthusiasm of the group's plans, he announced that he was "nearly ready" to get back into the fight to rebuild Paterson.

Reference to Sal Maso as a self-made man was accurate and appropriate. From his early days in Paterson, whence he came from his native New York City, he envisioned his life work as dedicated to labor, and despite the fact he carried no portfolios in education, he soon made himself felt in the field. The lathers union was his forte, and from local leadership, he went to state and then to national, always winding up as state, national and international president. When there was a convention, the centerpiece was Sal Maso, whose powerful voice rallied around him older and younger men who respected his judgment and his leadership ability.

In spite of preoccupation with important labor obligations, Mr. Maso kept his burning zeal for good citizenship in his home city. The school board, the housing authority, Forward Paterson—all these had his earnest attention, not as a member on the rolls but as a vigorous participant in civic affairs. He had a warm devotion for his home city.

In the past few years, Mr. Maso's time was taken up with his national presidency of the lathers union and his opportunity for service at home and in the city was sorely proscribed. In recent months, he had made known his desire to give up his residence in Maryland, which he yielded to Paterson and his family only on weekends. Now he is home for good, taken by the Lord to his permanent resting place. He was a good man.

PRAYER EXPRESSES OKLAHOMAN'S GRATITUDE AND HOPE

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1971, was a long-awaited day which marked the beginning of a new era for my hometown of Muskogee, Okla. On that day the Port of Musokgee, which will link Muskogee with the great commercial centers of the world, was dedicated.

The opening of this port, with the opening of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system a few days earlier, was the result of many years of dreams and work by the people of Muskogee and all of northeastern Oklahoma.

The dedication was a splendid occasion with addresses, speeches, and remarks by some of Oklahoma's leading citizens, including the Governor of our great State.

The shortest talk of all, a communication with Our Lord delivered as the invocation for the dedication banquet, reflects with great feeling the attitude of gratefulness and hope for the future present that day.

This innvocation, given by the pastor of my family's church, Rev. Mr. Henry Churchill of Muskogee's First Presbyterian Church, was an inspiration to all who heard it. I would like to have it appear in the RECORD for my colleagues to share.

INVOCATION, PORT DEDICATION BANQUET

Almighty God, just as you promised by your prophet, you have opened rivers on the bare heights, fountains in the midst of the valleys, and made the wilderness a pool of water! (Isa. 41:18)

Thank you, Lord, thank you!

For the vision of men who could see barges where there were only sandbars;

For the skills of men who have brought discipline and purpose to this capricious stream;

For men of industry and dedication who will make it a blessing for many;

For the investment of the rest of our nation:

Thank you, Lord!

With our thanks, we must admit an old fascination with cross currents and eddies. Forgive us when we secretly prefer the stagnant pools and treacherous shallows.

Teach us to seek the main channels of life today.

Then, Lord, let our spirits flow as far as these waters, for we long to buy and sell in the great markets of our world-neighborhood, and bring even the great prize of Life to our city and our state.

Thank you, Lord, through Jesus Christ, for this food, this day and night together, and the fresh promise of this great river road. Amen.

HENRY CHURCHILL,
Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Muskogee, Okla.

DRUG PROBLEM

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, apologists for marihuana—those who say it is nonaddictive and that it does not lead to the use of other drugs—should read a letter I recently received from a young constituent in which she relates her experience with drugs.

This 19-year-old girl, who is now "straight," started drug use at the age of 15 and apparently used most of the drugs known to our young people, with the exception of heroin. Fright led her to a rehabilitation center in Broward County called "The Seed" which, at the time of her letter, had kept her off drugs for a month.

Her letter, Mr. Speaker, serves a dual purpose. It points up the dangers inherent in the use of marihuana, and also the fact there are organizations effectively dedicated to the rehabilitation of those who are on drugs and who earnestly desire to be freed from their habits, be they addictive or compulsive.

My constituent's letter follows and I urge all who are interested in the drug problem to read it carefully and take to heart its message:

NOVEMBER 30, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: I am 19 years old and have been involved in drugs since the age of 15. I have covered the whole drug spectrum from alcohol, glue, marihuana, ups and downs to psychedelic drugs. Everything but heroin (only because I never had the opportunity). It has been only in the last month I haven't done any drugs at all. One month may not seem like a very long time, but considering I am used to getting stoned at least once a day, one month is like three years. I just begun to think straight; and be honest with my people and myself. I've started a brand new life and the reason for this is a rehabilitation center, "The Seed".

I have approximately 60 friends at the Seed, a lot of them were once strung out on heroin. They are now straight and the most beautiful part of it all is that they don't want to have anything to do with drugs. A lot of them were taken out of the jails and put in the program. It has a been a 89% success.

My whole involved story of how I got to the Seed and what I've learned in the last month isn't really important for you to know except for one small thing; I did'nt get strung out on heroin. I also know a few that stayed pretty much with pot. And if anyone believes pot is harmless I've got news for them. I used to work all week and when the weekend came if I didn't get so loaded I could hardly move, it was a bum weekend. That is definitely an addiction.

The point I'm trying to get across is that we have found an answer to the drug epidemic at least in Brevard County. Jail, police enforcement, cutting off the supply doesn't work. Rehabilitation centers like the Seed does. I never would have stayed if there would have been a few straight adults trying to give me facts about how bad drugs were, because if they never tripped in acid how could I relate to them?

I'm happy now! I used to be miserable.

Thank you for listening,

———.

ROBERT E. McNAIR

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Robert E. McNair recently completed 6 years' service as Governor of South Carolina. Governor McNair led our State during a difficult period. In time of crisis and in the day-to-day work of State administration he provided for our people a responsible and progressive leadership which won for him great respect and affection in South Carolina and throughout the Nation. In fact he became a world figure through his travels abroad to promote our State's development. No South Carolina Governor of modern times has served with greater distinction or more favorable national recognition.

Mr. Speaker, Bob McNair is well known here in Washington as a chief executive who is a keen student of Federal-State relations and as a political leader who recognizes that the South can and must retain a strong role in the Democratic Party. He is a man for whom we predict a bright future in public service. I am pleased to commend to my colleagues' attention the following splendid editorial from the Columbia, S.C., State which describes the pride South Carolinians have for the courage, character, and devotion of Gov. Robert E. McNair:

MCNAIR'S ADMINISTRATION WAS CREDIT TO THE STATE

Robert Evander McNair has been an uncommon Southern governor—different in style, demeanor, appearance, and approach from the stereotype of regional politicians.

And he has been an uncommonly good governor for South Carolina during a period when imaginative, determined leadership was required to meet the challenges (and circumstances) of the Sixties.

When, as a 41-year-old lieutenant governor, McNair was thrust unexpectedly into the governorship upon the resignation of Gov. Donald S. Russell, some doubts were expressed as to whether the quiet-spoken country lawyer could cope with the ever-expanding problems of state government.

As he began wrestling with the reins of government, he was called bland and ineffective. Much of such criticism was due to his propensity for working behind the scenes and out of the headlines—coordinating, cajoling, consolidating, getting people to develop a "togetherness of spirit and effort." He came to be known as a champion of the "interagency approach" to problem solving.

But this mild fellow, as it turned out, had a great deal of steel in his makeup. Once a course of action was set, he proved he could pursue it with tenacity. In addition, he proved to be a fine student of government, able to detect structural flaws that caused waste and duplication of effort, or which otherwise impeded progress. His long legislative experience led him to operate in what he has called "the realm of the possible."

He did make mistakes; he did suffer defeats. But he had a far better grasp of the problems than most of his enemies, and he was able to use this superior knowledge to accomplish quite a bit of what he set out to do.

Under McNair, South Carolina moved forward in education, health, wealth, governmental administration, and, despite Orangeburg, Voohees, Lamar and Greenville, in race relations. The state has embraced the concept of regionalism—cooperative efforts with other states as well as within South Carolina.

As an individual, McNair won, during his term of office, more positions of regional and national leadership and influence than any other Palmetto governor.

As a politician, he has fought vigorously at the national level to keep the left-leaning Democratic Party from abandoning its conservative Southern base. At the state level, his efforts have helped keep his party in power at a time when it was under powerful attack from all sides and at a time when it could not sell its presidential candidates to the people.

During a period of transition, often accompanied by hand-wringing and resistance to change, McNair helped restore South Carolina to a position of regional leadership. And, as he said in his final address to the General Assembly, "the price of leadership is responsibility, and the price of responsibility is the willingness to adapt ourselves to changing times and new demands."

Searching back over the record, one can find quite a few things to criticize. His time in office was a difficult time that tested the man and demanded tough decisions. He was not always right, but on balance, he measured up; he was equal to the responsibilities that fell on him.

He avoided appeals to emotion—the cop-out tactic employed by so many old-line political leaders who have little respect for the voters' capacity for logic. He was generally able to fend off pressure groups and maintain the state's reputation for fiscal responsibility.

In short, Bob McNair has been a modern-minded governor who has guided his state through six arduous years filled with as many pitfalls as opportunities. As he leaves office, both he and the state enjoy an improved image, greater pride of accomplishment, and firmer confidence in the ability of South Carolinians to cope with the nagging problems which remain at hand.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

CALLING GOVERNMENT TO ACCOUNT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, our system of government is based on the right, the duty, and the power of the American people to call their Government to account for the way it collects and spends their money and exercises its authority in their name.

But it is becoming more and more difficult today for the people to call their Government to account; and more and more often, when they do so, Government refuses to accept their verdict and spends the people's money in new ways designed to get around their objections.

Probably the most striking example is to be found in spending for schools. In many school districts throughout the country, and especially in California, the voters have made it known in no uncertain terms that they have "had it" with schools, the costs of which keep on rising, while the quality of the education they provide keeps on dropping, and immorality, drug abuse, and even violent crime become more and more common on their premises.

Instead of taking steps to meet these widespread concerns and objections on the part of the public by changing their educational policies and methods, the first response of the education establishment in California was to sneak through legislation depriving the people of their right to vote on school tax increases—legislation which, after a fierce struggle, I was instrumental in repealing in the 1969 legislative session in California.

Now, as the people continue to vote down school tax increases, we find increasing pressure for huge increases in school funding from the State and Federal levels of government, where the voters do not have a chance to express their will on the specific issue of whether their own schools should get this much more of their tax money.

This example shows how important it is to make sure that, to the greatest possible extent, each unit and level of government raises the money it spends by its own taxes. But under the "revenue sharing" program now being hailed with such fanfare, the Federal Government would turn over tax money to State and local government without specifying its use, completely separating taxation from spending. Most of the voters would not even know that their State and local governments were receiving this money, and so would not even attempt to call them to account for it. And even when they did know, obviously it would be much harder to vote a man out of office for accepting Federal funds than for raising local taxes.

There is a real need, as President Nixon has said, to transfer more responsibility to local government and away from Washington. But this should be done, and easily could be done, by Federal tax reductions or credits leaving more taxable resources available to State and local government, which could then obtain additional revenue without increasing the overall burden on the taxpayer, provided the taxpayers could be convinced of the need for it.

But the revenue-sharing proposal outlined in the President's state of the Union address January 22, would simply add $5 billion for State and local governments on top of all existing expenditures, thereby increasing the Federal deficit, forcing up the debt limit, making inflation worse, and depriving the people of that much more of their direct control over local government.

The only way to keep the size and cost of government at all levels within reasonable bounds is for those who spend public money to have to raise it in taxes as well.

SUPPORT YOUR LOCAL POLICE—AND KEEP THEM INDEPENDENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, local law enforcement officers are the first and last line of defense against crime, anarchy, and insurrection. A strong, armed, and independent local police force is an impassable barrier to the advance of communism.

For these reasons Communists, their dupes, and allies seek to make ineffective, if not to destroy local police forces. They use several means of attack. One way calls for the establishment of civilian police review boards so as to intimidate the individual police officer by making him afraid to do his duty for fear of punishment. Another method is to use policemen to play the role of social worker or tour director instead of law enforcer and require policemen to undergo human relations or sensitivity training so as to make them oversensitive to and lenient toward criminals.

Yet another method is to centralize control over police from the State, regional, and eventually national level. Such a federally controlled plan will establish the National Police Force—the antithesis of the American peace officer.

In connection with the latter method for removing control of local police from the hands of local officials, I insert an American Opinion article by Gary Allen entitled "FEDCOP—Washington Grabs for Police Power," in the RECORD at this point:

FEDCOP—WASHINGTON GRABS FOR POLICE POWER

(By Gary Allen)

It was during the quadrennial madness of 1968 that Conservative political candidates began thundering against criminals and radicals and calling for "law and order." Apparently the cry was popularized by the tough little governor of Alabama who calls a spade a spade. But when his charges were found to have mass political appeal, the demand for "law and order" was Spiroed away by the Republican wing of the Establishment. During the ensuing two years crime in the streets continued to proliferate like Mrs. Hansenpfeffer on Welfare.

By the time of the recently concluded plebiscite, even candidates of the Establishment's Democratic wing were trooping about calling for "law and order." Which seemed very odd, indeed, since as late as August of 1970, they had been characterizing "law and order" as code words for "racism." Pragmatism had drowned ideology when the polls indicated that millions of Americans feel themselves threatened by a continuing mugathon in our streets, and revealed that many more millions have simply *had it* with the campus terrorists. As *Time* magazine indicated in its issue for July 13, 1970:

"Millions of Americans in 1970 are gripped by an anxiety that is not caused by war, inflation or recession—important as those issues are. Across the U.S., the universal fear of violent crime and vicious strangers . . . is a constant companion of the populace. It is the cold fear of dying at random in a brief spasm of senseless violence—for a few pennies, for nothing."

The statistics tell the story. Serious crime rose by 148 percent in the turbulent Sixties while the population increased only thirteen percent. This means that crime is increasing eleven times as fast as population. Robberies are up 180 percent over the past nine years. While crimes of plunder and passion continue to increase, a new dimension has been added in the form of crimes of political terrorism aimed by revolutionaries at the police. "Kill the pigs" has become their battle cry. In its issue for October 26, 1970, *U.S. News & World Report* provides a statistical box score:

"The cold statistics are in themselves frightening. The F.B.I. reports that in 1969 a record high of 86 law-enforcement officers were killed by felonious criminal action. This is a 34 percent increase over the previous year, when 64 . . . officers were murdered . . . ."

And 1970 proved even more terrible than 1969. By the end of July, some sixty-seven policemen had been killed in the line of duty—sixteen of these murdered from ambush by revolutionaries. And the killings are escalating seriously. Recently United Press International quoted an F.B.I. spokesman commenting on revolutionary racism:

"Since January 1, 1970, there have been 190 reported instances of racially motivated attacks against policemen, including 17 ambushes. As a result, 21 police officers have been killed and 159 others have been injured [in attacks by black militants]. During August alone, there were 23 attacks by black extremists against police. These caused the death of five officers and injuries to 56 others."

F.B.I. reports show a total of 35,202 assaults on police in 1969, or 16.9 attacks per hundred officers. In 1960, the F.B.I. said, there had been only 9,621 such assaults, or 6.3 per hundred officers. In September an Associated Press survey indicated that this year policemen had already been victims of fatal, apparently unprovoked, attacks in Philadelphia, San Francisco, Berkeley, New York, Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, Montgomery, St. Paul, San Jose, and Omaha.

California has been particularly hard hit. Chief deputy attorney general of California, Mr. Charles A. O'Brien, testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in October of 1970:

"It is patently clear that law officers have become a special target for the terrorists and anarchists in our society. . . . Murders of California police officers have increased 100 per cent in 1970. During the past 10 years, from 1960 through 1969, an average of one peace officer was killed every two months—a rate more than 4 times that of the general population. In 1970, an average of two peace officers have been killed every month—15 in the first seven and a half months of this year."

The Los Angeles Times for October 7, 1970, quotes Mr. O'Brien as informing the

Subcommittee that assaults on police are up 350 percent in the last three years. (As of October twenty-fourth, seven policemen had been slain in the San Francisco-Oakland-Berkeley area, alone, four of them clearly terror killings.) Charles O'Brien continued:

"Since January, 1970, there have been 12 bombing incidents against police buildings in California and 16 bombing incidents involving police automobiles. Twenty-six persons have been injured as a result of these bombings. . . . We should also not ignore the fact that other public officials and agencies are now being singled out as targets for violence. The terrible incident on August 7 at the Marin County Courthouse in San Rafael which resulted in the murder of Judge Harold Haley—his head was blown off—plainly revealed that black terrorists had turned their attention to the courts."

In Berkeley there were fifty-eight assaults on policemen in 1968 and eighty in 1969. In the *first eight months* of 1970 there have been eighty-eight such assaults. In Detroit, there were 412 assaults on police officers last year, 230 of them in the first eight months. In the first eight months of 1970, there were 410 such assaults on police officers there. Twelve Detroit officers were shot last year; in the first eight months of 1970, fifteen have been shot.

Police officials in New York City reported that in the first eight months of 1970 some 985 policemen had been so badly assaulted they required medical attention, compared to 591 in the same period in 1969—a sixty-seven percent increase. Thirty-four City policemen were shot in the first eight months of 1970; eleven in the first eight months of 1969. Four New York City policemen, including a transit patrolman, had been killed this year by the end of August.

Within the last few months the killing of police officers has reached a nearly fantastic level. According to Quinn Tamm of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, 26 policemen were killed in the United States and 650 injured in the *three month* period ending October 23, 1970. Authorities are convinced that this is more than coincidental. In its issue for October 19, 1970, *U.S. News & World Report* asks:

"Is there a national conspiracy to kill policemen? Congress dug into this question in early October. One witness after another told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that a pattern of attacks on police indicates a plot.

"Eighteen police officers have been slain in unprovoked assaults this year—twice as many as last year—the Subcommittee was told by John J. Harrington, head of the 120-000-member Fraternal Order of Police.

"Capt. Joel Honey, of the sheriff's department in Santa Barbara, Calif., told of confiscating pamphlets giving detailed instructions on manufacture and use of weapons to kill police. He said wires have been strung across California highways to decapitate motorcycle policemen. A police undercover agent told of being 'trained to kill police' by student revolutionaries in Buffalo, N.Y."

As Carl Parsell, director of the Detroit Police Officers Association, observed in October: "Public officials keep saying it's just the hazards of the job, but we should face it for what it is: a conspiracy to kill policemen . . . the men feel people with political causes are zeroing in on them to highlight their causes."

Edward Kiernan, president of the New York Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, says the shootings of policemen are "part of a cold, logical, hard-eyed revolutionary strategy." Philadelphia Police Commissioner Frank Rizzo is of the same opinion. In September he blamed assaults on police in his city on hard-core radicals. As Commissioner Rizzo put it: "This is a national conspiracy. It's treason . . . It must be stopped even if we have to change some laws to do it."

On October 8, 1970, the International Association of Chiefs of Police adopted a resolution calling for a federal investigation of the conspiracy to assassinate police officers, declaring: "The members of this conference actually do believe that a number of these attacks are planned and executed by those traveling in interstate commerce."

California's deputy attorney general O'Brien made a second trip to Washington in October to charge before a Congressional Committee that the Black Panthers and the Weatherman faction of the Students for a Democratic Society have instigated many of these attacks through speeches and published materials. Both groups have distributed manuals which advocate attacks on police and provide instructions for making bombs to assasinate law enforcement personnel. Mr. O'Brien also testified that it would not be long before the revolutionaries outgun the police. As he told a newspaperman: "Soon it will be machineguns and high-powered rifles against police carrying only shotguns and pistols. It'll be like sending police out to protect us with peashooters."

Militants are staging their own arms race, O'Brien said. Thousands of automatic weapons, bombs, and explosives are being stockpiled. Many are powerful modern weapons and grenades stolen from military bases and from shipments to Vietnam. The extent of thefts from Army bases, he observed, "is beginning to frighten" even the military. For example, police recovered ninety-four pounds of C-4 military explosives and thirty-nine hand-grenades during the recent student riots near Santa Barbara, California. Mr. O'Brien reports in detail:

"The seriousness of the problem first hit us about two years when we arrested one character selling unstable C-2 plastic explosives stolen from Army bases. Through him, we tracked down 40 Army .45s, which had been stolen from military bases in Colorado. From this investigation we learned of a regular traffic in stolen military materials.

"We also found out about supplies headed for Vietnam being stolen in shipment, including guns, grenade launchers, grenades, explosives and ammunition. . . ."

In September, Senator John McClellan gave a large audience in Akron, Ohio, an idea of how this stolen equipment is being used:

"Some 5,000 bombings have occurred in the United States during the past 18 months. More than 1,200 of these were with high explosives bombs; the others were with incendiary devices. These bombings caused the deaths of at least 45 persons, injured more than 400 others, and resulted in property damage in excess of $25 million.

"In addition to these actual bombings, some 35,000 bomb threats have been made. . . . (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 23, p. 31488)."

As one must imagine, our police officers are very concerned. John J. Harrington, national president of the Fraternal Order of Police, was quoted by Associated Press on October 15, 1970, as having told a Washington rally that our "police are fed up with being treated like fish in a barrel." He continued:

"The thin line between civilization and the jungle—which is us policemen—is being shot to hell and something has to be done about it.

It's time the people of this country face up to it—there is a revolution taking place."

Is it any wonder then that almost everyone—Democrat and Republican, "Liberal" and Conservative—is calling for "law and order"? The cry of the hour is: Do something! And most Americans are now willing to go along with almost anything that promises to relieve the situation.

In America, law enforcement has traditionally been a function of local government, but in the wake of the disastrous Watts riots of August 1965, Washington began coming to the "aid" of local governments. Within a week of the Watts holocaust the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, now known as the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (L.E.A.A.), was set up in the Justice Department to provide federal funds and helpful guidelines to "upgrade" local police departments.

Then, as crime continued to rise and riots proliferated, Congress passed the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. As in other such programs, expenditures began modestly. The budget for fiscal 1969 was $63 million. But now the outlays are being expanded enormously. On June 30, 1970, the House authorized $650 million for L.E.A.A. in fiscal 1971, $1 billion for fiscal 1972, and $1.5 billion for fiscal 1973. Our federal, state, and local governments will spend $5 billion on law enforcement this year. Which suggests that within two years nearly one-third of everything spent in this area will be routed through Washington to be returned with federal controls.

How is such federal money to be spent? According to *U.S. News & World Report:*

"That Act [Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets] requires that most of the money be given, initially, to States in block grants. The States are then required to redistribute 75 percent of their grants to local and county law-enforcement agencies. But first, plans must be drawn up—and approved—for ways to spend money."

It would certainly *seem* that the "law and order" men in Washington are on the right track. Surely we shall soon see a sharp drop in crime and the jailing of the revolutionary terrorists now bombing, burning, and killing in our streets.

If you think that, you are being played for a fool. What is wrong with the federal government coming to the aid of our local police is all too obvious. But let us take a hard look.

First we must recognize that the problems which all of this new federal anticrime legislation is supposed to solve have been artificially created—and by many of those who now pose as friends of "law and order" to offer federal "solutions." The strategy is known as "pressure from below and pressure from above." It is the technique used by the Communists to take control of Czecho-Slovakia, and it is described in detail by Communist theoretician Jan Kozak in a Communist Party textbook now available in an English translation as a Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.[1]

The strategy is to produce "pressure from below," by supporting crime in the streets with a cadre of revolutionaries organized to lead bands of looters, marchers, misguided peaceniks, and the like. These are to create a demand from the "silent majority" for the placing of more power and control in the hands of the central government. The "pressure from above" comes when "the Parliament" (Kozak refers to Czecho-Slovakia) or the Congress (in the case of the United States) responds by surrendering to the demands of the radicals in the streets in order to prevent further violence, while at the same time centralizing police authority on the ground that it is necessary to maintain "law and order."

This highly sophisticated strategy creates a pincers movement directed against the

---

[1] Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, first session, The New Role Of National Legislative Bodies In The Communist Conspiracy, reprint of "How Parliament Can Play A Revolutionary Part In The Transition To Socialism" and "The Role Of The Popular Masses," by Jan Kozak, historian of the Communist Party Of Czechoslovakia, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1962.

great middle-class, which is the target of Establishment conspirators seeking total control in America just as in Czecho-Slovakia.

I do not mean to infer that any but a few of those actually applying either the pressure from above or below understand the scheme in which they are being used. Most of the street revolutionaries are in deadly earnest, and most "Liberal" Congressmen and Senators actually believe they are helping to solve America's problems through increased federal controls and the centralization of law enforcement. But the *Insiders* who manipulate the Establishment know the game *very* well. And it is they who are calling the signals.

Consider the stimulation of crime in the streets which has resulted from the radicalism of the Supreme Court, an arm of the same government which now claims it wants to help "improve" law enforcement. Thanks to the High Court a law officer today has to speak softly and carry a big law library. The Court has handcuffed the police and given the clever criminal virtual carte blanche to pursue his trade. It is pressure from above complementing pressure from below.

You have doubtless noted that the enormous growth in our crime rate followed hard on a trail blazed by the Supreme Court. After a series of rulings striking down our laws against internal subversion, its first major "be kind to criminals" decision was the Mallory rape case of 1957, which threw out use of confessions obtained before arraignment. Crimes against property showed a major increase in 1958 and the escalation was on! Decisions in 1963 required free lawyers and appeals for convicted indigents. In that year the rate of violent crime had been 166 per 100,000. In 1964, it increased thirteen percent. Crimes against property increased eleven percent.

The *Escobedo* decision in 1964 required the taxpayers to provide a free lawyer for all suspects. The next year crime rates jumped again. The *Miranda* decision, throwing out confessions secured while in police custody without an attorney, was handed down in mid-1966. It was followed by an enormous fifteen percent rise both in crimes of violence and crimes against property. The 1967 *Wade* decision, requiring defense counsel even at a police lineup, was followed in 1968 by an astronomical increase of eighteen percent in the rate of crimes of violence, and sixteen percent in crimes against property. The next year saw jumps of ten percent in both categories. As statistician Louis H. Bean has observed:

"The fact that the Supreme Court decisions of the 1960s were each followed by similar increases in both categories of crime is clear evidence that the decisions created an atmosphere of leniency in law enforcement, lowering the probability of apprehension and conviction."

Of course, other factors were present. To blame the crime explosion of the Sixties entirely on the Supreme Court would be an over-simplification, but few will deny that it was a major factor. The Court has *contrived* "new Constitutional rights" for the accused which have gravely altered evidentiary rules and law enforcement procedures. Many of these changes have served to make the job of our police officers not only more dangerous but increasingly difficult. While the overall rate of crime rose by 148 percent over the last ten years, the rate of crime clearances—that is, crimes solved by our handcuffed police—actually declined by thirty-two percent.

The permissiveness of "Liberal" judges has also been an important factor in the growing crime wave, with upward of seventy-five percent of those arrested today being repeaters. So hamstrung is American justice that, according to *Time* magazine, "Of all reported major offenses, the experts say, only 12 percent lead to arrests, only 6 percent to convictions and only 1 percent to prison." You can bet the criminal knows the odds are in his favor.

Police Chief James D. Wright of Sausalito, California, complains that he often hears young burglars say: "Why should I work? I can make more with burglaries." Thanks to the Supreme Court and its "Liberal" courtiers, crime does pay better than ever. One estimate is that it now costs Americans $51 billion annually.

Naturally the public is appalled, and looks to our local police for a crackdown. But the judiciary tied the hands of the police at the same time it untied those of the criminal. Until this process is reversed, a showering of federal funds on law enforcement agencies can hardly help the situation.

The answer to the problem is not centralized police power, but a reversal of those decisions of the Supreme Court which have created the problem. If the Justice Department were serious about reducing the growth of crime it would re-submit those cases in which the Warren Court overstepped the bounds of sanity. If the Court were then to refuse to reverse itself, Congress could limit jurisdiction or institute impeachment proceedings (both wholly legal procedures provided for in our Constitution) until such decisions as those of *Miranda* and *Escobedo* are reversed and our local police are again given an even chance with the criminal.

Our police cannot do their job unless they can arrest criminals and get convictions. But, like the rest of us, they are caught in the pincers movement between the Supreme Court "above" and the criminal element "below."

A second area in which the strategy of "pressure from below and pressure from above" is being used is that of general insurrection in the streets. In the last six years no fewer than 114 American cities have suffered serious conflagration and riot. It was these insurrections which did so much to build the myth that local law enforcement is ineffective in dealing with mobs. When riots were quelled by efficient police work, the ventriloquists of the Left shouted through a thousand dummies that the police were brutal. Heads I win, tails you lost. That's the name of the game when you control the media.

Yet, in every case where riots have gotten out of control and had to be quelled by Army or National Guard personnel, it was because the police were *not allowed* to take firm action before things got out of hand. During the kickoff riot at Harlem in 1964, for instance, the "Liberal" Mayor of New York kept policemen out of the area for many hours until the rioters had built up a sufficient head of steam to do real damage. He later asked for federal support.

In the Watts riot of 1965, Chief William Parker was convinced by "community leaders" that order would be restored if "provocative" uniformed policemen were kept out of the area. Parker later publicly admitted his mistakke, but the power brokers in the federal government used the Watts insurrection as an excuse to set up a special bureau in the Justice Department to "improve" our local police.

During the early hours of the Detroit riot of 1967, "Liberal" Mayor Jerome Cavanagh ordered police to do nothing about looters. Finally, troops from as far away as Kentucky had to be brought in to stop the terror. As the fires flickered out, Mayor Cavanagh offered a plan for the handling of future riots. On July 31, 1967, United Press International reported the Mayor's proposal:

"Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh called Sunday for a special 1,000-man federal police force in each major city to fight riots like the one which left 40 dead in Detroit.

Cavanagh said the riot policemen should be trained and paid by the federal government and be ready to converge on cities torn by racial strife. He said they should be specially trained in riot control and could be used instead of the National Guard."

America was on the road to a federal police force.

Since the Revolution has shifted gears into an urban guerrilla war against police, the Black Panthers have replaced the roaming mobs in the streets. An avowedly Maoist group, the Panthers have declared war on the police, but they and their friends the "Liberals" would have you believe it is the other way around. As J. Edgar Hoover has observed:

"The claim of the BPP that it is an innocent victim of police persecution and genocide is rendered absurd by the fact that since 1967 at least five police officers have been killed by BPP members and 42 officers wounded. One of the officers was killed by a Panther with a shotgun blast at point-blank range as the officer lay wounded and helpless on the ground. . . .

"The intelligence data being developed reveal that the continuing activity of agitators and revolutionaries affiliated with black extremist groups plays a large part in the unprovoked attacks against police. . . ."

The Panthers openly admit that they are Communists, and declare that they mean to have a revolution here and now. On October 10, 1970, United Press International reported:

"A California police official charged today the Black Panthers are being "used" by Communists in a conspiracy to overthrow the government by force. Chief E. M. Davis of the Los Angeles Police Department said attacks on police throughout the nation were part of the Communist-inspired conspiracy."

The day before, Chief Davis testified before a Congressional Committee that what we are facing "is revolution on the installment plan. . . . The Panthers [are] shock troops that are willing to go in and get themselves killed. The Black Panther winds up being an Uncle Tom to a white Communist."

Chief Davis provided evidence that the Panthers are being heavily supported by "white Marxists" in "silk stocking districts." Without such support the Black Panthers would be just another gang of criminals. But Establishment newspapers give them space and sympathy; fund-raising parties are thrown for them by wealthy actors, composers, and businessmen; Establishment publishers like Dell and Random House publish and promote the books of their chief propagandists; and, the Establishment magazines treat them like ebony heroes of a Brave New World.

But the "pressure from above" extends even higher. As the Associated Press reported on October 15, 1970:

"Testifying before the House subcommittee investigating the Black Panthers, [President of the Fraternal Order of Police John] Harrington said when he wrote Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell about alleged Panther violations. "I got a mild reply from somebody down the line, saying that an investigation was being held."

Harrington added: "This is disgusting to myself and most other police officers. Here we have an administration supposedly dedicated to the bringing about of law and order. But no recommendations to put a stop to the nationwide conspiracy aimed at the police by the Black Panthers and others like them have come from the White House and the Department of Justice."

Attorney General Mitchell, who poses as Mr. Law and Order, has to date refused to name the Black Panthers, self-proclaimed Marxist-Leninists, to the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, or to so much as approve hearings on the Panthers by the Subversive Activities Control Board. Yet the terrorism of the Black Panthers is cited as a prime reason why we must have more fed-

eral aid to law enforcement. This when it is the federal government which is already the roadblock. What we need is not federal aid but for the federal judiciary and the Justice Department to permit enforcement of the laws already on the books!

A third area in which local law enforcement has not been allowed to do its job is in the prevention of the continuing campus revolution. Again, we are dealing with a textbook case of "pressure from below and pressure from above."

The nation's college presidents have allowed the campuses to be used as sanctuaries for revolutionary organizing. Many have refused to allow police even to enter the campus unless a riot is totally out of hand. Some not even then. Campus agitators have been coddled in the name of academic freedom instead of being expelled. Literally hundreds of our student Lenins are on federal scholarships, but the Nixon Administration has done nothing to revoke the subsidies of such revolutionaries despite the fact that Congress has passed legislation requiring it. Instead, President Nixon proposes adding one thousand F.B.I. men to control campus rioting and bombing.

Meanwhile the leaders of the student revolutionaries make no secret of the fact that it is their *purpose* to provoke a federal takeover of local law enforcement, the abolition of civil liberties, and the creation of a Police State. The line was laid down by Ted Gold of the S.D.S. Weatherman Faction, who was killed last spring while making bombs in New York City. He is quoted by the Liberation News Service of January 8, 1970, as proclaiming: "If it will take Fascism we will have to have Fascism." Jerry Rubin emphasizes the same theme in his book *Do It!*

Such revolutionary leaders tell their cannon fodder that a Police State is a first step in driving the middle-class to rebellion. What they do not mention is that there has never been any such thing as a successful rebellion against a modern, well-equipped Police State.

The name of the game is alienation. Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, and their cohorts readily admit that their goal is to alienate youth from their parents. This is, quite naturally, a two-edged sword. The more outlandish the youthful revolutionaries become in their appearance, rhetoric, and agitation, the more violently the "silent majority" reacts.[2] As Saul Alinsky, a self-described "professional revolutionary," puts it: "The action is in the reaction."

The whole idea behind the Communist terror on the campuses and in the streets is to bait the middle-class into throwing Br'er Rabbit into the briar patch of a Police State. If the leaders of the youthful radicals were really trying to get them to persuade their elders of the merit of their ideas, would they urge them intentionally to look and to act repulsively? Obviously not. This business is a setup. It is a con game in which thousands of young people who have never heard of the theme "pressure from below and pressure from above" are being used as cannon fodder for a phony revolution designed to so strengthen the federal government that a takeover by the *Insiders* of the Establishment will be possible.

Of course you, Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Brownshoes, are just as important in the strategy as the shaggy hippies. The ultimate strategists of this revolution are counting upon you to become so angry and frustrated and embittered by growing crime and insurrection that you will first demand federal aid for the local police—producing federal guidelines and control, as with your schools. And when even the "guidelines" do not solve the problem you will be expected to accept a national police force to restore "law and order."

It is expected that you will remain ignorant of the fact that this threat would not even exist if the Supreme Court had not emasculated our internal security laws; if college faculties and administrations were not permitted to promote or condone revolutionary activity on the campus; if the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Ford Foundation did not provide revolutionary students and organizations with the funds to operate; and, if the Justice Department would just *use* the evidence already provided it by the F.B.I. to prosecute the cadre of radicals, young and old, who are now in the streets preaching sedition.

Only those who brag about their crimes seem to get on the wanted list these days. We have had only a token crackdown on revolutionaries from the Justice Department—just enough to avoid being accused of doing nothing. Those of the Chicago 7 who were convicted are now being allowed to cross state lines to give speeches inciting to riot—the very crime for which they were convicted. Why is bail not revoked? Why are they not again indicted? Why has a score of revolutionaries wanted by the Justice Department found it so easy to skip the country to Canada, Algeria, and elsewhere?

None of this is the fault of the local police, and it is certainly no justification for a federal police force. The street revolutionaries "below" are being protected by the Establishment *Insiders* "above," so they can be used to create the sort of climate necessary for a takeover. The revolutionaries have no more chance of bringing down our government by themselves than Slippery Rock has of going to the Rose Bowl. Their function is to promote a reaction enabling *a takeover from the top*. The revolutionary movement in this country could be destroyed almost overnight without adding one new law if that was what the Establishment wanted. It isn't.

Imagine that you wanted to be a dictator in this country. How would you go about it when there are in the United States 40,000 separate police departments and sheriffs' offices, and an average of more than one gun per household? Obviously, you must figure out a way to confiscate those weapons and to centralize control of the police. Like all would-be dictators, the masters of the International Communist Conspiracy understand this principle. That is why the Communists have for years pushed anti-gun legislation while carrying on an attack against the independence of our local police. As J. Edgar Hoover has testified:

"Law enforcement has long been a target of communist attack. . . . Lenin taught that it was essential for every 'real people's revolution' to destroy the 'ready-made state machinery.' Wherever communists have been able to exercise any measure of control, their first step has been to hamstring and incapacitate law enforcement. . . ."

W. Cleon Skousen is a former assistant to F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover. In his authoritative book, *The Communist Attack On U.S. Police*, Skousen observes:

"The official Communist Party hate campaign against the police of the United States is now reaching a full crescendo in many parts of the country. . . . It is a concerted, well-organized broadside of unmitigated venom against those who have the responsibility of protecting life and property and preserving the peace."

Such defectors from the leadership of the Communist Party as Joseph Kornfedder, Manning Johnson, Dr. Bella Dodd, and Leonard Patterson have all told how they were taught by the Communists to give top priority not to just discrediting the local police, but to discrediting the very concept of local police. One of the major attempts by the Communists to discredit and neutralize our local police forces has been their agitation for establishment of civilian review boards. Mr. Skousen recalls a conversation with former Communist Bella Dodd about such boards:

"I spoke at length with Dr. Bella Dodd, former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party who defected in 1948. During this conversation I brought up the subject of police review boards and she stated that she was appalled at the success of the Communist Party and its cadre of fellow travelers in persuading New York politicians to accept the idea of a civilian police review board.

I asked her how the idea originated and she said it was invented by the Communist Party in the 1930's when it was felt that the country was ripe for revolution. The idea was to somehow get the police out from under the control of elected officials and subject the police to the discipline of a "civilian" group which the Party could infiltrate and control. She stated that by this means they intended to mete out harsh and arbitrary punishment against the police until they were intimidated into a benumbed, neutralized, impotent and non-functioning agency."

The Communists and those traveling a parallel course ran into heavy resistance against the establishment of the civilian review boards. Cities which had them paid a high price. According to an F.B.I. report for September 18, 1964:

"The investigations also revealed that where there is an outside civilian review board the restraint of police was so great that effective action against the rioters appeared to be impossible. This restraint was well known in the community and the rioters were thereby emboldened to resist and completely defy the efforts of the police to restore order. In short the police were so careful to avoid accusations of improper conduct that they were virtually paralyzed."

Director Hoover opposed civilian review boards as a threat to the independence of local police, and spoke of their "inherent political overtones." But, the coup de grace was delivered when the voters of New York City, following an all-out campaign by the Support Your Local Police Committees and others advocating efficient local law enforcement, overwhelmingly rejected Mayor Lindsay's attempts to establish a civilian review board. This contest attracted so much nationwide publicity that it effectively buried other such attempts. Despite all the propaganda about "police brutality," the major rationalization for such boards, the public bought neither the brutality pitch nor the civilian review boards.

The *Insiders* changed tactics. Neutralization and control over our local police is now to be accomplished through a maze of federal "guidelines" attached to federal aid. The conspirators "above" are fully aware that the Supreme Court has ruled in *Wickard vs. Filburn* that "It is hardly lack of due process for the Federal Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." Subsidy and control are two fingers in the same glove.

Cleon Skousen is now editor of *Law and Order*, a professional journal for law enforcement personnel. He warned in that magazine for April 1969:

"I am old enough to remember all the protestations of innocence of intent which

---

[2] During the recent campaign, Richard Nixon always allowed a few radicals to attend his rallies and bait him. Then Mr. Nixon, who had the microphone, would delight his audiences by verbally cutting them to pieces. This was carried to the extent that enough radicals were allowed to form for the purpose of stoning and egging a Presidential motorcade. Mr. Nixon did not come to town on a wagonload of pumpkins with hay in his hair. He arranged a nationally televised speech to speak out against his "assailants," and the next day the front page of the *New York Times* announced: "Mr. Nixon is . . . expected to approve plans for a new intelligence apparatus by which Federal and local officials will exchange information on extremist groups." Big Brother would be delighted.

poured out of Washington when the early bills for Federal aid to education were being considered. Yet on October 6, 1966, *U.S. News and World Report* stated that the U.S. Department of Justice, through acting Attorney General Ramsey Clark, had notified the House Rules Committee that the federal government felt it had complete power to order the reassignment of teachers, professors or members of the staffs of any educational institution receiving federal assistance if it did not follow the guidelines issued out of Washington.

"Note, of course, that not at any time did the Federal government pretend it had taken over the local schools. It had simply acquired the admitted power to control them because of the massive aid on which the schools had gradually become dependent.

"In the breakdown of national law and order the police became the most harassed, maligned and neglected profession in the entire American culture. But gradually Americans became angry and the politicians knew they were angry. They knew there had to be some kind of program to make it look as though *something* was being done to clean up the mess. So they came up with the same formula they have used on everybody else. Money.

"Well that was something law enforcement desperately needed. Just like the schools. And exactly like the schools we began to get the 'local control' treatment. It was not only promised verbally but written right into the fabric of the bill. Just as it was in the school bills.

"All of which we wish were a reality. But it never was and never can be. There is not one single, isolated case where massive Federal aid was not followed by massive Federal control.

"It is immoral to pretend otherwise. When a government spends the people's money it is responsible for those expenditures. That is as it should be. Eventually, that government, no matter how sincere its intentions to remain aloof from the local use of those funds, is compelled to move in, to supervise, to lay down rules, to control. It happened with the farms; it happened with the schools; it happened with government-contract industries. What makes us think law enforcement will be an exception?"

Of course, such controls are seldom introduced at the inception of a federal program. During the first few years an army of federal bureaucrats beats the bushes to sell its scheme to local officials. The controls come only after the local government has become financially dependent upon the federal program. But once the federal camel gets his nose in the local tent it's over. Writing in *Law And Order*, Chief Skousen explains:

"All of us recall that Federal aid to local law enforcement started out in a most modest and humble fashion. Hardly enough to frighten anyone. But that is not the case today. Federal aid is no longer merely for planning and experimenting. It has moved over into the fields of paying for facilities, paying salaries on broad and comprehensive programs, providing essential equipment. This is the same old well-worn path to Federal aid in every other field. . . .

". . . this generation is likely to see the creation of a Federalized police system whether we intended it or not."

As a matter of fact this is exactly how Sweden was saddled with a federal police force. The September 1964 issue of *Public Management*, published in Chicago by the Rockefeller-financed International City Managers, reports:

"Local Police in Sweden on January 1, 1965, were transferred to the central government in accord with action taken in 1962 by Parliament. Smaller towns and rural districts have for many years received national grants for the maintenance of police service and since 1954 local police personnel salaries have been regulated by the national government. The National Police Service will be administered by the central board, large police districts will be established and better technical equipment will be provided."

J. Edgar Hoover is among those who have warned against such a takeover in the United States. Writing in the F.B.I. *Law Enforcement Bulletin* for February 1968, Director Hoover declared:

"America has no place for, nor does it need, a national police force. It should be abundantly clear by now that . . . effective law enforcement is basically a local responsibility. In the great area of self-government reserved for States, counties, and cities, the enforcement of the laws is not only their duty but also their right. Law-abiding citizens and local officials should vigorously oppose concerted attacks against law enforcement and the devious moves to negate local authority and replace it with Federal police power."

Hoover was quoted earlier, in *U.S. News* for December 21, 1964, as observing: ". . . I am inclined toward being a States' righter in matters involving law enforcement. That is, I fully respect the sovereignty of State and local authorities. I consider the local police officer to be our first line of defense against crime, and I am opposed to a national police force. . . . The need is for effective local action, and this should begin with wholehearted support of honest, efficient, local law enforcement."

The cry of the federal bureaucrat is always neutralize, federalize, and centralize. The ize have it, so to speak. Which is exactly what the Communists have been advocating for years. Those local officials who think the police will be more effective with the help of federal funds, *despite* the controls, should remember that the "war on crime" will be directed by the same federal government that has run the wars in Korea and Vietnam. In those "no-win" wars the hands of the commanders in the fields were and are tied—just as those of our police chiefs will be if Fedcop becomes a reality.

Among the major steps toward centralization that L.E.A.A. is already promoting is the consolidation of local police departments on a "regional" basis—crossing city, county, and sometimes even state lines. These regional departments, now springing up like toadstools after a rain, are no longer responsible to, and controllable by, local voters. They are under the thumb of state and federal bureaucrats, funded by the federal government and obedient to its guidelines. To regionalize *your* local police the federal government will now pay ninety percent of the planning costs and an average of sixty percent of the costs of implementing the regional scheme—a very juicy carrot indeed.

The federal dollars for law enforcement are dispensed from Washington through state planning commissions which must first submit suitable plans to L.E.A.A. for approval. The man selected to approve such grants was Patrick V. Murphy, described by nationally syndicated columnist Edith Roosevelt as one who "epitomizes the so-called 'sociological' or 'permissive' approach to crime." Doling out of federal funds for the regional law enforcement groups already looks like the old War on Poverty game all over again, with radicals in control of the purse strings.

The *Oakland Tribune* of June 6, 1969, reveals that the Bay Area's regional police units are the prototype of this federally supported operation, noting that "the 24-member committee that will administer the ABAG [*Associated Bay Area Governments*] is headed by San Francisco Supervisor Terry Francois."

Who is he? Mr. Francois is a longtime radical activist who is so committed to the revolution that he listed the Communist W.E.B. DuBois Clubs as one of his endorsers in a newspaper advertisement. He has been connected with S.N.C.C., C.O.R.E., the National Lawyers Guild (cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a top Communist Front), and the A.C.L.U. He has participated in radical sit-ins (for which he was jailed twice), regularly marches in Vietnik anti-war rallies, and even signed a petition supporting the notorious Berkeley Free Speech Movement. An advocate of violence, Francois was elected in 1966 to the board of directors of the Fabian Socialists' Americans for Democratic Action. *This* is the man who controls federal funds to "help" law enforcement in the San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, and San Jose area.[3]

But regionalization under local radicals is just a beginning. Bigger and better plans are in store. The American Telephone & Telegraph Company has prepared a law enforcement study for the federal government recommending a system under which all intelligence and communications for our local police would be handled through a dozen regional centers. Wouldn't Big Brother like to get his hands on *that* kind of a setup! Coincidentally, perhaps the *Oakland Tribune* revealed on May 6, 1969, that President Nixon has already selected a dozen cities to serve as federal "sub-capitals." As the *Tribune* notes: "The reorganization and decentralization [*sic*] was started under a little-noted executive order signed by President Nixon on March 27." Big Brother cometh on little cat feet.

The big-domes of Washington have many such clever ideas for shackling the local constabulary. For instance, L.E.A.A. is very big on establishing "human relations commissions" which turn out to be civilian review boards under a different guise. "Sensitivity training" is also being pushed under some two dozen different names. Another program which makes the boys at L.E.A.A. all soft inside is for police to improve their education by taking college courses. Which sounds commendable, except that the courses recommended are in sociology rather than police techniques.

If a police-control program is yet too radical for L.E.A.A., funding can be obtained from the Ford Foundation, which has recently allotted $30 million for the purpose of "helping" law enforcement. For the Ford Foundation, a cornucopia of funds for every conceivable radical project, to want to help our local police is as plausible as W. C. Fields bankrolling the W.C.T.U. Running the "pressure from above" for the Ford Foundation is Charles Rogovin, who until this spring was the lord high pooh-bah at L.E.A.A. On October 1, 1969, Rogovin told the International Association of Chiefs of Police: "If local law enforcement fails, then something else will replace it." And as you might suspect, he quickly added, "local law enforcement has failed to do its job." The Ford Foundation has another Redder Idea.

And Washington's interference in local law enforcement is already a matter for serious concern. The *Oakland Tribune* of July 31, 1970, reported that three California police chiefs have complained to Attorney General

---

[3] California requires regional (metro) government before releasing any federal funds for law enforcement. Butte County Supervisor Donald Maxon told your reporter: "Governor Reagan claims to be against metro government, but then creates the California Council on Criminal Justice which in turn required a regional setup to get federal funds. The Governor is either very naive or he is just not on our side."

The federal government could not get a requirement for regionalization through Congress as part of the Omnibus Crime bill, but the bureaucrats administering it in the states have let it be known that they are more likely to provide such funds if the states include regionalization in their plans.

John Mitchell about the intrusion of federal investigators before local police have even had time to complete preliminary investigations. One of these investigations concerned the handling by police of a riot in Berkeley. The *Berkeley Daily Gazette* for August 4, 1970, noted that the Berkeley Chief of Police had written to Attorney General Mitchell:

"These investigations"—in this case civil rights violations—"bring incredible complications to local issues. They put a police department and its officers in an impossible situation . . . this precipitous intrusion by the federal government is incredible to me—almost unbelievable."

Berkeley has endured attacks by revolutionaries on troop trains, riots, bombings, burnings, and large-scale destruction of property on and off the campus of the University of California, but it took a hippie minister who claimed his civil rights had been violated during a riot to get the Justice Department to do something—and even then it came in on the side of the hippie Left!

Doubtless many local police officials are accepting federal funds against their better judgment because they are desperate. An average of only 4.5 percent of local budgets is now spent on police protection, while Welfare, which is not even a legitimate function of government, is in most cases gobbling up over half of local tax revenues. According to *Time*, "local police forces now cost the average citizen only a bargain-basement $14.48 per year." (Take a look at your property-tax bill and see how that compares with the total you are paying!)

If Fedcop is to be stopped, Americans must prove to their local police that they support them and want them to remain independent. We must be willing to pay the tariff for doing so. After all, this thin blue line of police officers is all that stands between us and the armies of criminals and revolutionaries in the streets. Already they are wavering from the assault on the one side, and the lack of support on the other. If that line ever breaks, our country will be so irretrievably lost that no army will ever be able to restore the freedoms we now have. We *must* see to it that our local police have the *local* funds they need to do their job!

All Americans must be brought to understand that L.E.A.A. is treating the symptoms rather than the causes of growing crime and insurrection. We must expose the fact that those most active in promoting the federal takeover of our local police are the politicians and bureaucrats who have long supported the radicalism of the Supreme Court and backed legislation which puts the blame for crime on "society" and not on the criminals and revolutionaries behind its escalation. The answer to our problem is to take the handcuffs off our local police and put them back on the criminals where they belong.

But keep in mind that the issue at hand is not law and order. All Communist nations, every dictatorship, has *law* and *order*—enforced by a national police force. No, the question is *who* is going to enforce law and order, our local police or the federal government. Fedcop must be stopped. As Dan Smoot has reminded us: "At the end of that road is the instrument for total control that all dictatorships require: a national police force. Then, the character of American law enforcement will undergo another, and this time a rather abrupt, change. When a national police force becomes a recognized, accepted, operating reality, it will no longer be ineffective and permissive. It will be ruthlessly efficient and repressive. Its mission, however, will not be to protect the public, but to protect entrenched political power against the public."

Now, more than ever before, it is vital that we support our *local* police, and keep them independent.

POET LAUREATE OF UKRAINE

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, at the intersection of 22d and P Streets NW., here in Washington, there stands a statue which is all too often unnoticed by passersby. It is the impressive form of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine.

If the figure had been of this man as he appeared near the end of his 47-year-life, it would have been weary, crooked, and sad. Taras Shevchenko, a champion of individual liberty, was a prisoner of tyranny, tortured by ruthless czarist Russia.

In prison he secretly wrote powerful poems of faith—faith that the Ukrainian destiny was to live in freedom.

Years after Shevchenko died, and two centuries after Peter the First "crucified" Ukraine, czarist oppression crumbled. It was 1917, a year of prayers answered, a year of joy, and a year of dignity for Ukraine. Quickly an independent state was established incorporating the ideas of liberty long confined to the dreams of a strong-willed people. The Ukrainian Assembly provided progressive guarantees for the rights of minorities. Thoughtfully the assembly issued currency in three languages to accommodate the different tongues in Ukraine.

The new nation was hard at work providing what Shevchenko had called the new and righteous law when freedom was snatched away.

In 1922, the Bolsheviks disregarded boundaries and seized Ukraine, clamping despotism over this nation of vast natural resources, great seaports, and 50 million valiant people.

Although the Ukrainian independence was short and precarious it remains a symbol, a hope for a better future. Two million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry celebrated the 53d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine on January 22. Sadly, they had to face the fact that the nation where they were born, or where their parents were born, is again a captive. They know that they who fled tyranny are the only Ukrainians who were allowed to celebrate their anniversary of freedom.

Millions of Ukrainians, composing the largest non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R., languish in repression. Yet the flames of national identity are still alive. Fifty-three years of Communist rule has not adulterated the determination of a people who resisted two continuous centuries of Russian czars.

Ukraine lives as a symbol to all those who cherish freedom.

The statue of Taras Shevchenko is a monument to a nation's ideas and hopes that have not been blessed by fulfillment, like similar ideas of Jefferson and our other forefathers here in the United States.

Next time you pass the intersection of 22d and P, stop and think of the millions of captive Ukrainians still carrying the hope that someday, they too, shall share in the freedom we enjoy.

LONG BEACH CITY COUNCIL MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, a singular tribute has been paid to our late chairman, Hon. L. Mendel Rivers, by the City Council of Long Beach, Calif, which has passed a beautifully worded memorial resolution in his honor.

Coming as it does from a city 3,000 miles across the country from Mr. Rivers' home district in South Carolina, it is a unique example of the national reputation that he achieved and of the esteem in which he is held by outstanding citizens everywhere.

I am inserting the resolution in the RECORD at this point as I am sure all Members of Congress will want to read it:

CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH MEMORIAL RESOLUTION—HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

Be it remembered: That the members of the City Council of the City of Long Beach, by means of this resolution, wish to honor the memory of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, head of the House Armed Services Committee, who passed away December 28, 1970, at the age of 65;

That Mr. Rivers, who was recently elected to his 16th term, was a widely known member of the Congress because of his dynamic personality, who, throughout his career, held unswervingly to the belief that the freedom that exists in the modern world is inextricably tied to the military strength of the United States;

That Mendel Rivers, was buried near his parents in a moss-hung colonial cemetery in St. Stephens, South Carolina, with a five-man military honor guard accompaning the casket, and as taps were blown for the white-maned congressman, a dozen jet fighters and the lumbering C5A, the world's largest plane and the result of one of Mr. Rivers' most controversial battles, flew over St. Stephen Episcopal Church Cemetery;

That it is altogether fitting and proper that the members of the City Council of the City of Long Beach adopt this memorial to Rep. L. Mendel Rivers as a tribute to an outstanding legislator in our nation and to his full life of accomplishments for the good of the citizens of our country;

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to such individual or individuals as the Mayor of Long Beach may deem appropriate, as a token of the esteem and regard held for L. Mendel Rivers by the citizens of the City of Long Beach.

Let the Great Seal of the City of Long Beach be affixed hereto.

Adopted this 12th day of January, 1971.

———, *Mayor of the City of Long Beach.*

Attest:

———, *City Clerk.*

SOVIET TRIAL IS WARNING TO ALL OPPONENTS OF THE REGIME

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1971

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Soviet Jews was brought home most vividly by the dramatic sequence of events surrounding the recent Leningrad trials. Jews in Russia have been subject to overt persecution and yet have not been granted the right to emigrate by Soviet officials.

The injustices that have been committed against the Jews have now become public knowledge. One article that documents the seriousness of the problem is one by Murray Zuckoff, editor of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency. I place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to demonstrate that their plight has grown more serious.

The article follows:

SOVIET TRIAL IS WARNING TO ALL OPPONENTS OF THE REGIME

(By Murray Zuckoff)

The trial of the 11 Soviet citizens—seven of whom have been identified as Jews—and three more trials scheduled to be conducted early next year in Leningrad, Kishinev and Riga, is in effect a warning to all those in the Soviet Union and its east European satellites that any opposition to the regime will be unmercifully crushed. The trial is not a "show trial" but a secret trial. It is closed to the foreign press, unreported by Soviet news agencies, and lawyers from abroad are not permitted to come to the Soviet Union to defend the prisoners in the dock and to assure impartial and objective proceedings. This makes the trial all the more ominous and significant than previously imagined. What is at stake is not merely the right of Jews to emigrate to Israel or any other country of their choice or the right of Jews to live as Jews with the same guarantees that other minority groups have under the Soviet constitution. The trial is not merely an attempt to discourage Jews from emigrating. At stake in this trial and the others scheduled is a concerted effort by the Kremlin rulers to crush all opposition to the regime by those who are dissatisfied with current conditions.

The trial reveals that Jews are in the dock as scapegoats because they are in the forefront of the struggle against the criminal rule of the Russian oligarchs. The Soviet authorities know better than anyone else that the form of Jewish resistance, which currently is expressed as a struggle for the right to emigrate, has far greater ramifications. The Jews in the Soviet Union, in fact, are inspiring others to open resistance. Unlike the image of Jews in many western countries where they are linked to the status quo, the Soviet Jews are in the forefront of an anti-establishment movement. This does not mean that they are organizing open rebellion but it does mean that their actions are giving heart and courage to others to do so. The sixteen Soviet republics are seething with unrest and discontent. Artists, intellectuals, scientists and writers are in ferment against the stranglehold the ruling elite is exercising on free intellectual expressions. But these elements are isolated, atomized and fragmented by the very nature of their profession and generally impotent as a community to exert any far-reaching pressure on the regime. By contrast, the Jews in the Soviet Union, despite their dispersal throughout the country, are a cohesive and integrated community in its tradition, ideals and objectives. They are also, as a national minority, subject throughout the country to the same abuse and chafe under the same repressive mechanism which deprives them of the right—in practice—to pursue their Jewishness.

SOVIET RULERS AFRAID OF JEWS WILL INSPIRE OTHERS TO REBELLION

What undoubtedly concerns the Brezhnevs and Kosygins is not the desire of Jews to leave the Soviet Union, but the prospect that their demand, which can be summarized, as "Let us leave or let us live," could open a Pandora's Box and pave the way for the restructuring of the entire social fabric as a more democratic and equitable society. It seems unlikely that a mere wish to emigrate would have required such an elaborate frameup as attempted hijacking. Evidently, what is of greater concern to the Soviet authorities is that the defiance of the Jews against repression, their insistence that they be allowed freedom of expression and movement as provided under what Soviet leaders contend is the "most democratic constitution in the world," will provide the spark and flame for more widespread opposition. One has only to recall how 1,000 Soviet Jews recently defied Soviet police to conduct a memorial observance at the mass grave of 30,000 Jews slaughtered by the Nazis in 1942 in Rumboli Forest on the outskirts of Riga. One need only recall the outpourings of thousands of Jews—young and old—on the streets of Leningrad to celebrate Simchat Torah.

One needs also to recall that during the 1930's, the infamous Moscow Trials against the "Old Bolsheviks"—many of whom were Jewish—was sparked by the assassination of Kirov, a Communist Party hack in Leningrad. His assassination, which many Sovietologists contend was ordered by Stalin to serve as a pretext to crush opposition to his rule, was developed as a "plot" against the "workers' republic" by "renegades" and "traitors" working with, if not for, Hitler. But the actual reason for those trials, which lasted three years and which led to the death of dozens of Bolshevik leaders and the incarceration of thousands of people, was to find a scapegoat for the economic failures of the then Five-Year plan. The refusal of the Soviet authorities to permit the foreign press and lawyers to attend the current trial, is also extremely significant and revealing. During the Moscow trials this permission was not only granted but encouraged. At that time, Stalin felt he had the sympathy of the world on his side and an airtight case against the victims. Now, apparently, the Kremlin leaders fell they have neither. The secret trial now being conducted will be recorded as an infamy in the annals of world history. But the heroism of the Jews to confront their oppressors and to speak out, even at the knowledge that they face imprisonment and possible death, will be recorded as a monumental contribution toward ending the Soviet system of despotism. In the last analysis, the struggle to free the Soviet people from the shackles of enslavement—mental and physical—will be attributed to the heroism of those who dared to defy.

SENATE—*Friday, February 5, 1971*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1971)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose Word declares that "out of the heart are the issues of life," grant to Thy servants who serve Thee here strong hearts, brave hearts, and hearts firmly fixed to do Thy will. Help them to fulfill in daily life and private practice the words of the Master: "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God." Make and keep them wise and good and strong men, filled with Thy spirit and guided by the ideals of the Founding Fathers. May they walk and work with faith in that coming day when the kingdoms of this world live under Thy divine sovereignty in justice and lasting peace, and to Thee we ascribe all honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 4, 1971, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 602—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO THE CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES, MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague (Mr. METCALF) and myself I send to the desk a bill to provide for the disposition of judgments, when appropriated, recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraphs 7 and 10, docket No. 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.