

Albert V. Bryan, Jr., of Virginia, to be a U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, vice a new position created by Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

John Dickson Baldeschwieler, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, vice Hubert Heffner, resigned.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be Brigadier Generals

Col. William A. Browne, XXXX FG, Mississippi Air National Guard.
Col. William S. Elmore, xxx-xx-xxxx FG, Alaska Air National Guard.
Col. Wendell G. Garrett, xxx-xx-xxxx FG, Indiana Air National Guard.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration:

To be captains

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.
James P. Randall

To be lieutenant commanders

Albert J. Semtner, Jr. Melvin S. Asato
Bernard N. Carol D. North, Jr.
Mandelkern William W. Spychalla
Thomas E. Gerish Donald E. Nortrup

To be lieutenants

William F. Murphy Donnie M. Spillman
Kenneth A. Pier Joseph J. Morley
C. Patrick Hodgson John E. Thomasson
Charles G. Adelseck, Jr. Larry A. New
Michael L. Adams
Allan F. Divis Garry W. Elliott
Jerry A. Miller Albert E. Theberge, Jr.
Douglas A. Briggs Arthur N. Flor
Paul M. Duernberger John R. Hudson, Jr.
Richard M. Mathis James L. Stokoe
John P. Campton Michael E. Wagner
Lowell R. Goodman Robert E. Hunt, Jr.
Andrew N. Bodnar, Jr. Richard K. Muller
Martin R. Mulhern Donald L. Suloff
Charles H. Langdon Stephen J. Mangis
III Roger P. Hewitt
Kenneth W. Potter David H. Johnson
Stephen H. Scolnik Alan D. Hirschman
Gerald C. Retzlaff Lawrence L. Lake
Donald C. Suva Norman L. Lovelace
Newell W. Wright

Andrew L. Sikes Raymond W. Reilly
Thomas Ballentine Robert C. Roush
Robert B. Lawson Stephen E. Anderly
Harvey L. Parry, Jr. William A. Viertel
Ronald L. Gester Robert L. Johnson
Thomas W. Richards George C. Fuller
Robert W. Rushing John R. Annett
Howard W. Herz Thomas M. Goforth
Donald J. Smolowitz William M. Hornick, Jr.
Donald W. Nostrant Wayne A. Hoyle
Stephen C. Schwartz Raymond Louis
Archibald C. Davis Stewart McGee, Jr.
III

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Warren K. Taguchi
Abram Y. Bryson, Jr.

To be ensigns

Michael J. Eisenstat James R. Hastings
Steven J. Hollinshead George W. Jamerson
Robert E. Karlin James H. Hartzell
Lawrence E. Keister Stephen H. Manzo
Thomas W. Raszala Michael R. McCaslin
Bobby J. Taylor Michael C. Meyer
James A. Watkins Craig S. Nelson
Thomas R. Crane Alan J. Potok
Joseph M. Kunches Robert J. Schmidl
Kenneth H. Underwood James D. Servais
David J. Stockwell
Richard D. Black Richard Tabor
Jeffrey P. Calebaugh James L. Warner
Richard H. Daly, Jr. Burl L. Wescott
Brent G. Harris Sydney R. Withers

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT DISCUSSED BY SENATOR RANDOLPH IN ADDRESSING AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION—NEW YORK TIMES FUELS AND ENERGY SERIES PRAISED

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in addressing a July 6, 1971, luncheon session of the American Bar Association convention in New York City, this Senator declared that the public again is being placed on notice that the Nation is on the verge of being confronted by a deepening energy crisis. It was noted in this connection that newspapers in Washington and elsewhere recently carried articles announcing a Government program which relies on volunteer action to conserve electricity. I pointed out that in the Government report, "Survey of Electric Power Problems," by the Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, the immediate energy outlook seems to be discouraging.

On the same day, July 6, the New York Times published the first of three articles by John Noble Wilford on the energy crisis. The first was captioned: "Nation's Energy Crisis: It Won't Go Away Soon, as Demand for Power Grows." Mr. Wilford opened with this paragraph:

For the third straight summer, Americans by the millions are living under the daily threat of power brownouts, blackouts and possible electric rationing. But it is more than a seasonal shortage of power. It is part of a national crisis that won't go away—the energy crisis.

Mr. Wilford wrote further:

Nationwide, authorities in the Administration and out expect the crisis to continue for some time . . . In fact, they say, it is likely to persist for years . . .

The second of Mr. Wilford's articles appeared in the July 7 issue of the New York Times and was captioned, "A Nuclear Future Looms the Nation's Energy Crisis." It was devoted mainly to nuclear approaches to solving the energy crisis. But there is a warning based on events of the past, such as this portion of Mr. Wilford's first article:

Another miscalculation was made back in 1966 when the nation's first truly commercial nuclear power plant was completed at Oyster Creek, N.J. Utilities began "thinking nuclear." They rushed to place orders. Consequently, the coal industry slowed down the development of new mines and, looking for new markets, signed some big export contracts, especially with Japan.

So we must ask, Will nuclear power be a continuing will-o-the-wisp as the search continues for technologically feasible breeder reactors? Can the country really rely during the next 10, 15, or 20 years on nuclear power as the single most productive answer to the energy crisis, or are we over-optimistic as we were in 1966 at the time the Oyster Creek plant came on the line? The chances are that, for the short range, we are experiencing considerable nuclear power and breeder reactor over-optimism. For the long range, it is to be hoped we can be more optimistic concerning the breeder reactor and nuclear power.

It is interesting and a tribute to the real-ism to read in Mr. Wilford's article No. 2:

Not all current energy research involves nuclear technology. A number of researchers are working on processes to remove polluting chemicals from fuels before combustion and on devices, such as improved electrostatic precipitators, to clean stack gases. Utilities

are supporting research to improve transmission lines.

My regret is that insufficient technological progress is being made in these endeavors to improve use of fossil fuels while the search for better nuclear power processes continues. And the costs of these processes—so far as they have advanced—are reported to be incredibly high.

It is important to note in Mr. Wilford's second article the recognition he accords to one of the brighter prospects for development of a new clean fuel to expand energy supply and to improve the environment; namely, gasification of coal.

He wrote:

One of the more promising lines of research is directed toward converting high-sulfur coal into sulfur-free, pipeline quality gas—a synthetic form of natural gas.

The Department of Interior's Office of Coal Research is doubling its efforts in coal gasification, aiming toward the operation of a large demonstration plant by 1976. A smaller pilot plant is running in Chicago.

The gasification process involves heating crushed coal under very high pressures. Reactions between steam and the coal's carbon gives off carbon monoxide and hydrogen. In a series of further reactions, sulfur is removed and the gases are converted to methane, which is what natural gas is.

Mr. President, I urge that we work energetically on the short-range solutions to the energy crisis and persistently on the long-range answers. The Times series is thought-provoking and informative. The third and final part was printed July 8 under the caption: "Nation's Energy Crisis: Is Unbridled Growth Indispensable to the Good Life?" The series made a more-than-adequate case for the fact that the energy crisis is real and its articles are thoroughly responsive to the energy-economy-environment interrelationship. Represent-

tative CHET HOLIFIELD of California placed the series in the Thursday, July 8, 1971, RECORD, pages 24178 through 24183, with cogent comment. And the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) spoke appropriately of the energy problems and likewise sponsored the printing of the New York Times series, pages 25180 through 25023, of the Wednesday, July 14, 1971, RECORD.

Mr. President, my July 6 speech on the subject "Energy and the Environment," and the need for a national fuels and energy policy for the United States of America, was delivered as an abbreviation of a comprehensive text. I believe it complements the Times series. I ask unanimous consent that the complete text be printed in the RECORD.

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

ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT; NATIONAL FUELS AND ENERGY POLICY IS NEEDED FOR U.S.A.

The public is being placed on notice once again that the nation is on the verge of being confronted by a deepening energy crisis.

Newspapers in Washington and elsewhere recently carried articles announcing a government program which relies on volunteer action to conserve electricity.

At the time of the short-duration railroad strike last month, the accelerated deepening of the crisis was related to that strike in press evaluations.

The possible depletion of electric utility companies' coal reserves, due to interruptions in coal shipments by rail and the closing of coal mines as a direct result of coal miner strikes, does not offer any degree of encouragement. When short-duration railroad service interruptions and brief wildcat coal miner strikes cause energy supply danger signals to appear, the tenuousness of the over-all energy situation becomes more apparent.

In my view, these conditions illustrate symptoms arising from the lack of a national fuels and energy policy. Until such a policy is clearly enunciated and effectively instituted, this nation will continue to proceed from mild crisis-to-crisis until irreparable damage is done by a crisis of major proportions.

One obvious and visible facet of what appears to me to be an impending critical problem in meeting national energy demands is the expected worsening of the electric power supply situation in several parts of the United States.

In the government report, "Survey of Electric Power Problems," published by the Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, the immediate outlook seems to be discouraging. This OEP document predicts:

"This summer, much of the nation—particularly the area from the Midwest to the Atlantic Seaboard—is expected to face an especially tight power capacity problem unless normal summer temperatures prevail and, in general, system capacity performs as scheduled. Equipment breakdowns or unscheduled outages similar to those which have occurred so far in calendar 1971 could aggravate the situation. Because of the continuing tight electric power situation in many areas, especially New York City, normal maintenance has not been performed on some units. In addition, many units are old and unreliable and normally would have been replaced, except for the current problems of obtaining replacement capacity."

In a statement accompanying the OEP

report, the OEP director, George A. Lincoln, in his capacity as Chairman of the Joint Board on Fuel Supply and Fuel Transport, said:

"We find that electric power generating capacity to meet peak loads this summer will be in tight supply in many areas from the Midwest to the Eastern Seaboard—and particularly in New York City. Fuel supply to (electric) utilities is generally improved, allowing plants to rebuild stocks. Barring unexpected reductions in coal production and imports of residual oil, no interruption of power is expected from fuel shortages. In the areas which experienced difficulties last summer, the reserve margins have improved, but are still below desired levels. And some areas have slightly less reserve capacity than last year."

It is disturbing that the ability of this nation to meet the demand for electric power rests on so many "ifs".

We are told repeatedly that there will not be a problem "if" normal summer temperatures prevail, "if" system capacity performs as scheduled, "if" peak loads are not much higher than utility company estimates, "if" no major equipment outages occur, "if" planned additions of capacity are available when expected, "if" there are not unexpected reductions in fuel supplies due to strikes or other causes—and so on almost indefinitely. How did such a great country as ours permit itself to reach such an "iffy" energy position, to which General Lincoln seems to have added another potential eventuality when he said:

"A combination of an intense heat wave and poorer-than-expected power system performance could result in the elimination of reserve margins and a failure to meet peak loads."

Year after year, season after season, increasingly larger parts of the United States are continually faced with energy uncertainties. I cannot think of a worse example of the consequences of failure to have developed and adopted a national energy policy.

There are far too many "ifs".

Now, listen, please, as I quote on this aspect from the 1971 annual report of the Office of Coal Research, U.S. Department of the Interior:

"With increasing population and increased per capita consumption of energy, all domestic energy forms, and especially coal, will have to make a maximum contribution to supply the demand and forestall dependence on overseas fuel sources."

Further:

"Energy supply requires the same kind of national concern that is now being shown for the problems of the environment. In fact, the solution of environmental problems depends on a major degree upon solving the problems related to the supply of clean energy."

The same report restates a warning often heard lately:

"Perhaps the most critical aspect of the forecast energy-shortage is that it is likely to develop before some of the remedies are fully available. There is real concern, in the near term future, that adequate supplies may be available from domestic sources."

We hope, and we have every right to expect, that government leaders will offer programs and direction to lead the Nation out of a situation in which the maintenance of even normal energy supplies is surrounded by "ifs". But I have doubt that such hope and expectation will be realized in the near future.

The problems of energy demands and fuel resources have been considerably under discussion by members of the Administration. There seems to me to be a lack of agreement and cohesiveness in what they have been saying.

In an address at Stanford University in January 1971, Hollis M. Dole, Assistant Secretary of Interior for Mineral Resources, discussed America's energy needs and resources. He referred to critical points in the course of our affairs as a people, "where we are forced to recognize that something we had long taken for granted is no longer true."

He was specifically concerned with the Nation's problem of energy demand and supply. The problem as seen by Assistant Secretary Dole, in whom I have a high degree of confidence, is clearly enunciated in this excerpt from his talk:

"I refer, of course, to the subject of energy. After years of supposing that we could count on all the energy we needed, we are now finding that the focus of our concern has suddenly moved from the disposal of abundance to the rationing of scarcity. The newspapers and magazines in recent months have been full of references to the oncoming energy shortage, and in the interest of saving time, I am simply going to stipulate as the major premise of my remarks what has been the consensus of these many separate articles and reports: namely, that the United States is facing an energy gap of major proportions which is now opening between its needs for energy and its capacity to supply them."

"The long-term reality of this energy gap is in no way diminished by the President's statement in December 1970 that the danger of an energy shortage this winter is substantially behind us. For the moment, at any rate, we have been rescued by a fortuitous combination of events which served to dampen energy demand enough to allow supply to catch up with it: namely, the exceeding mild weather conditions that prevailed over most of the country almost until Christmas, the general slowdown in business activity; and the General Motors strike. On the supply side, the deficit in crude oil imports caused by the most recent disruption of foreign oil supply is being made up by calling on our spare capacity at home."

Mr. Dole discussed further the question of fuels and energy before the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining on May 17, 1971. There, he said:

"The energy crisis has been the subject of much discussion recently, and not without substantial justification. At the present time, U.S. sources are providing fuels at close to \$19 billion, or 85 percent of the domestic demand. By the year 2000, these sources will be meeting only 48 percent of the demand at a value of nearly \$42 billion."

The Assistant Secretary discussed the need for a national energy policy as follows:

"Now, I would like to turn to the subject of energy. After years of comforting belief that the Nation's supply of energy was a veritable cornucopia of abundance, we now foresee the ominous beginning of a growing scarcity. As I pointed out earlier, the United States is facing an energy gap of portentous proportions that is now opening between its needs for energy and its capacity to supply them."

"This energy gap does not result from the lack of fuel resources, for there is no immediate shortage of coal, oil, or natural gas underground. In fact, the Nation's resources of all three fuels are, indeed, adequate for some years to come. Our predicament with regard to meeting the requirements for energy stems from the need for technologic advances and the need for a coherent, long range, energy policy that comprehends the whole range of factors bearing upon energy exploration, production, transportation and use, and which optimize the contribution that each source and form of energy can make to our total supply. This policy must reconcile the requirement for environmental protection with the equally important and

urgent requirement for adequate and secure supplies of energy. Most important, it must provide timely, consistent, and stable guidelines to enable private investors to make long-term decisions to commit their resources with confidence."

I agree that our natural fuel resources are tremendous and that their existence is not in itself related to meeting future demand. The problems are the result of the disparity between resources and reserves and are due also to environmental considerations associated with the production and utilization of the different fuels. If environmental quality and consumer costs were ignored, there would not be an energy crisis. But environmental quality and consumer costs cannot be neglected or ignored.

Another view of the problem was revealed in a talk by Hendrik S. Houthakker, Member of the President's Council on Economic Advisers, at the Mid Pacific Gas Marketing Conference held in Honolulu, Hawaii in May, 1971, where he discussed economic growth and the efficient use of energy resources. After summarizing overall energy demands for 1975 and 1980 and projected requirements for the individual energy resources, including fossil fuels, nuclear energy and hydro-power, Mr. Houthakker stated:

"Despite the many uncertainties in these projections one point can be made with some confidence, namely that the talk about an emerging energy crisis is greatly exaggerated even though there may be some temporary problems in the near future. Unless our projection of energy demand is far too conservative, it can be met by relatively small changes in relative prices, and without excessive reliance on imports. In view of the many uncertainties about the individual components of the energy supply, the best policy may well be to maintain sufficient flexibility, so that we will not become unduly dependent on any single source of energy, whether domestic or imported."

And, in concluding his presentation, Mr. Houthakker said:

"There are few economic problems that cannot be solved by private competitive enterprise with a minimum of Government intervention. Nothing I have seen or heard in the area of energy so far has convinced me that exceptional measures by the Government are warranted. Provided we let the free market do its job, we shall be neither cold nor powerless in 1980."

I have quoted from what seems to be two contradictory positions assumed by two prominent officials of the Administration. Is there an imminent or foreseeable energy crisis or is there not? This confusion must be resolved at once.

I am particularly concerned with the accuracy of projections of energy demand. Historically, they have consistently been conservative.

Projections published in 1968 of energy demands for 1970 were more than 4 quadrillion BTU's below the actual consumption for that year. We must remember that an unanticipated demand for energy can only be met by an unanticipated demand on energy resources. Whether this demand on resources can be met is determined by fuel industry commitments at that time or other unforeseen calamitous events.

And the additional fuel demands are not trivial. For example, the need for 1 quadrillion BTU's based on current conversion practices, requires the utilization of approximately 8 million tons of coal, plus 0.3 trillion cubic feet of gas, plus 68 million barrels of oil. It is the increasing disparity between projected demand and planned availability of fuels that will surely lead us to a permanent energy crisis, if immediate steps are not taken to develop and implement a rational, soundly based national policy governing fuels and energy.

I can think of no more appropriate time than the present for the initiation of the fuels and energy policy study by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, as authorized by Senate Resolution 45, cosponsored by Senator Henry M. Jackson and this Senator. Notwithstanding the fact that these topics are the current concern of various groups in industry and the executive branch of Federal Government, the Interior Committee study offers the hope of being the most thorough and objective exposition of the problems of energy demand and fuel resources. The staff to work with the Committee on this special endeavor is being assembled and the study will be underway next week.

The Interior Committee was awaiting the President's energy message and the opportunity to hold hearings on it before moving into the policy study. That message by President Nixon reached the Congress on June 4. In it, the President announced what the White House described as "a broad range of actions to ensure an adequate supply of clean energy for the years ahead." The Chief Executive said that private industry is expected to play the major role with government helping. The message addressed research and development, access to energy resources on Federal lands, the supply of enriched uranium, more efficient use of energy, planning for power plant sites and transmission line routes, economic incentive to reduce sulfur oxide emissions, and establishment of an Energy Administration.

On June 15, the Interior Committee held hearings on that message and its chairman and members and this Senator questioned several of the witnesses at length. The witnesses included Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton; Dr. Paul McCracken, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors; General George Lincoln, director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness; and Dr. Glenn Seaborg, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is my opinion that, with a few exceptions, the President's energy message stresses the pursuit of a series of programs on the hypothesis that a valid national fuel and energy policy already exists.

But there is not such a national fuels and energy policy—at least not a coherent, synchronized policy—and the Presidential message did not include several important topics which, it seems to me, should be considered in the development of such policy.

Primary among the deficiencies to which I alluded is the matter of the relationship between energy demand and national productivity. For the past several years, the annual energy consumption in the United States has grown at a faster pace than the annual level of productivity. Hence, increases in productivity require increasing amounts of energy. If demand is related to productivity, this situation makes it almost impossible to forecast energy requirements—even for the very near future.

While economic growth is obviously necessary, the ability to meet energy demands—especially demand for electric power—is becoming increasingly difficult. The use of energy throughout the American economy must be evaluated more precisely so that the trend toward economically inefficient use can be reversed.

The President's proposed energy program combines technological efforts and administrative procedures. I have attempted to determine how long it will take for each element to start to exert a significant effect on the overall fuels and energy problem. The time estimates are admittedly approximate but they are primarily based on available information related to the expected performance of each element.

This analysis indicated that the total realistically significant effects will be felt in 5 to 15 years from now but closer to the end of

such period. The Presidential program elements that will have significant impact within the next five years include:

- (a) Incentives for industry to search for new sources of natural gas;
- (b) Stepped-up coal gasification;
- (c) Facilitating imports of natural and liquefied gas from Canada and other nations; and,
- (d) Improving trade in crude oil with Canada.

The success of these elements is very much dependent upon the amounts of fuels that are available, both immediately and later, assuming that these elements are to be continuous.

A further gross omission in the executive message is the interrelationship of the individual elements. For example, what will be the impact on the coal gasification program priority if incentives and increased imports of natural gas do make large quantities of less-expensive gas available? Conversely, what will happen if the gasification program results in large quantities of gas at prices competitive with domestic natural sources and imports?

Perhaps the most important element missing in the message is that of oil imports from nations other than Canada. Without a complete discussion of this and lacking a fuller understanding of import relationship with all the elements now and in the future, the President's message lacks cohesion.

In summary, mine is the belief that the fuels and energy crisis is so acute, and the environmental problems so tense, that we must endeavor to give them almost equal priority and act on them together, rather than treat them separately.

Few people belittle the need for electrical power nor under estimate its present uses. It is noted, however, that power projections are arousing a torrent of public protest.

But, when they occur anywhere in America, so do brown-outs and black-outs cause "torrents of protest."

With the controversy deepening between energy and ecology, what are the prospects for power in the remaining years before 2000? And it is pertinent to ask: "Does more 'power for the people' mean the abandonment of what is left of a deteriorating environment?"

The quality of life and the use of energy are inextricably tied together.

Yes, there are problems of conservation and environmental concern, but I agree with Federal Power Commission Chairman John N. Nassikas' observation that "Every major industrial and economic decision that results in a change in our land, water, and air resources cannot be condemned out of hand without sacrificing decades of important advances in our standard of living in this country."

I believe that there really is no margin for freedom of choice as to priority between working, on the one hand, for preservation of high quality environment and, on the other hand, working to preserve and expand the energy base on which our complex economy rests.

We can maintain energy supply reliability compatible with demand. Maintenance of this reliability is dependent on adequate sources of crude oil, natural gas, and coal. But these alone will not be enough. There must be other immense sources of energy—(possibly the breeder reactor, fusion instead of fission, or the fuel cell)—to augment the fossil fuels. And there must be broader uses of the fossil fuels, such as gasification of coal. There must, of course, be more exploration and discovery of domestic petroleum and natural gas—and exploration should be encouraged, not impeded. We are too reliant on foreign sources of oil.

One reason for the confusion in national policy is that Americans have been accustomed to act as if cheap and abundant ener-

gy were assured through eternity. Power—to heat and light buildings, propel cars and planes, keep computers and other machines purring—is the backbone of an industrial society. The U.S. has been consuming it far more greedily than any other nation. Americans make up 6% of the earth's population but use approximately 40% of its energy-producing fuels.

Concurrently, and partly as a response to the side effects of expansion of energy requirements and the accompanying growth in our economy, a broadening public concern has developed for environmental quality.

In reaching this awareness, however, we have become uptight environmentally. As a nation we appear to be entering a new era of nature worship. There is talk of returning to a "balance of nature." Those who propose this, however, imply that the natural balance is the only one and if man would just effect a hands-off policy, nature would adjust itself by natural processes to everyone's benefit.

This attitude fails to recognize that man is a part of the ecological system and by our presence we affect the balance of nature. Public policies must be tempered to a rational outlook toward environmental problems while, at the same time, retaining the necessary sense of urgency concerning technology, energy needs, and economic growth.

We are the custodians of nature. The environmental confrontations we are experiencing result from our failures to properly exercise this custodianship. We have failed to consider the effects of our modern technology on the environment, not only detrimentally, but in terms of what can be done through technology to improve our environment. I am concerned that neither the Congress nor the Executive branch is placing enough emphasis on improving the pollution abatement technology.

There are environmental extremists who would sacrifice technological advancement and economic growth on the altar of ecology.

I believe that balanced federal policy can promote energy growth and economic growth and better protection of the environment at the same time.

Yes, the public interest demands that there be a balanced federal policy that not only can promote but, in fact, will promote economic growth and better protection of the environment AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH simultaneously.

But not only must we meet the challenges and requirements of environmental law, there must also be met the challenges and requisites of society for ever-increasing supplies of fuels and energy.

There must be an updating of evaluations—a crash program for the strengthening and the acceleration of research and development and a reordering of priorities on the fuels and energy front, as well as in environmental endeavors.

Obviously, reliable long-term sources of energy must depend on more exploration and discovery of reserves of fossil fuels, followed by increased domestic productions, and the developing of unconventional replacement supplies. Therefore, any viable National Fuels and Energy Policy must include consideration of incentives. But it must be in tune also with environmental requirements. Such sensitive policy balances will not be easy to accomplish.

The immediate need is to overcome a fossil-fuel supply shortage and to develop more effective, more efficient, and cleaner methods of power generation and transmission without doing excessive ecological violence.

Providing secure sources of energy surely will involve increased costs and bring higher prices for consumer products. Vast new capital investments will be required. These are costs we must be prepared to meet for the

fulfillment of the double objective to secure more reliable energy sources and a cleaner environment. We hope the Interior Committee Study will pull the many fragmented parts of the fuels and energy picture together into a meaningful whole that will lead to a long-overdue National Fuels and Energy Policy. And we hope it will meld with the National Policy on the Environment, rather than clash with it.

CONGRESSWOMAN ABZUG WARNS PRESIDENT NIXON WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS IS "NO LAUGHING MATTER"

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the men who are leaders of this country fail to recognize the needs and potential of women. That President Nixon, Secretary of State Rogers, and Mr. Kissinger chose the opening of the National Women's Political Caucus as an opportunity to ridicule and insult women is upsetting—but not surprising. This administration has done nothing to increase women's participation in the political process and, evidently, intends neither to appoint women to policymaking positions nor to encourage them to run for political office.

The National Political Women's Caucus was started to help women of all political affiliations organize to use their political power effectively. In the past women have not been fully represented by or in any of the political parties. It is high time that the male power structure realizes that we are not satisfied with this situation, and that we intend to share equally in governing this country.

I am entering in the RECORD a working paper from the National Women's Political Caucus concerning the role of women in politics as well as statements that Gloria Steinem and I made in response to Mr. Nixon, Rogers, and Kissinger.

I hope that the administration will redirect its efforts from making derogatory comments about the National Women's Political Caucus to developing constructive affirmative action plans that will involve women at all levels of government.

The material follows:

CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA S. ABZUG WARNS PRESIDENT NIXON WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS IS "NO LAUGHING MATTER"

WASHINGTON, July 14, 1971.—"President Nixon will find out in 1972 that the newly formed nonpartisan National Women's Political Caucus is no laughing matter," Congresswoman Bella S. Abzug said today.

Commenting on news reports which had Secretary of State Rogers comparing the leaders of the women's caucus to a "burlesque" and the President replying, "What's wrong with that?," the New York Congresswoman said:

"Obviously, the President and his advisers are accustomed to viewing women only in terms of flesh shows. It's insulting, but not surprising. The President has never said or

done anything to indicate that he has the slightest understanding of women, their power, diversity, potentiality or needs.

"The fact is that women represent 53 per cent of the population, but they're almost invisible in his administration. Women hold a total of only 1.6 per cent of 3,796 Grade 17 policymaking jobs in the government. Mr. Nixon has made no appointment of women to Cabinet rank or to ambassadorial rank, which leaves us even worse off than we were under the Eisenhower Administration.

"Of the 200 women whom he claims to have named to 'top' jobs, 30 were appointed to the JFK Committee on the Performing Arts, two to the Committee for the Preservation of the White House, and others to museum advisory boards and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

"Mr. Nixon is going to find out in 1972 that women will no longer let themselves be consigned to kitchens, to museums, or to the sidelines of political power.

"The National Women's Political Caucus, which was initiated this past weekend, is organizing women of all political parties and affiliations to demand an equal share in elective and appointive office.

"We're serious, we're here to stay, and we're determined to use the enormous political power of women to see that we share equally in governing our country and change our nation's priorities to place human needs first."

STATEMENT BY GLORIA STEINEM ON NATIONAL WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS

I am not now and never have been a girl friend of Henry Kissinger.

If Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Rogers treat Madame Binh, the chief negotiator for the North Vietnamese in Paris, with the same disdain and male chauvinism displayed in their comments on the National Women's Political Caucus, it may be a major reason for the failure of our negotiations in Paris.

I can think of nothing more likely to encourage Republican women to join the caucus than this attitude on the part of their male representatives.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS—JULY 10-11, 1971: WORKSHOP ON POLITICAL PROCEDURES AND STRATEGY

The following figures on women in public office give us some idea of the decline of women's political strength over the past eleven years:

Women	1959	1969
State representatives.....	347	306
U.S. Congresswomen.....	17	11
State elective positions.....	41	31
Mayors.....	4	23

As awareness of the insignificance of women's participation in the political process increases, there will have to be an equal increase in knowledge of the techniques of real political involvement. Women today are the coffee-pourers of both parties. "It's time," as Congresswoman Bella Abzug has said, "For women to come out of the back rooms of politics."

The statement of purpose for the Women's Political caucus includes these calls for action. Suggestions of how to implement them are the subject of discussion of this workshop:

1. Confront our own party structures.
2. Disseminate information on filing deadlines and election procedures—state, local national, for use of women candidates.
3. Monitor selection of delegates as presented to the credentials committee of Presidential Nominating Conventions.

4. Raise women's issues in every election.
5. Register new women voters.
6. Rally national support for campaigns of women candidates.
7. Publicize record of male politicians on women's and humanist issues.
8. Withdraw support from candidates who do not take concrete steps forward for women.

I. PARTY STRUCTURE—REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRAT

Out of 108 state and territorial Democratic and Republican parties only two are chaired by females. (Oregon Democratic Party chaired by Caroline Wilkins and Nebraska Republican Party chaired by Lorraine Orr).

Although most states are required to elect an equal number of committeewomen and committeemen to operate the basic units of political party organization (precinct, ward, town or voting district) equal access to leadership positions has been severely limited.

Proposed action

The Democratic Party in the 50 states is in the process of conforming to the 18 guidelines for reform issued by the McGovern-Fraser Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection. (The commission itself contained 3 women out of 28 members.)

Among the guidelines are a request to "encourage representation on the state's delegation to the convention of minority groups, young people and women in a reasonable relationship to their presence in the state's population."

To date, the following have taken no action on complying with the age/sex guidelines:

California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, and Massachusetts.

Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Ohio.

Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Women should become familiar with these guidelines for reform within the Democratic Party, agitate within their state for compliance, cooperate with efforts being undertaken for party reform. For example, there is an ad hoc task force of Democratic women who are attempting to make proposed changes within the party meaningful to women.

See: "The National Democratic Party and the Status of Women," Congressional Record Reprint of April 7, 1971—Congresswoman Bellia Abzug. *Policy Council Resolution on the Status of Women in the Party* (attached)

For further information:

Official Guidelines for Delegate Selection adopted by the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, 1969. Address: Democratic Nat. Comm.

Mandate for Reform, Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, April 1970, Dem. Nat. Comm.

Political Report Democratic reform drive falters as spotlight shifts to Presidential race, Andrew J. Glass and Jonathan Cottin in *National Journal*, June 19, 1971, P. 1293.

"Women and Political Parties: The Legal Dimension of Discrimination," by Phyllis Segal. Congressional Record reprint, April 6, 1971—Congresswoman Martha Griffiths (attached)

Republican Party

Republican Party has no similar reform movement underway but is actively making an effort to show women in visible positions within the government and party. (See hand-out on Nixon policies toward women.) Women's Division of the Republican National Committee has a report on Republican appointments of women entitled "Women in

Public Service." (Also see *The Progressive*, August, 1971, "Nixon's 200 Women" by Judy McFadden.)

II. ELECTING DELEGATE TO PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATING CONVENTION

In 1968 only 13% of the Democratic delegates in Chicago were women; in Miami at the Republican National Convention only 17% of the delegates were women. Four Democratic delegations included only one female delegate (the National committeewoman who by Convention rule was an automatic delegate.) In Illinois only 8 of 118 Democratic delegates were women; in Indiana only 4 of 68; in Alabama 1 of 48.

In the Republican delegations of New Hampshire, West Virginia and the Virgin Islands no women at all were represented.

Information on the delegates selection process, dates of filing, state and party requirements have to be researched state by state. Political action takes place primarily at the local level. Therefore, the NWPC needs to provide information, money and visibility for women organizing at the local level.

Sources of information on *The Selection of Delegates to Conventions, election Procedures and filing deadline*:

(a) Secretary of State of the individual state for copy of election laws.

(b) State Party Chairman for party regulations.

(c) *Registration and Voting Laws of the 50 states*: Youth Citizenship Fund, 2100 "M" Street, NW, Suite 306, Washington, D.C., \$12.00.

(d) *Registration and Voting Laws and Procedures State by State*: League of Women Voters, 1730 "M" Street, NW, Washington, D.C. (pamphlet being updated, \$.75).

(e) Center for the Study of the American Woman in Politics at Rutgers University, New Jersey is planning to hold a conference in September on Increasing Women Participation in National Conventions. They plan to deal with problems of how to become a delegate. Material should be available from them.

(f) Guidelines for Delegate Selection—Democratic National Committee.

(g) Common Cause, 2100 "M" Street, NW, Washington, D.C. is compiling material on state changes in election laws, etc. This study should be available sometime in September or October, 1971.

THE TELEPHONE STRIKE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "The Coercionists" appeared in the July 15, 1971, issue of the August, Ga., Chronicle.

The editorial pointed out that one element of the current strike by telephone workers is related to the demand that all workers be compelled to pay union dues if they work for the telephone company.

Mr. President, this demand is not only unreasonable but dangerous to the health of the communications industry. It would deny an individual the right to work unless he became a member of the union.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, July 15, 1971]

THE COERCIONISTS

One issue which contributes to the present telephone strike, with its threat of a communication crisis, is a demand that all workers be compelled to pay up in the form of union dues, or be fired.

The demand for a compulsory union shop is, of course, only one part of the package the union wants. We make no judgment herewith on proposed changes in wage structure, pension improvements and job security.

We do, however, brand as grasping and hypocritical any proposal to make secure the jobs of those who suppress their distaste for compulsion and pay up, while making 100 per cent insecure the job of an individual who feels that he does not want or need the union. The American way is the way of freedom of choice, and the more alternatives are eliminated, the closer we come to medieval serfdom.

The tired old argument that a compulsory union shop is necessary for the existence and growth of a union won't hold water. In the case of the telephone workers, the solid record of growth of the Communications Workers of America is in itself proof of the fact that they do not have to use coercion to expand. Over the past 20 years the CWA has almost doubled its numerical strength—in circumstances permitting freedom of choice by the worker.

Such freedom is not inconsistent with the principles of great union leaders. At an American Federation of Labor convention nearly 50 years ago, Samuel Gompers, a pioneering union builder, said: "I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty—the principle of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion."

AFL-CIO President George Meany, furthermore, told a congressional committee in 1965 that disputes over compulsory unionism are "a major cause of industrial strife."

While this issue is before the American public in such dramatic fashion, it would be timely for that public to insist to its congressmen that legislation be passed protecting the freedom of workers in all federally regulated utilities. Last year, a victory for individual freedom was won when, by legislation, a ban on coercive unionism was applied to the new U.S. Postal Service.

To extend this same protection to all utilities subject to national regulation would be an extension of the rights for which our forefathers fought in 1776.

FULL EDUCATION BENEFITS FOR VETERANS ATTENDING NIGHT SCHOOL

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter and petition from a group of veterans in my congressional district which brought to my attention a serious inequity in the present system of veterans' educational assistance programs.

Under current law, a veteran who attends high school during the day and works afternoons or evenings is eligible to receive full veterans' benefits for educational assistance. However, a veteran who works days and attends night classes is only allowed a maximum of half benefits despite the fact that he is taking the same course load.

The bill which I am introducing today will correct this inequity. It will provide that educational allowances for veterans be distributed on the basis of the number of credit hours of course work taken regardless of whether the classwork is completed in day or evening classes.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we owe it to our returning veterans to offer them and provide them with the best opportunities for educational assistance possible. A veteran who returns home and attempts to further his education while holding down a job certainly deserves our praise and encouragement, and should not be discriminated against merely because it is necessary for him to attend night school.

At this point, I would like to insert the text of this bill into the RECORD. I would hope that my colleagues will give the bill their prompt and favorable consideration:

H.R. 9894

A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to designate certain adult evening high school courses as full-time courses for purposes of educational assistance allowance payments

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1684(a) (3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(A)" immediately after "(3)"; and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) an adult evening high school course in which two or more Carnegie units are required per semester shall be considered a full-time course;"

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the month after the month in which this Act is enacted.

TESTIMONY OF EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., SECRETARY OF STATE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. ALAN CRANSTON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, one of the able new young leaders recently elected to statewide office is Edmund G. Brown, Jr., California's Secretary of State.

Jerry Brown recently demonstrated his ability and insight in testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Having just won the confidence of the voters of our Nation's largest State in a campaign in which he had to raise \$250,000 for a constitutional office not well understood by most Californians, Jerry has developed an excellent grasp of the excesses which threaten our electoral processes.

I believe his testimony should be of great interest to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that Jerry's statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY EDMUND G. BROWN, JR.

Last year, as a candidate for Secretary of State in California, I spent a quarter-million-dollars—more than half of it on television. Since I had no significant financial resources of my own, I was forced to spend approximately 80 per cent of my time raising money. This prevented me from doing more of what I really should have been doing—discussing the issues and communicating with California's 8.7 million voters.

Other candidates in California raised and spent approximately \$26 million to conduct their campaigns last year. And—for the most part—a handful of wealthy people gave the money.

In California and most large states skyrocketing campaign costs are turning candidates into beggars who are forced to go hat in hand to lobbyists, special-interest groups and wealthy individuals. It is no longer possible to conduct an adequate campaign in a major state without buying lots of costly TV time. Candidates who are not wealthy must solicit funds from what I believe are questionable . . . and sometimes highly improper . . . sources.

We have now in this nation a campaign system that actually invites corruption.

You gentlemen have before you several bills which attempt in one fashion or another to deal with this growing problem. In my opinion, any bill which would lessen the role of money in politics would be beneficial.

Rather than discussing the specific bills in detail, I would like to offer you my views on how the goal of lessening the importance of money in politics can be reached through Congressional action.

Let me point out first that in California the Secretary of State is the chief elections officer. He not only supervises the actual conduct of elections, but he also files and reviews the campaign financial reports required by our state law.

I have spent considerable time studying these reports and discussing them with candidates. All this has led me to conclude that immediate steps must be taken to control the spiraling cost of local and statewide, as well as federal, campaigns.

We now have pending in the California legislature several proposals dealing with campaign finance. Some of the bills set expenditure limits. Others impose tighter financial reporting requirements. Some provide for tax credits for contributions.

These bills, if adopted, may help with state legislative campaigns, but they will not deal with the major campaigns—those for statewide office, for example, or Presidential or U.S. Senate campaigns.

The problem of money in major races must be tackled by Congress because most of the money in those campaigns is spent on television. Unless you gentlemen deal with the question of TV advertising, we will continue to see ever increasing costs for statewide as well as federal campaigns.

Rather than taking the much-discussed step of limiting expenditures for broadcast or other media, I suggest the following six-point plan:

1. Candidates in a general election for President, Vice President, U.S. Senator and Governor should be prohibited from purchasing television time.
2. Those same candidates should be given a substantial amount of free television time on every station in the country.
3. Political campaign mail should be eligible for the low non-profit organization rate rather than the higher third-class bulk rate.
4. Contributions of more than \$5,000 should be effectively outlawed and loopholes allowing separate contributions to various committees should be eliminated. Persons who contribute more than \$5,000 and candidates who accept more than \$5,000 from any

single source should be subject to stiff fines and possible imprisonment.

5. Small contributions should be encouraged by granting 90 per cent tax credits for contributions of \$10 or less by individuals.

6. Candidates for offices where television advertising is allowed should be sold time at a station's lowest unit rate. This same lowest unit rate provision should apply to other media, such as radio, billboards, newspapers and magazines, which sell time or space to candidates for any office.

Each of these proposals must, of course, be spelled out in detail in any legislation which may be adopted.

I would like to briefly elaborate on several of the more difficult questions which my suggestions raise.

First, the proposal to prohibit TV advertising. I limited this prohibition to candidates for President, Vice President, Governor and U.S. Senator because I believe it is practical to provide a substantial amount of free television time to nominees for these offices. If adequate free time is available, there is no need for candidates to supplement that with paid time. And I believe it would be contrary to the public interest to allow rich candidates to purchase additional, and unnecessary, commercial spots. If our goal is to reduce the role of money in politics, then we must remove the advantage that money now buys in campaigns. This can only be done by prohibiting candidates for President, Vice President, Governor and Senator from purchasing commercial television time.

When free time is provided to candidates the question arises, who will pay for the time? There are three options: First, the stations themselves could be required to donate the time under the theory that they are using the public's airwaves and have an obligation to make time available for public purposes free of charge. Second, the federal government could pay the stations for the time. This, of course, would be a direct federal campaign subsidy. Third, some combination of donated and subsidized time could be worked out.

I believe Congress, with the aid of the Federal Communications Commission, should study the economics of these various options before choosing between them.

When free TV time is provided, somebody must determine the amount and format of the programs.

I am sure you are familiar with the Twentieth Century Fund's Voters' Time proposal, which suggests a series of six half-hour prime time programs for major party Presidential nominees. I do not believe that is the best way to allocate television time.

It is well-known by those who have been involved with TV advertising that short "spots" are generally the most effective way to reach the public. Most people simply will not watch a half-hour political program. Consequently, most candidates would rather use their money to buy 20-second, 30-second and 1-minute commercials.

This same principle can be applied to my free time proposal. I suggest that each team of major party Presidential and Vice Presidential nominees be given two prime-time spots, each two-and-a-half minutes long, on every television station in the nation every night during the four weeks immediately preceding the general election. In addition, each Presidential nominee should be given one half-hour program to be aired in prime time on every station during the last week of the campaign.

Major party gubernatorial and Senate candidates should be given the same amount of time on every station in their state. If, as is the case in some areas, a candidate's state is substantially served by a station located in another state, then that station must provide time in the same amount as would be re-

quired if the station were located in the candidate's home state.

I chose the two-and-a-half minute length because it is a reasonable compromise between optimum advertising and what is needed to convey a message with some rational content. At least half of each candidate's spots should consist of the candidate himself speaking directly to the viewers.

The time amounts I have recommended apply to what I call "major party" nominees. I define a "major party" as one whose nominee for the office in question placed first or second in the popular vote in at least two of the three preceding elections.

I believe some television time should also be provided to "minor party" candidates, defining a "minor party" as one whose nominee received at least one-eighth of the votes cast in the preceding election for the office involved.

In addition, some minimal time should be provided to what I call "emerging parties." This category makes room for the new party that arises from time to time. To be considered an "emerging party" for gubernatorial and Senate campaigns, the party would merely have to qualify for the ballot in the state involved. To qualify as an "emerging party" for a Presidential campaign, the party would have to appear on the ballot in at least three-quarters of the states, and these states would have to represent enough electoral votes to constitute a majority in the electoral college.

"Minor party" nominees should be given five separate two-and-a-half minute prime time spots during each of the four weeks preceding the election. "Emerging party" nominees should be granted three separate two-and-a-half minute prime time programs during each of the last four weeks before the election.

The relative apportionment of time, by the way, is generally in line with the ratio suggested in the Twentieth Century Fund report.

If my free time proposal or one similar to it were adopted, American voters would be given substantial opportunity to hear the views of Presidential, gubernatorial and Senate candidates seeking their votes. A candidate's wealth or ability to raise money from rich friends would no longer determine whether he could gain access to the voters' living rooms.

Although I am suggesting free TV time only during the general election campaign, my third proposal—a reduced political mail rate—would apply in the primary, as well: I believe these mailings should be available to political candidates at all levels, from city council to President.

As you may know, the U.S. Postal Service proposes to raise the third-class rate to 5-cents per letter, a move that would increase campaign costs. I believe qualified candidates should be allowed to mail campaign material at the 2.1-cent rate being proposed for mailing by non-profit organizations.

Just last week I filed a petition with the Postal Rate Commission asking for a reduced political rate. If the Commission denies my petition, I am hopeful this committee will consider adding postal reduction sections to the various campaign finance bills now being studied.

Postage is a large cost in local campaigns. A survey by my office shows that candidates for the California state legislature last year spent considerably more than a third of their total budgets on mail. Reducing the postage rate would go a long way toward reducing the cost of conducting legislative campaigns in California and other states.

My fourth proposal—prohibiting contributions larger than \$5,000—is one that is dealt with in some of the bills before you. I strongly support limiting the role that any wealthy individual can play in a campaign and I believe this prohibition, if backed up with a

tough enforcement mechanism, will be beneficial.

Tax credits—my fifth proposal—are also called for in some of your bills. In my opinion small contributors should be given 90 per cent for their contributions. A 50 per cent credit, as supported by some, will not adequately accomplish the goal of encouraging small donations.

My sixth proposal—guaranteeing lowest unit cost for advertising media—is one that again is contained in many of the bills you are considering. I believe the lowest unit cost provision should apply to billboards, newspapers, magazines, radio and television.

In conclusion, let me emphasize the critical role that television plays in all statewide campaigns in California. We are a state of 20 million people, most living in single-family residences. A statewide candidate who does not use television simply cannot communicate with the electorate. Spending huge sums for paid TV advertising does not guarantee victory, but failure to spend huge sums does seem to guarantee defeat. You may be interested to know that in the eight statewide races conducted last year in California, the candidate who purchased the most TV time won in every instance.

So, on the one hand we have the extreme importance of television in California. On the other hand, we have the great impracticality of using television in races for the House of Representatives or state legislature. Slightly more than 52 per cent of California's voters live in what is called the Los Angeles television market. This means that about half of our state's 38 Congressmen would have to use Los Angeles stations if they wanted to buy TV spots. Each Congressman would be paying to reach about 11 million Californians, but only a fraction of those people would live in his district.

Television, in California and many other areas, is strictly a medium for candidates with statewide or close to statewide constituencies. This is why I have limited my combination of free TV time and prohibition of paid TV advertising to candidates for President, Vice President, Senator and Governor. It simply is not practical to extend this plan to other candidates.

I have with me and am submitting for the record a copy of a petition I filed last year with the Federal Communications Commission requesting a rule that would require TV stations to provide some free time for major candidates. I filed an amendment to that petition earlier this week and I believe these documents will be of interest to those concerned with the use of television in campaigns.

I am also submitting for the record a copy of the petition I filed last week with the Postal Rate Commission requesting reduced rates for political mail. That petition contains detailed information on the importance of mail in political campaigns.

Public office is rapidly becoming a rich man's preserve. Each year it is more difficult for an honest man of moderate means to conduct an adequate campaign. Skyrocketing campaign costs have opened the door to influence-peddling by those who command sufficient resources to bankroll campaigns. Immediate Congressional action is needed to prevent our democracy from becoming a plutocracy.

U.S. OIL NEEDS AND THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a strong possibility that the United

States will have to obtain an increasing amount of its oil supplies from the Middle East and north Africa in the coming years unless there are drastic changes in consumption patterns and many new energy discoveries. Trends in the world oil industry, the role of Middle East oil in the world, and future U.S. needs were the topic of James E. Akins' testimony before the Near East Subcommittee on July 15, 1971. Mr. Akins is director of the Office of Fuels and Energy at the Department of State. I urge my colleagues to read his remarks:

MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICAN OIL

(By James E. Akins)

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The main feature of the world oil picture is that three-fourths of the non-communist world's proven, recoverable reserves lie in the Middle East and North Africa. The main corollary is that Europe and Japan, which now get 90 percent of their supplies from this area, will remain dependent on it for almost all of their hydrocarbons and for much of their energy through 1980, and very likely through the remainder of the century. While the United States is in a more fortunate position with its domestic supplies and with synthetic oils which could be developed, it too could very likely be forced to import one-half of its petroleum needs from the Middle East and North Africa by 1980.

WORLD RESERVES

According to recent estimates prepared by various industry sources the world oil reserves are roughly as follows:

[In billions of barrels]

Arab Middle East and North Africa.....	350
Iran	60
United States (including Alaska).....	40
Venezuela	15
Indonesia	15
Canada	10
Other Western Hemisphere.....	10
Other African.....	5
Others	5
Total	510

Although this table shows that two-thirds of the non-communist world's reserves are Arab and 80 percent are in the Middle East and North Africa, the picture is in fact understated. The reserves from the Middle East include "only" 150 billion barrels for Saudi Arabia, whereas most authorities are convinced that the figure should be at least twice that high; and the figure for Iraq is only 30 billion whereas the actual figure is more probably closer to 75 billion barrels.

Much has been said about the necessity of looking for oil outside the Middle East and North Africa, with the implication that the size of these reserves reflects the amount of exploration being performed. In fact the opposite is true. Most companies operating in the Middle East and North Africa have already found reserves sufficient to meet their needs for many years to come and almost all exploratory activity today is being carried out in other areas: Indonesia, the North Sea, Canada, and Alaska, off the Coast of Africa—indeed wherever there are sedimentary basins.

Much, too, has been said about the importance of recent discoveries. The finds at Prudhoe Bay Alaska were greeted with great enthusiasm by many who were dealing with energy problems. This enthusiasm unfortunately carried away many who predicted that Europe and Japan would be supplied by Alaska and Canada and who continued this with a prediction of the gradual withering up of the Middle East. We now look at Alaska much more soberly. Our most optimistic hope at present is that Alaskan pro-

duction will offset declining production elsewhere in the United States. Similarly, the discoveries in the North Sea were welcomed enthusiastically and some even predicted that "the North Sea will free Europe forever from dependence on the Middle East." Here too the facts are much more sober. Current projections are that the North Sea will produce one million barrels/day by 1975. If Europe's needs continue to expand as projected, the North Sea will take care of only nine months growth in 1975.

Production is also expected to grow in Indonesia and Nigeria and possibly elsewhere off the coast of Africa and Asia but the growth in demand throughout the remainder of this decade will continue to be covered by the Middle East and North Africa.

The United States has extremely large reserves in shale and very large reserves of coal, both of which could serve as sources of hydrocarbons for the United States if not for the entire world. The cost of production from either source however is very likely to be higher than conventional petroleum. One company estimates that oil from shale will never be less than \$5.80 a barrel, in current dollars. Other companies are somewhat more optimistic but we have seen no reports predicting that oil from shale will ever be below \$4 a barrel. This latter figure however is only marginally above present U.S. oil prices and may ultimately set the upper limit on world oil prices.

This oil however is not immediately available; it requires a very large capital investment and a long lead time. One firm interested in the development of shale oil has told us that if there were immediate leasing of shale lands and a crash investment program, 3 million barrels/day could be produced from shale in the United States by 1980. Most others working in this field predict no more than a million barrels/day and possibly much less at that time.

Canada has large reserves (c. 300 billion barrels) of oil in the tarsands of Athabasca but here, too, the cost of production is high, although not as high as shale; the investment is also high and the lead time is long.

Venezuela may have as much as 3 trillion barrels of oil in the heavy oil belt of the Orinoco but the cost of development is also high. One company has estimated that a 250,000 barrels/day plant—the minimum practical size—would cost \$500 million. With the pending Venezuelan legislation on reversion of assets, which many of our companies consider to be confiscatory, it is not certain how investments of this magnitude could be made. In any case, the oil would be high cost and it is unlikely that it could be sold on the world market today. It could, however, be produced and sold profitably in the United States at today's US price or even somewhat lower.

There are also large reserves of shale and tarsands in Brazil and elsewhere in the world and many countries have coal which could be converted into synthetic oil. It is quite likely that all these sources will be exploited sometime in the future, but it seems unlikely that the world will turn to high cost conventional or synthetic oils until the price of conventional petroleum has risen to something near the American price—or more aptly to something near the price of shale oil converted in the United States.

CONSUMPTION

Consumption projections have been notoriously inaccurate in the past. The President's Task Force on Oil Imports for example, which completed its work only eighteen months ago, estimated that US consumption in 1980 would be only slightly above 18 million barrels/day. Our consumption today is about 15.5 million barrels/day and we now expect consumption to reach 18 million barrels/day in 1975.

A rough estimate of world consumption is as follows:

[Figures in millions of barrels/day]	
United States	
1970	15
1980	24
1990	32
2000	40
Non-Communist World	
1970	40
1980	80
1990	120
2000	160

COST OF PRODUCTION

The average well in the United States produces around 14 barrels/day and the cost of production is of the order of \$2.50. In the Middle East the average is over 5,000 barrels/day with some fields producing 15,000 barrels/day per well. The cost of production throughout the Middle East is not much over 10 cents/barrel. In North Africa it is somewhat more expensive than the Middle East but cannot be compared with the United States. Transportation costs from the Persian Gulf to Europe by giant tankers around the Cape of Good Hope or by smaller tanker through the Suez Canal will probably be something of the order of 70 cents/barrel through the remainder of this decade. The total delivered cost of this oil to Europe would therefore only be 80 cents/barrel. It is

this fact which has led several economists to conclude that competition among producers will soon result in the reduction of oil prices very dramatically.

Theoretically, of course, the delivered cost in Europe could fall to less than \$1 a barrel and at least one noted economist has in fact predicted a maximum of a dollar a barrel for the oil in the Persian Gulf. This assumes that there will be full competition among the producers, that they will all try to maximize their production and that cooperation or collusion among the producing states will not exist. In other words that OPEC (the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) will collapse. There is very little evidence that this will happen—in fact, there is much evidence to the contrary. OPEC has recognized the value in cooperation and facing the companies with unified demands. There seems little reason to believe that the schedule of increased taxes and royalty payments to the host governments which has been projected through 1975, will be altered downwards.

INCREASE TO PRODUCING GOVERNMENTS

The income to the producing states from oil is of course enormous. In some cases it will treble within the next 5 years because of increased production and increased payments per barrel. The following table gives comparison of production and income for the years 1965, 1970 and projections for 1975.

OIL PRODUCTION (IN THOUSANDS OF BARRELS PER DAY) AND GOVERNMENT REVENUES (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS ANNUALLY)

	1965		1970		1975 (estimate)	
	Production	Revenue	Production	Revenue	Production	Revenue
Middle East:						
Iran	1,885	\$522	3,848	\$1,106	6,500	\$3,345
Saudi Arabia	2,205	655	3,798	1,228	6,500	3,487
Kuwait	2,351	671	2,989	891	4,000	2,059
Iraq	1,320	375	1,558	511	2,600	1,433
Abu Dhabi	282	77	691	222	1,000	536
Qatar	230	63	361	116	361	194
Oman			333	107	400	215
Dubai			86	28	150	80
Bahrain	57	16	77	25	77	41
Total Middle East	8,330	2,379	13,741	4,234	21,588	11,390
North Africa:						
Libya	1,213	371	3,321	1,300	3,170	2,476
Algeria	565	144	990	361	1,430	1,065
Total north Africa	1,778	515	4,311	1,661	4,600	3,541
Total Middle East and north Africa	10,108	2,894	18,052	5,895	26,188	14,931

Note: Figures for Middle East oil production in 1975 are conservative estimates, using an aggregate rate of growth of just under 10 percent annually after 1971. Middle East production growth was 12 percent in 1970, and has been even higher (18 percent) so far this year.

It has been argued that the oil is grossly overpriced and that the producing countries have no "right" to such income. While it is futile to discuss the morality of this issue, the question of the value of the oil has been answered most strikingly by Senator Bellmon of Oklahoma. He said "the cost of production of the oil is irrelevant to its value. If you find a diamond in a field at no cost whatsoever, it is worth just as much as a diamond extracted from a multimillion dollar mine in South Africa." A relevant comparison would be costs of other sources of oil or of energy, and this would show that oil in the world markets, even with the recent price increases, is still a bargain.

IMPORTANCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST TO THE UNITED STATES

The United States oil industry, from its investments in the Middle East and the downstream investments in tankers, refineries and distribution networks in Europe and Japan, remits about \$1.6 billion per year to the United States. Frequently this entire sum is ascribed to the production end but this implies a far greater return on invest-

ment in production than should actually be the case. Nonetheless, the figure is an impressive addition to our balance of payments.

Others are more optimistic. Estimates of the value of the investment itself in the Middle East and North Africa vary from a low \$2.5 billion for depreciated bookvalue up to \$50 billion or even more for replacement value. Neither figure of course gives an adequate indication of the true current value. The latter figure would have some validity except it would be impossible to replace the oil from other sources—at least not in any time frame that we could consider, i.e. 10 to 20 years.

Unless the United States takes measures either to restrict consumption or to develop indigenous sources of oil or to encourage development of oil from secure sources, all projections we have seen show substantial US dependence on the Middle East and North Africa by 1980. One major oil company believes that there is nothing that could be done at costs acceptable to the United States consumer to avert this dependence. Others are more optimistic although most seem to agree that reducing this

dependence would be fairly costly—at least in the short run.

The main importance of the area to the United States is that our NATO allies and Japan are and will remain almost totally dependent on it for their energy for the foreseeable future. If the Middle East and North Africa were controlled by forces hostile to us, our allies' security and therefore our own would be compromised.

This is of course one of the main reasons for the interest of the Soviet Union and China in the area. It is not because either country is expected to become dependent on the Middle East or North Africa for its own energy. The Soviet Union will almost certainly remain a net exporter of oil through this decade and probably beyond, and there is no evidence that China, which is now self-sufficient in oil, is disposed to becoming again dependent on imported oil.

ROBERT H. WYATT, INDIANA
EDUCATOR

HON. BIRCH BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, an article published in the summer issue of *Indiana Teacher* describes the many battles for education waged by Mr. Robert Wyatt and a portrait of this man who so ably presented the case for quality education in Indiana and the United States.

Mr. Wyatt is certainly among the most distinguished educators in the country and is among the vanguard securing better education for all Americans by merit of his efforts marshalling teachers behind legislative proposals concerning education.

This account of his life of efforts is certainly worthy of the highest commendation, which his fellow teachers have awarded him by his selection in 1963 as President of the National Education Association. Mr. Wyatt has eloquently spoken of the social conscience of teachers; his eloquence is well understood after a study of his long and admirable career.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

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

FRONTLINE FIGHTER IN TEACHERS' BATTLES NEVER GIVES UP

(By Dorothy E. Steinmeier)

The scars are there. The wounds have been deep, but Robert H. Wyatt is a man who never gives up in battle.

As he fought in the frontlines carrying the teachers' banner, many times it must have seemed that he was alone. But the troops were there—the thousands of teachers in Indiana who have backed him every step of the way.

The man who has been the undisputed leader in Indiana's teachers for more than 32 years and served a term as president of the National Education Association, the largest independent professional organization in the world, is called "Mr. ISTA" by teachers, or "Mr. Educator." Or sometimes "Mr. Education."

Editors and newsmen have often called him other names. So have many of Indiana's

legislators. Among them, however, are more friends than enemies.

WYATT CALLED "TOUGH COOKIE"

One reporter wrote, "Robert H. Wyatt is a tough cookie who almost always gets the job done. Not everyone is pleased in the process."

The Indiana State Teachers Association is looking around for another "tough cookie" who will get the job done. Wyatt retired last month (April 30) as ISTA's executive director. His tenure in office was longer than that of any state association executive in the nation.

He was elected to the office of executive secretary in 1938 by ISTA members (all of them) who voted by secret ballot. Wyatt has moved with the times. It can be said, in the world of education, he moved things a bit himself. He was unanimously re-elected to the ISTA top office for each term he served. No one even appeared as competition.

ASK A VETERAN TEACHER

Indiana's veteran teachers know exactly what Wyatt (and his name has been synonymous with that of ISTA) has done for them—and for education. Thousands of young teachers may not even imagine the struggle it took to advance their welfare and prestige, to improve the quality of education and of teachers in Indiana, and to make schools better for the children.

Legislation had to be the key to open the doors to better schools.

An *Indianapolis Star* reporter once wrote that "he (Wyatt) has been accused of defeating political candidates who oppose his views by marshalling his huge teacher corps in opposition.

"And he is not particularly liked by most of the other large lobbying organizations in the state.

"But few will deny that Robert H. Wyatt has probably done more to gain higher teachers' salaries improved fringe benefits, and high prestige for Indiana teachers than probably any other man in the state's history."

"And this is what I'm paid for," Wyatt told the reporter.

HIS METHODS EFFECTIVE

Edward Ziegner of the *Indianapolis News*, one of the state's top political writers, had this to say in 1963 about the man who worked for so many years an average of 70 hours a week for all Indiana teachers: "No lobbyist is more frequently denounced and criticized on the floor of the House and Senate in the Indiana General Assembly than Wyatt. Few lobbyists, if any, are as consistently successful in winning their goals."

And Wyatt told Ziegner about the unusual and difficult problem in the fight for ever-better education. He said:

PRODUCT IS THE FUTURE

"We have an enormous handicap in the fact that paying for education is widely separated in point of time, from enjoyment of the product. If you want to buy a tangible product, you walk into a store, buy it, and you have it immediately. With education, payment goes on for years, and it's years before it can be seen if the child grown into an adult has had a good education, fitting the person for his job in today's complex world.

"It's a question of present goods vs. future goods."

Wyatt has done a mighty good selling job. He has written and helped to steer through the Legislature some 11 teachers' salary laws and 12 retirement laws, and has cooperated in the enactment of several school finance acts and school reorganization laws.

Under his leaderships, ISTA has provided many firsts in the nation. Among these are the first state minimum salary schedule extending to \$10,000; the first State Teacher

Training and Licensing Commission composed of professional educators; the first \$2,400 state minimum salary schedule (1947); the first Defense Commission; the first state Teacher Education and Professional Standards Committee, established prior to the national TEPS Commission, and the first statewide student education association in the United States.

WYATT IS I.U. GRADUATE

Wyatt is a native of Allen County, Indiana. He attended Laotta High School, earned his Bachelor of Arts and the Master of Arts degrees from Indiana University, and has done graduate study at Indiana University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Southern California. Ball State and Taylor Universities awarded him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. He is a member of numerous honorary education fraternities.

His teaching career, over a span of 15 years, began at age 16 in a one-room schoolhouse. He became head of the social studies department at Central High School, Fort Wayne, and was a guidance director in that school.

At the age of 27, he became president of the Fort Wayne Classroom Teachers Association, and four years later was elected president of the Indiana Classroom Teachers Association.

Wyatt has been president of the Indiana State Teachers' Retirement Fund, and a member of many state and national commissions and education organizations. He established and is now president of the NEA Mutual Fund.

In 1939, along with 20 other citizens of the Fort Wayne area, he helped found the Mutual Security Life Insurance Company, which has now attained the status of nearly one billion dollars of insurance in force.

What does Wyatt consider the most pressing problem in education today?

"ADAPT SCHOOL TO CHILD"

"I think our greatest problem is to try to identify the individual needs of a child and to try to adapt a school to him rather than trying to run him through a procedure which stamps him as it would a piece of metal," he said.

"I think there is great progress being made in schools today in trying to identify special problems children have, not only mentally and intellectually, but emotionally and physically. Right now, one of the great needs we have is to equip the teacher to identify problems and to engage a specialist in solving problems so that they can be diagnosed and treated," he continued.

"The current movement in this particular year and in the next two years is going to set this process back very materially," he predicted.

"Hundreds and hundreds of capable people in the school field are being dismissed; positions are being eliminated so that the classroom teacher who has an abstruse, unusual special case child in his classroom is going to be greatly handicapped. These unusual children disturb all the rest of the pupils in the classroom—and make teaching more and more difficult," said Wyatt.

Wyatt went on to say how serious this situation may become, and that he feels that it "may come to the point where I fear great deterioration in education will occur within the next few years."

SOME TEACHERS MAY GIVE UP

"I think that the health of the teacher is going to be impaired to the place where his efficiency will drop—and some teachers, after a certain length of time with this kind of experience, are simply going to quit.

Wyatt was asked what kind of bouquets he would like to give "his" teachers, and gave this answer:

"Teachers are teachers because they have a basic desire to serve humanity. The gen-

eral social conscience of teachers is probably higher than that of any other occupational group. I would not even except the ministers—although I might give them par with the teachers. But the real drive of school teachers is to serve humanity by educating young people. The teachers' work is not exceeded by any group of people in this country."

It follows that serving the teachers must be the greatest work in the country. For the warrior, Robert Wyatt, it has been that way.

BIG BUS BILL—ERRORS IN COMMITTEE REPORT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the committee report on the big bus bill, H.R. 4354—House report 92-345—I have discovered a number of inaccuracies of which my colleagues should be aware.

The first error deals with a statement made on page 3 of the report. The report states:

Practically all of the cities in the country presently permit 102-in buses to operate on their streets and highways.

This statement gives the impression that the cities of this country are practically unanimous in this use of 102-inch buses. The facts in this respect are spelled out at page 339 of the hearing held on this legislation in 1969. In response to a question from me as to the number of cities with bus systems, the following dialog occurred:

Mr. GUNTHER. There are 14,500 cities that belong to the National League of Cities through their State affiliates.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Would you say at least half of them have bus systems?

Mr. GUNTHER. There are about 1,500 bus systems in the Nation, some cover more than one city.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The 94 cities that are listed here is a pretty small percentage of the total?

Mr. GUNTHER. That is right. It is the large cities.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is not even all the large cities?

Mr. GUNTHER. That is right.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Many of the large eastern cities do not allow 102 inches.

Mr. GUNTHER. Yes.

A second error relates to the statement in the report:

Yet, in these cities the newly constructed Interstate System is not available to them under curen law.

Again, I quote from the 1969 hearings on this same legislation. At page 9, Mr. Charles A. Webb, president, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, testified:

In about 25 of these States, operations of 102-inch-wide local and suburban buses were permitted prior to July 1, 1956, which means such operations are permitted today on local and suburban segments of the Interstate System. In the remaining 15 States, local and suburban bus operators must confine their modern 102-inch-wide buses to

routes which do not embrace any part of the Interstate System.

Thus, it seems clear to me, that one of the main reasons the proponents are seeking the increased width is for intercity buses and not intracity buses.

A third point relates to the number of 102-inch buses now in service. The majority report states that there are approximately 22,000 buses of 102-inch width in operation. This figure is probably accurate, the error here lies in the false impression of the number of 102-inch buses now in use. To get a correct picture, you must look at the total number of buses now in use. The 1970 issue of Motor Truck Facts published by the Automobile Manufacturers Association states that 364,340 motor buses of all types were registered in the United States in 1969. This means that less than 7 percent of the buses in the United States are 102 inches in width—a much smaller relative quantity than the majority report would imply.

At page 4, the report states:

An excellent example of this situation is right in the Nation's Capitol where the seven bridges crossing the Potomac River from Virginia four are on the Interstate System, and therefore, cannot be used by 102 inch buses. The three remaining bridges all have lane widths less than 12 feet, but are available for the 102 inch buses. Yet, within Washington, D.C., the bus system contains over 300 buses of 102 inch width which operate legally on the city street system.

The report bemoans the fact that 102-inch buses can operate in the District of Columbia, but cannot cross the Interstate bridges. The fact is there is no need for D.C. Transit buses to cross these bridges because D.C. Transit has no operating authority or route requiring them to cross the Potomac, except for one short route between Bethesda and the CIA. In fact, it is interesting to note that D.C. Transit has only 173 buses which are 102 inches wide. That is out of a total fleet of 1,167 vehicles, the majority of which are only 95 inches wide. The report claims D.C. Transit has over 300 buses, 102-inches wide, however, I have been assured by D.C. Transit officials that they have only 173 buses that are 102-inches wide.

Still another fallacy in the majority report stems from the statement:

The clear facts that the 102 inch bus is in widespread use with an excellent safety record on narrow lanes with lesser safety characteristics then the Interstate System has convinced the Committee that the 96 inch restriction on the Interstate System should be removed.

When viewed from the perspective of the fact that widespread use means less than 7 percent of all buses, the safety record may not be as impressive as it appears at first blush. The National Safety Council publication, Accident Facts—1970—indicates that for the year 1968-69, the accident rate for buses were as follows:

Accidents per million vehicle miles	
City	56.45
Suburban	31.71
Intercity	6.34

While it is impossible to tell what percent of the buses involved in these acci-

dents were 102 inches wide, it is quite clear that the city buses do experience a much higher accident rate. Hardly what should be termed "an excellent safety record." In addition, since the safety record of 102-inch buses is based mainly on city usage, some of the other safety problems, particularly those of the blast effect have not been fully evaluated. The blast effect would not be significant under most city traffic conditions.

Also, at page 4, the report states:

The other part of the bus operation—intercity long haul buses—presents still another phase of the transportation system which must be realized to its peak efficiency. This fact is accentuated by the recent developments in the railroad industry which have completely removed passenger service to many of our cities and so curtailed others as to create hardships on the total mobility of the American people.

It seems clear to me that the major portion of the urban traffic congestion results from intracity traffic and not intercity traffic. Encouraging people to ride intercity buses will do little to solve our urban-intercity traffic problems. In recent years, the number of intercity passengers carried by bus has steadily declined. The 1970 World Almanac cites the following figures:

1966	169,323,447
1967	166,285,070
1968	160,692,862

So the argument that "recent developments in the railroad industry" necessitate increased intercity bus service hardly squares with the fact bus ridership has been declining drastically during the period passenger trains were being dropped at an alarming rate. The bus owners themselves admit that their buses travel, on the average, half empty. It is for that reason, I suggested to the bus owners that they can get additional seating space by removing one row of "unused" seats.

Another point which needs clarification is that the size and weight of the new wider buses. While the present bill clearly deals only with an increase in the width of buses, it should be noted the new "family" of Greyhound buses would be 5 feet longer, 2 feet higher, and 13,267 pounds heavier than present buses. These increases are within the present size and weight limitations, and no changes in the law are necessary to accommodate them. It seems readily apparent to me that a bus 13,267 pounds heavier is going to cause more wear and tear on our highways. Thus, contrary to the statement contained in the report, there will be substantial costs to the Government and thus to the taxpayers beyond the cost of the studies mentioned in the report.

Finally, it seems to me that there are a sufficient number of inaccuracies in the majority report as to raise serious questions about the conclusions drawn by it in favor of the bill. Conclusions based on such questionable facts, certainly should not be given much weight. I would again urge you to read the entire report, including the minority, supplemental, and additional views, and draw your own conclusions.

THE KEY TO FULL EMPLOYMENT

HON. WILLIAM B. SAXBE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, American Machinist magazine devoted a special edition on June 28 to the findings of an independent research company which did a study of 129 companies in 20 industry groups with an emphasis on capital spending. The findings offer an excellent analysis of capital outlays in our country today.

The companies sounded out basically favor free trade internationally and competition at home in order to breed efficiency. Some of their ideas are new and they seem quite well thought out. The final eight pages of the study summarize their recommendations. Because I think the topic of the study is particularly timely, I ask unanimous consent that the findings be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From American Machinist magazine, special June 28 edition]

THE KEY TO FULL EMPLOYMENT
NEW FACTS ON CAPITAL OUTLAYS

Computer analysis of the records of 129 companies shows how capital investments relate to the value of installed plant, the depreciation taken, and the net cash flow.

How much are American manufacturers actually spending on capital investment? Is the rate of investment growing or declining? And how does the total capital investment stack up as a percentage of gross plant, as a percentage of net cash flow, and as a percentage of depreciation booked?

The answers given by politicians tend to be more emotional than factual, partly because the facts have not been readily available. Therefore, in order to get at the truth, American Machinist commissioned Investors Management Sciences to perform a computer study based on actual figures over a period of ten years.

The study revealed wide variations in the capital-investment practices of manufacturing companies, as shown by the investment ratios in the table that starts on the facing page. The table gives data on 129 companies in basic manufacturing arranged in 20 industry groups.

These companies had gross plant and equipment valued at \$117 billion in 1970 and made capital expenditures for new plant and equipment amounting to almost \$13 billion, or 11% of the value of installed plant. This was about the same ratio as the average for the past ten years, which is 10.8% for these companies, calculated from the ratio of capital expenditures each year to the value of gross plant for that year.

Sales of the 129 companies totalled \$156 billion last year, on which the net profit after taxes was 4.4%.

Capital expenditures in 1970 amounted to 28% more than the retained cash flow of these companies and to 74% more than the amount of depreciation booked.

The ratios were calculated from the data in the computer bank of Investors Management Sciences. The companies selected were the largest companies in each industry for which relatively complete data was available. No company was included unless the information on capital spending was available for the past five years. For 103 of the companies, data for the past ten years was available.

MOST MEANINGFUL RATIO

Because the capital expenditures are reported in the amounts spent each year while the book value of gross plant is not increased to correct for inflation, a given ratio of investment to gross plant tends to mean a smaller real investment after a period of inflation than it does before it. However, this complication operates in essentially the same way for every company on the list, and it seemed likely that this ratio of capital outlays to gross plant would provide the most meaningful base. It was calculated, therefore, for the last year, as an average of the past five years, and as an average of the past ten years.

Industry composites were calculated except in three industries for which there was not enough ten-year data for meaningful calculation. The table on this page shows the ten-year investment rate for the other 17 industry groups. For manufacturers of office machinery, the average rate is more than four times what it is for the steel industry. Within each industry group, however, there are variations from company to company that are equally striking.

Among office machinery firms, for example, the ten-year ratio for Diebold is 11% and for Xerox is 48%. Among the steel companies, the range is from 5.3% at U.S. Steel to 9.9% at Republic Steel.

The investment ratio to gross plant was higher for the most recent five years than for the previous five in nine of the industries, lower in seven. This fairly even split contrasts with the performance of individual companies; for 72 companies the ratio was higher in the past five years than in the previous five, while in only 23 companies was it lower.

Last year was a year of cutback for many. In only 27 companies was the investment ratio higher last year than the average for the last five years, while in 100 companies it was lower. But in a third of the companies for which data was available, the investment ratio last year was higher than the average of the last ten years.

RATIO OF INVESTMENT AND PROFIT

If we contrast the seven industries which have the highest composite net profit with the seven that have the lowest net, there is a difference in investment ratios that may be small but is remarkably consistent. The ten-year ratio for the higher profit industries is 14.1% while for the lower profit industries it is 13.0%. The five-year average for the higher profit group is 15.5%, for the lower profit group it is 14.8%. And last year the outlay by the more profitable industries was 14.2%, compared with 10.1% for the lower profit industries.

One can ask: Are the better companies more profitable because of more capital investments, or do they make more investments because they are more profitable? Is it a chicken-egg question, but the correlation is too great to be accident. It suggests that profits and investment go together and each makes growth of the other possible.

RELATION TO DEPRECIATION

The ratio of capital investment to depreciation for these companies may prove surprising to many. The U.S. Treasury Department devised the reserve ratio test some years ago to force companies to invest in new equipment at the rate at which they depreciated the old. However, the test proved so cumbersome and so hard to meet that application of the test has been repeatedly postponed and will be cancelled under the revised procedures recently developed by Treasury. Abandonment of the reserve ratio test has been denounced as a "giveaway" to business. Much of this criticism has suggested that business is not investing at a rate comparable to that at which old equipment is being depreciated.

These ratios provided evidence to the contrary. Even last year there were only 20 of

the 129 companies that spent less than the amount of depreciation they took. When you look at the five-year average, there is only one company (Ampco Pittsburgh) that has spent at a lower rate than it has been depreciating.

And for the past five years there have been 53 companies whose capital outlays have been more than twice the depreciation rate!

Such levels of capital spending in relation to the amount of depreciation taken refute the charge that proposals to accelerate depreciation are a "raid on the Treasury," but they do not give as realistic a picture of investment practices of companies as does the basic ratio of capital spending to gross plant.

In the table on this page, for example, you see that the makers of railroad equipment are spending the most in relation to depreciation (nearly three times as much) yet are not really making a large increase in value of gross plant. In contrast, the office-machinery producers are spending less than average in relation to depreciation but have the most rapidly growing plants of any.

These and other seeming inconsistencies in the comparison on this page reflect both the cumulative effect of capital investment on depreciation and the options currently available to business as to the type of depreciation booked.

The amount of depreciation a company can charge is a reflection of the amount of money previously invested, the timing of that investment, and the method of depreciation used. Such accelerated methods as declining balance and sum-of-the-digits permit more of the capital investment to be recovered in the early years of use, compared with conventional (or straight-line) depreciation, which spreads the recovery evenly over the estimated life of the asset.

A company that has been spending relatively little and then begins to spend at a higher ratio to gross plant will find that several years are required to bring annual depreciation charges in line with the new levels of capital outlay. Of course, if the company uses accelerated depreciation rates, it will happen more quickly than if straight-line rates are used. It would appear from this evidence that the average office-machinery firm is making much more effective use of the capital recovery provisions of the present tax regulations than is the average railroad-equipment manufacturer.

There are, of course, industries such as automotive, farm machinery, and hardware where the ratio of capital investment to depreciation is low because the ratio of investment to gross plant is low. In the same way there are industries like photographic and electronics where both ratios are high.

It is probably also safe to generalize that industries with a high ratio to depreciation are following more "conservative" policies—and paying higher taxes as a result.

THE IMPACT OF CASH FLOW

Cash flow in a company is essentially the net profit after taxes, plus depreciation. Retained cash flow is this same figure minus the money paid out in dividends. Any money spent on capital investment in addition to the retained cash flow is money that will have to be borrowed on either a short-term or a long-term basis.

The table on this page shows that 12 of the 20 industry groups averaged a level of investment that was higher than the level of internal funds available during the past five years. Some, but not all, of the industries where relatively high rates of investment are maintained have gone into debt to do it in recent years. However, many of the industries with the highest borrowing needs seem to have been companies that were earlier maintaining relatively low rates of investment.

COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL COMPANIES

Here are some points worth noting about companies in several industry groups:

Aerospace.—The industry as a whole has been winding down very tightly in view of the discouraging outlook for aerospace. All but Martin-Marietta held outlays last year below retained cash flow. Boeing has done the fastest turnaround from an average of more than 24% on gross plant for the past five years to only 2% last year.

Automotive.—The most striking feature in this group is the consistently low investment levels (for its size) at General Motors. The level of the industry as a whole is low, and it has been declining in recent years. Even so, the GM investment runs more than \$1 billion a year and in a year of poor profit like 1970 required an outlay equal to 2.5 times the net cash flow. Note that Ford, which normally spends a higher proportion, cut more sharply last year than GM, while Chrysler with a net loss cut the sharpest of any firm in the industry.

Construction, mining, material handling.—All of the companies in this group show essentially the same pattern: They increased spending in the last half of the '60s over the first half but then cut back sharply last year. A notable exception is Schulumberger, which increased capital outlays substantially last year—but net profit was the highest of any firm reported in the group, even though off substantially from the year before.

Electrical.—Emerson Electric runs against the pattern here. The company made a higher investment last year than the average for either the last five or the last ten years. Because of high profitability the company has done this out of retained cash flow.

Electronic.—Four of the companies in this sample (Admiral, AMP, Fairchild, and Hewlett-Packard) managed investments in excess of 20% of their gross plant last year, though all but AMP had trimmed below the average for recent years.

Farm machinery.—The pattern here is similar to that in the automotive industry, perhaps because nobody is making much money. Wickes is an exception, but that investment is largely going into retail and service operations, not into manufacturing.

General industrial machinery.—Gardner-Denver and Hobart each increased their investment levels last year, compared with the previous five years. Most of the firms have been handling investment from cash flow.

Metalworking machinery.—Net operating losses last year caused investment at both Brown & Sharpe and Giddings & Lewis to exceed four times net cash flow, though each firm cut the level to about half that of the previous five-year average.

Photographic.—Polaroid has averaged an investment equal to 27% of its gross plant in each of the past ten years and was up to nearly 34% last year.

Office machinery.—Several companies in this group have been expanding with unusual rapidity. Xerox has the highest investment, 48%, for the ten-year average, of any company in the study. Xerox was relatively quiet last year, investigating only 27% more in gross plant. Burroughs, with a ten-year average of 26%, was up to 36% last year. And IBM edged to 27% last year—and that is 27% of a \$9.5 billion existing gross plant.

Special industry machinery.—Black & Decker has been increasing its rate of investment, generally without exceeding net cash flow, and reached nearly 22% last year. It has the highest net return in the industry sample shown here.

Conglomerates.—The mixed nature of these companies makes comparisons difficult, but notice how much more heavily and consistently Litton and ITT invest than do the others.

FOURTEEN COMMON PANACEAS

Almost everybody has the key to full employment. The trouble is that almost everybody has a different key. Some of the proposed solutions, like the recent \$2-billion appropriation to expand public works, are

methods of making work for the unemployed rather than methods of creating conditions for full employment.

Most people also think of full employment as being something less than 100% employment. Recent experience has confirmed that when unemployment comes down near 4% virtually everyone who wants a job can find one. When it is at 5% or 6%, many people are unable to find work.

On the following pages we consider the fourteen basic proposals most frequently advanced in a serious way as keys to full employment.

PROMOTE EXPORT EFFORTS

The United States has never relied heavily on exports. For more than 20 years we have exported only about 4% of our gross national product while many other nations have exports that total 15% or more of their GNP. At the same time, our imports have continued to rise; and although we still have a favorable trade balance, it is continuing to slip. The Labor Department estimated that as many jobs in the U.S. are now dependent on imports as on exports.

Several ways to promote exports are getting prime attention in Washington, although none seems to hold the prospect of a major breakthrough. Some officials, notably in the Commerce Department, feel that America has little growth potential in exports because the nation lacks an overall, unified export policy.

Beyond the establishment of a national export policy, the U.S. can consider several other means to increase the number of goods it sells abroad. The Administration has already been urged to mount a major export drive, to underwrite drives by manufacturers, and to make the financing of exports more accessible.

Pros and Cons.—The benefits from exports are many. By selling more American goods abroad, we can improve our balance of payments and create more jobs at home. An ironic drawback is that some U.S. firms may decide to move abroad when they discover techniques of marketing overseas. Another disadvantage might be the timing. Some manufacturers question the value of export promotion at this time, claiming that it isn't lack of drive but the high price of American manufacturing that is holding back exports.

Evaluation.—It is vital to promote an "export climate" in the United States, and perhaps the recent creation of the Council on International Economic Policy is a step in that direction. It will take much more, however, before manufacturers in America's heartland realize that the nation must export to survive. We need to educate both labor and management in this area.

We also need trained and experienced men from the Commerce Department, not the State Department, in commercial posts at embassies.

REVISE EXPORT POLICY

Just as restrictions on imports affect the nation's industrial health, limitations on exports have at least as great an impact. But unlike the former, restraints on exports have their foundation in military considerations. Virtually all policy-makers agree that there is no reason to restrict exports except to prevent other nations from obtaining militarily valuable products.

The cold war made the United States very sensitive on this issue, but prolongation of the stalemate has paradoxically caused some officials to believe that we might as well be exporting more products to Communist nations. A breakdown of Russia's hegemony over those nations has intensified the belief.

Until very recently it was next to impossible to sell production items that might go toward a military use in the Soviet Union. Machine tools were a prime example. Now policy has changed, and the Administration has even okayed a substantial list of products that can be sold to Communist China.

Another type of export restriction prohibits the selling of technology to other countries. Except where military considerations are involved, the U.S. has never had such restraints. Suggestions in their favor, however, are now occasionally heard, particularly from organized labor; it contends that the exporting of technology in the form of licensing agreements has been a giveaway to foreign competitors.

The IUE, for example, has a list of 177 RCA licensing agreements with Japanese electronics producers, 61 agreements made by Western Electric, 79 by General Electric, 27 by Bendix, and about 169 other agreements by firms that read like a Who's Who of U.S. manufacturers.

Pros and Cons.—By restricting the export of products with a military potential, the United States might be able to ease its military expenditures at home. By limiting license agreements abroad, the nation might not have to worry about an influx of products made more cheaply overseas with American technology.

On the other hand, it has proved almost impossible to prevent manufacturers from selling to Communist countries, and enforcement will be an even bigger problem as multi-national companies grow in number. While imported products made with American technology are an inevitable consequence of licensing agreements, such agreements allow U.S. companies to make bigger profits from R&D investments. A limitation on overseas licensing might, therefore, reduce the incentive to innovate.

Evaluation.—Communist nations are going to import just about whatever they want, if not from the United States then from other nations. The key to deciding what products to embargo should be their availability from other countries. If the United States is the sole producer of a particular high-technology item with military value, then we may be justified in not selling it behind the Iron Curtain. But otherwise, we might as well make a profit from our enemies as well as our friends. "If we'd sold Russia a fleet of F-111s, the U.S. could have assured itself of air superiority," a Defense Department official said off the record—and only half-jokingly.

Restrictions on licensing agreements would be harmful to the United States and to its manufacturers, who should be allowed to recoup their investment in research and development. It is naive to believe that foreigners can't make the same developments, and in the meantime other countries may retaliate with licensing restrictions of their own. Cheap imports made with American technology admittedly are a problem, but the solution lies in reducing our own manufacturing costs, not in restricting the sale of technology.

REVISE ANTITRUST LAWS

Business activity has come under increasingly tight control in the United States as the list of anti-trust laws lengthens. Manufacturers are prevented from engaging in a wide range of activities, and many consumer advocates, including Ralph Nader, would like to see the laws enforced more rigidly. One current controversy centers on whether a patent-holder violates anti-trust legislation when he negotiates contracts that call for broad restrictions on use of his patent. Another controversy concerns the applicability of antitrust legislation to American companies doing business overseas.

Legislation now in force puts the same restrictions on overseas business practices as it does on domestic operations. Pressure is mounting, however, for a relaxation of the outside the U.S. in order to let American firms compete more favorably with foreign manufacturers.

Pros and Cons.—If American companies were allowed to stake out market areas, form monopolies, and join together in making bids

overseas, they could unquestionably do more business. There are definite dangers, however. Relaxing anti-trust laws outside the U.S. may encourage manufacturers to expand abroad at the expense of domestic operations. It might also encourage foreign producers to carve up the U.S. market more effectively. Finally, empire-building by large multi-national companies could lead to cartels that would be difficult to control.

Evaluation.—Some anti-trust restrictions should be eliminated for overseas operations, but we should go easy and by all means work closely with other nations. It might not pay to put much effort in this area, however, since the mood of the country has generally been hostile toward big business, making it next to impossible to change the law.

CONTROL WAGES AND PRICES

The United States used a system of rationing, wage controls, and price controls during World War II. Wage and price controls were imposed again during the Korean War. A set of guidelines based on productivity have also been offered for voluntary use, supported by a certain amount of "jawboning" and arm-twisting from the White House.

Wage and price controls have generally been applied during periods in which the demand exceeded the supply. In recent years there have been increasing demands from business for wage control and from labor for price control.

Pros and Cons.—Proponents of price control argue that it will end the greed of big business and stop inflation. Those for wage control argue that organized union labor is a new factor in the economic picture with great power and an immunity to the forces of the free market.

Opponents say that wage and price controls have never worked, either in this country or abroad. They say it is politically impossible to have one without the other. Price controls create cumbersome and lasting bureaucracies. They also create black markets. Wage controls are easily evaded because of the power of unions among factory workers and by changing titles and job descriptions for others.

Evaluation.—It is our belief that controls do not work and cannot work. Dale's approach is the only one that might stop inflation, but we find it difficult to conceive the Congress of the United States enacting it. Even if it did, when the two years were up, inflation would start again.

We have never eliminated the bureaucratic thickets that grew with the several previous efforts at control we have had in this century. New controls would only create new thickets atop the existing ones. To attempt to apply controls today would be a classic case of trying to cure a symptom instead of a disease.

LIBERALIZE CAPITAL RECOVERY

Capital recovery and depreciation are the same thing to some people, quite different to others. Depreciation is a concept of writing off the capital base as a piece of equipment wears out. In effect, it converts capital cost to expense as that capital value is used up. Capital recovery suggests the reclaiming of the money tied up in equipment and for other capital needs. In effect, it converts capital cost to expense at some rate not tied to the physical life of the equipment.

No government regulations on the rate at which capital assets were written off were needed until the income tax was started in 1913. The law said the rates had to be "reasonable" and business firms in general followed whatever procedures they had followed previously, though the Treasury's Bulletin F, first published in 1920, began to deal with the subject, suggesting acceptable lives and indicating a preference for straight-line methods of depreciation.

In 1933 the House of Representatives considered a bill to reduce depreciation allowances by 25% for three years to increase tax

revenue. The bill was not passed because Treasury promised to do the same thing by regulation—and did by new regulations in 1934. In 1942 the third and final version of Bulletin F was issued. It increased the useful lives (thus reducing depreciation allowances again) for 1038 types of assets, reduced them for 54 types, and left the 1934 lives unchanged for the remaining 1608.

After nearly two decades of demands for "accelerated depreciation," the Treasury in 1954 authorized the use of a choice of depreciation methods: straight-line, double-declining-balance, sum-of-the-years digits, or any other method that would not result in a larger write-off during the first two-thirds of the asset's life than the double-declining-balance method.

In straight-line depreciation, the cost of the asset is divided by the number of years assigned as its "life" and this amount is deducted as an expense each year. Thus, a \$50,000 piece of equipment with a ten-year life is depreciated at \$5000 a year.

In the double-declining-balance method, you take double the amount of depreciation but apply it to the undepreciated balance. Thus, a \$50,000 asset with ten-year life would be depreciated at \$10,000 (20% of \$50,000) the first year, \$8000 (20% of \$40,000) the second year, \$6400 (20% of \$32,000) the third year, and so on. By this method, the asset is never fully written off. The taxpayer has the choice of considering the unwritten remainder as salvage value or of switching to the straight-line method at the end of the fourth year.

In the sum-of-the-years digits method, depreciation is taken by adding up the digits in the life of the asset (1 2 3 4, etc.) and using this as the denominator of the fraction of which the numerator is the inverse of the year of use. Thus, for a \$50,000 asset with a ten-year life, the sum is 55, and the fraction the first year would be 10/55, or \$9090. The second year, it would be 9/55, or \$8180, and so on.

The relative merit of the three methods varies with the life of the assets, but, as a practical matter, it is generally necessary for one company to use the same method for all its assets, or for all of one class of assets.

In 1967, 13 years after the accelerated methods had been legalized, a survey reported by Norman Ture indicated that only 45% of corporate assets were being depreciated by the faster methods.

The 1954 changes in procedure had not changed the prescribed lives of equipment, and the demand for this continued. In 1962 the Treasury abolished Bulletin F and replaced it with *Revenue Procedures 62-21*. This established new group of assets, shortened lives by 20 to 25%, and gave taxpayers the option of using even shorter lives if they were justified by the firm's replacement practices.

The 1962 changes also established the reserve ratio test. Starting in 1965, this test was to measure the correctness of the useful lives established by a firm. Ratios were calculated for each guideline class by dividing total depreciation allowances claimed to date on the class by the original cost of such assets. The resulting ratios were to be compared with tables provided in *Revenue Procedure 62-21* to separate the good guys from the bad guys. Application of this test has repeatedly been postponed.

In 1970 a Task Force on Business Taxation appointed by President Nixon proposed abandoning the concept of depreciation based on useful life and replacing it with a concept of capital recovery based on economic considerations, the elimination of the reserve ratio test, the grouping of assets into new and simpler classes with a 40% shortening of lives, and several procedural changes.

In 1971 the Treasury announced new regulations that encompass a 20% shortening of lives and most of the other proposals of the Task Force. This group of proposals, generally

called the ADR (for Asset Depreciation Range) system, will presumably be finally adopted sometime this year, retroactive to last January 1.

Pros and Cons.—Businessmen generally favor faster depreciation methods and shorter lives in theory but often don't use them in practice because they reduce profits now. Engineers tend to view the whole subject with suspicion but are usually shocked to discover that faster depreciation reduces the return on investment and makes it harder to justify the purchase of new equipment. Labor leaders tend to view any capital recovery as a tax loophole designed to permit exorbitant profits.

More and more companies have been dealing with these problems in recent years by accounting for depreciation by accelerated methods for tax purposes and by slower methods for profit reporting to the stockholders. When this is done, the difference shows up on the balance sheet as a reserve for future taxes.

Recently, proponents of liberalized depreciation have been pushing the capital recovery concept in which, because of the ravages of inflation on the value of the assets of companies, prudence dictates a shorter capital write-off period that can be justified under the useful-life concept. Some of these argue that the two-sets-of-books approach is acceptable; others, that management should tell it straight and educate the public to accept the lower profits and higher cash flow that go with speedy capital recovery.

The Tax Foundation said recently that "a half century of thought and debate have not produced agreement on issues involved in depreciation policy for tax purposes. The matters involved are complex, extending beyond the amount of the tax and the timing of payment, to the effectiveness with which the economy will function. Depreciation tax policy exerts a strong influence on investment incentives, the supply of modern productive facilities, and thus on the rate of progress of the economy as a whole."

Evaluation.—Both political parties and many points of view were included in the President's Task Force on Business Taxation, and their proposals represent the soundest compromise between what is desirable and what is feasible that AM has seen. Opinions in Congress are so sharply divided that the Administration chose the quicker, surer, but partial route of ADR. Rightly so. Once ADR is established, an effort to legislate the larger changes of the Task Force proposals is anticipated, but the outcome of that effort is unpredictable.

REINSTATE TAX INCENTIVES

A major innovation in tax policy in the United States was the investment tax credit of 1962. This was intended to work with the new depreciation guidelines as an extra incentive for investment.

Essentially, the credit provided for a reduction in tax liability equal to 7% of the investment in new machinery and equipment. Originally, the asset's cost had to be reduced, for depreciation purposes, by the amount of the tax credit. In 1964 this requirement was eliminated.

The investment credit was not enthusiastically supported by either business or most observers on the economic scene when first proposed.

The investment credit did prove to be the strong incentive that had been promised by its advocates. This was clearly demonstrated when the credit, suspended in 1966, was reinstated earlier than originally planned in 1967.

The investment credit was permanently repealed in 1969 at the request of President Nixon. In 1971 several bills to restore the investment credit have been introduced, but none has reached the stage of committee hearings.

Pros and Cons.—Gaps were popular in

1962, and Treasury Secretary Dillon said the investment credit was needed to close the "depreciation gap" between the United States and other industrial nations. Experience with it has led advocates to say it is easy to use, equitable in its application to all types of capital equipment, and extremely effective as an incentive.

Opponents object that it is a subsidy to business, that, if there is to be tax relief, it should be provided to individuals and not to business. The credit is also blamed for overheating the economy and causing inflation. Proponents counter that it only overheats the economy when its withdrawal is anticipated.

Tax credits have also been proposed for a variety of specific objectives: manpower training, low-income housing, location of business in ghetto or poverty areas, anti-pollution equipment, and so on. It was generally believed that the 1969 repeal was to clear the way for such special credits in ghetto areas. If so, the plans have evidently been changed.

Evaluation.—We believe that, without question, the investment tax credit is the most effective stimulus to capital investment that has been devised. It is fair and effective and, so long as we rely on the corporate income tax instead of the value-added tax, we believe it is needed. We do not favor investment credits for special purposes because they do tend to work unfairly and to further unbalance the tax system. Such purposes should be served by direct subsidies, as is now done with low-income housing, rather than tax credits.

However, there have been four bruising battles in Congress over the investment credit: 1962, 1966, 1967, 1969. We are not optimistic that there will be a fifth battle or that the proponents of the credit could win if there were.

ADOPT A VALUE-ADDED TAX

The value-added tax is a tax paid on the value added at each step in any economic process. In effect, the tax is shown as a separate item on every invoice as a percentage of the total value of the invoice. A business pays the total tax shown on sales invoices minus the total tax shown on purchase invoices.

Historically, the tax was used in France at the wholesale level but in its present form was first adopted in Denmark in 1967. All countries belonging to the European Common Market are now required to use the tax. The tax is generally passed on to customers and is often confused with a sales tax, but it is essentially different in being divided up in its application among all the different people who contribute to the product or service.

The value-added tax is applied at the border to imports, in addition to the tariff, and is rebated at the border on exports.

Pros and Cons.—The tax is simple and easy to collect. It provides a simple way to equalize tax treatment between countries with different tax rates. Thus, a Frenchman pays a 20% VAT on a car whether it was made in France, Germany, or the United States. A German pays a 10% VAT on the same car.

Because the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade permits the rebate of value-added taxes on exports and their imposition on imports but does not permit the same treatment for corporate income taxes, those countries that rely on the income tax are at a disadvantage in trading with those that rely on VAT.

Proponents of the tax generally want it as a partial substitute for the income tax, perhaps being paid as a deduction from the income tax. Opponents are certain that the value-added tax would be a new and increased tax, not a substitute.

Other objections are that the tax falls more heavily on the poor and that it is not

in line with traditional forms of tax in this country, where we have relied primarily on the graduated federal income tax.

Evaluation. A few years ago the value-added tax had few friends. It was used in France primarily because it is such a difficult tax to evade. It has begun to acquire support with amazing rapidity, largely because it seemed the only way to provide free trade between Common Market countries while retaining unequal tax rates.

Two of the 15 members of President Nixon's Task Force on Business Taxation favor it. Only two. They are Dan Throop Smith and Norman Ture, and they are an articulate minority. Smith favors the value-added tax as an added source of revenue to meet new tax requirements. Ture favors substituting it for the corporate income tax and the payroll tax both because of the advantage of foreign trade and because of problems inherent in the corporate income tax. The income tax puts a special burden on the capital base that is to the disadvantage of society in a private-enterprise system. It provides a tax shelter for waste and inefficiency. Under a value-added system, a dollar saved in expense would be a dollar of profit, whereas it is not a 50¢ profit.

BOOST RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

One of the traditional strengths of American industry has been its ability to develop new, marketable products. Though much of this development is evolutionary, it has often depended for practical value on basic research and applied engineering. Long-term lubrication periods for automobiles came about through the development of suitable plastic sealing materials; electric toothbrushes hinged on lightweight electric motors; and even computer-controlled machines have come along with electronic miniaturization that was enormously stimulated by aerospace work, which has dropped off in recent years.

R & D in the U.S. includes aerospace work under government sponsorship, commercial efforts at such places as ITRI and Battelle Institute, studies in many U.S. universities working on their own and under commercial contracts, and private in-corporation research aimed at specific products. In total, this mass of R & D is, and has been for years, unmatched in the world.

Pros and Cons.—New products do create new jobs. Providing there is reason for commercial stimulus, it can be shown that an innovative commercial organization can stay with or ahead of the field. It can also be seen that a manufacturer who stubbornly or lazily clings to last decade's design is not long for this world. But research costs money, and a return on this kind of investment, while theoretically sound, may take more (or less) time than estimated. If a manufacturer is in difficult financial straits, research is an easily cut department, even if only "temporarily." In a difficult time on the national scene, government economizing or stretch-out (or cancellations) can seriously disrupt R & D, and has done so recently.

Evaluation.—Research and development is an essential spur to technological alertness and supremacy. It is also a source of commercial starting points for businesses that may not even have been thought of yet. Even though our commercial electronics industry is in current trouble, the nation was able to ride a wave of new ideas for some years, and there may be something comparable just about to break.

But R & D is not something that can be turned on and off at will and still be expected to produce new trade possibilities. It must be largely a continuing effort. For this reason, AM suggests that one of the most thoughtful and long-ranging investments the government can make in the future of the country is continued efforts at the R & D level. Even if cut, R & D must be considered vital.

There is also a special situation in existence at the moment. Many scientific authorities have suggested that new ideas have, for some years, been coming out of advanced research at a rate far beyond our capacity to develop and commercialize them. If this is so, more emphasis should be placed on development engineering to spur the ripening of potentially valuable commercial possibilities. The temptation to put a little less emphasis on pure research should be resisted. It always looks easy to postpone this if we have to let up on something. But the long range effects are so serious that we had better resist the temptation.

EXTEND AUTOMATION

Manufacturing technology itself offers potential solutions, and one of the more potent of these is automation. This boils down, quite literally, into a proposition of giving each individual worker more and better tools with which he can lift his real productivity.

The U.S. has long been the acknowledged leader in the field of industrial automation, a result of its having been one of the earliest mass markets. It is still the leader. But at least two factors are working to reduce the effectiveness of the technological gap if not its actual breadth.

These are:

1. Manufacturers in other nations of the industrial world are increasingly adopting automated methods. They are borrowing upon, or actually licensing American-born techniques. And they are developing their own; the U.S. has no patent on ingenuity.

In combination with basically lower wage rates, even a degree of automation lower than that which is typical in many U.S. industries provides competitive leverage. This demands redoubled efforts from U.S. manufacturers.

2. The basic nature of automation itself is changing, a fact that is not as widely recognized as it should be. The revolution in automation, and it is one, is the swing away from mass marketing and mass production. Today's consumers, whether industrial, governmental, or just the man in the street, are increasingly expecting industry to provide them with specially tailored products.

This, of course, has a profound effect on the demands placed on industry's manufacturing arm. The primary new requirement is for flexibility—which is precisely what "traditional" automation finds most difficult.

Pros and Cons.—There is no question that lifting the real productivity of the American labor force by means of automated equipment can strongly enhance the competitive attractiveness of U.S. manufactured products—both here and abroad.

But this must be achieved without excessive additions to capital cost. Automated equipment is not cheap. And as long as any single task can be performed cheaper by manual labor, the automation of that specific task is economically unjustifiable.

Organized labor often puts forth the case that automation replaces people. This is undeniable. This is the essential characteristic of automation that makes it attractive to industry.

Evaluation.—Although the latter negative cannot be denied, it must be recognized as both a short-term and microcosmic truth. More important from the national perspective is that the long-term effect is to increase the sum-total of employment.

Displacement of a man by a machine is a personal tragedy, but failure to automate provides only temporary extension of employment. Businesses which fail to keep pace with the most economic techniques of production simply go out of business sooner or later.

On the other hand, those companies which do modernize their facilities have a better chance to prosper and grow, thus providing increased employment. Overall employment is further enhanced by the creation of jobs

in those industries producing and servicing the automated equipment and associated controls.

The question of high cost is also undeniable. But all too often the cost of not automating is still higher. Sharp pencils are mandatory in any such major investment, especially since the adoption of automated techniques has effects throughout a corporate organization—whether or not these effects are recognized by management. Total reorganization of manufacturing operations may be desirable for fullest achievement of automation's potential.

Also vital is the recognition by management that automation in the '70's calls for far greater flexibility than in the past. Equipment of this type inherently provides the ability to adjust not only to individualized production but also to future product and production changes. Manufacturing management must heed the military injunction that generals should not prepare to fight the previous war.

ADJUST THE EXCHANGE RATES

Our inability to increase exports significantly indicates to some economists that the dollar has become an overvalued currency because of inflation and a variety of other reasons. Our products, they say, cannot compete effectively on the international market because they cost more than they should in terms of marks, yen, francs, guilders, pounds, and other foreign currencies.

Therefore, some say we should simply recognize the fact and devalue the dollar in relation to other currencies.

Pros and Cons.—A devaluation of 5% or 10% would immediately cut the price of our exports and increase the price of our imports by a corresponding percentage. This would cause a tremendous improvement in our balance of trade.

However, there's no reason why we should expect other countries to accept such a change without fighting back to preserve their markets. Many, in fact, might simply devalue their own currencies by an equal percentage so that there would be no net change.

Furthermore, the international monetary agreements, with their fixed rates of exchange, have been a major factor in the booming international trade of the past quarter century. Because of these fixed rates, companies engaged in international trade have been able to make contracts with some degree of confidence that the values agreed upon at the time a contract is signed will be the same as the values in effect when the contract is completed. Any change in the established rates threatens international trade because it upsets the delicate balance on which this trade depends.

It's true that there have been devaluations, and there have been upward revaluations of different currencies. However, both types of adjustment have occurred only in cases of dire necessity.

Evaluation: The main handicap of this proposal is that, because of technical reasons, it is not actually possible. The dollar is pegged only to the price of gold; other currencies are pegged to the dollar. Thus, under the present setup, the United States cannot change the price of its currency with respect to other currencies.

However, other countries can adjust the price of their currencies with respect to the dollar. This has happened recently when Switzerland, for example, boosted the price of its franc by 7% and West Germany allowed the mark to "float" until it finds an accepted price. These moves were made reluctantly and only because of a monetary crisis that could not be corrected any other way.

If the dollar is overvalued as some people claim, there may be other moves such as these. However, we don't believe the United States is in such dire circumstances that it should urge other countries to take this action. Inflation is a worldwide phenomenon,

after all, and the rate of inflation in many countries is now higher than it is in the United States.

RAISE TARIFFS

Higher tariffs are the classic measure to halt the influx of imported products. By raising duties on imports or by increasing the list of goods subject to existing duties, a country can put up an effective barrier against foreign producers. A more protectionist tariff policy in the United States might mean that consumers could no longer buy cheap Italian shoes, but it could also stem the tide of such imports as machine tools and electronic equipment.

The U.S. has been oriented toward free trade since the 1930s, but protectionist pressures have recently been mounting, initially from industries hurt by imports, and then by some unions. The latter move is surprising since unions have been among the most vocal champions of free trade.

Pros and Cons.—The advantages of tariffs are obvious. They protect home industries and increase federal revenue. According to most economists, however, the disadvantage is that the protectionist measures only appear to work. A case can be made for shielding infant industries from large and experienced foreign competitors, but U.S. policy-makers generally believe that high tariffs merely protect domestic industries that aren't efficient enough to meet foreign competition, and, at the same time, raise prices on imported products.

Evaluation.—American Machinist agrees with those economists who hold that the optimum trade situation occurs when each nation produces the goods it can make most efficiently and sells these to other nations, buying in return the products which others make more efficiently. Industries tend to become more efficient when they're exposed to competition. Beyond this concept, we also note the historical failure of protectionist measures to achieve economically desirable goals.

One of the strongest arguments against tariffs is the fact that free trade breeds peace. Henry Ford II recently put it this way: "International trade does not make war impossible but *does* make it less likely. It was no accident that World War II came at the end of a decade in which international trading relations had been disrupted by depression, the collapse of international monetary arrangements, and prohibitive tariff increases. The interweaving of Western Europe's economies since World War II has now made it unthinkable, for the first time in history, that any country in the West could make war on any other."

UPGRADE MANUFACTURING CONTROL

One factor sometimes limiting the ability of workers to work effectively is the ability of managers to manage effectively. This is not necessarily a result of managerial incompetence. Rather, it is increasingly the result of a corporation falling behind in the techniques of management control while its competitors, wherever they may be located, forge ahead in adopting and adapting effective new manufacturing control concepts.

Seat-of-the-pants management is no longer a sharp enough instrument to achieve optimum economy in manufacturing operations, especially the larger and more complex ones. Paring non-productive costs (inventories of raw material, parts in process, and finished goods, for example) without hampering manufacturing operations or delivery of products demands a delicate balance of knowing what to do and when to do it. Which, in turn, demands timely information as the basis of decisions.

A new phase of the industrial revolution is now taking place in which management is the recipient of the improved tooling. This, of course, is the use of computers not merely to count money but, more importantly, to help make money.

Call it "data feedback;" call it "a systems concept." Whatever you call it, it is an area in which this nation leads the world.

Pros and Cons.—Simply stated, an effective manufacturing control system provides needed information when it's needed for decision-making on a rational basis. This is true with or without computers. The computer provides a new potential for speedy reporting and for correlating more factors than a human mind can accommodate at a single time.

Objections are many. The expense is high, for both data-processing hardware and the necessary software. Implementing such a system is a lengthy process. The system often fails to function as promised. Management can be literally deluged with printouts. Fiascos can result—and there have been some lulus!

Evaluating.—Some of the successes of computerized management information systems, both in manufacturing activities and in overall corporate operations, have been so striking that the concept must not be overlooked. Benefits, in terms of productivity per manufacturing dollar, can be immense.

One of the principal difficulties that must be overcome in design, implementation, and application of these new techniques is their very newness. Both the length and the breadth of experience in the field are still quite limited. There is still some tendency to have such systems designed by computer experts. And, while these people are certainly necessary and valuable, it must be remembered that they are not necessarily experts in the particular field and the specific company for which the system is being designed. Much time and much money can go down the drain if the design team does not include experts in both computer systems and the specific manufacturing situations involved.

Radical reorganization of the manufacturing—even the corporate—structure is often necessary for effective use of computerized management information and control schemes. Of itself, this is neither good nor bad. It demands thoughtful analysis for each specific case. And where such change is really found desirable, care should be taken in any compromises. Half a loaf may be worse than none.

On balance, the computerization of manufacturing management offers considerable promise as a means toward more efficient production, and it is an area in which the U.S. currently holds a world lead. This combination, thus, provides a unique potential for improving the competitive position of American manufacturers. This means jobs.

CHANGE NON-TARIFF BARRIERS

Subtle means of restricting imports are often used by countries that don't want to raise duties. Quotas, which limit the number of products that can be imported, are the most familiar type of non-tariff barrier. Others include border taxes and laws which, in dozens of different ways, make it difficult for foreign producers to sell goods on the domestic market. Foreign boiler-makers, for instance, often charge that boiler standards in the U.S. are, in effect, a non-tariff barrier.

American manufacturers come up against another type of barrier in some countries which prevents them from selling unless they also manufacture there. A non-tariff barrier of increasing popularity, especially in Latin America, maintains that a minimum percentage of important products must be locally manufactured.

The IUE, IBEW, and the IAM have drawn up a seven-point program designed to reduce the flood of imports by both tariff and non-tariff barriers, the latter including a truth-in-labeling law to identify the manufacturer and the origin of imported products. The IUE has also suggested a quota based on the average level of imports from Japan during

the 1950s when only 28% of the consumer electronic goods came from Japan.

Pros and Cons.—Because of the wide variety of non-tariff barriers, it is almost impossible to make a clear-cut distinction between advantages and disadvantages. Local-content laws have certainly helped countries like Mexico develop industries which they might not otherwise have, but it's difficult to tell what they gave up in the process. Many economists feel that non-tariff barriers are tolerable when their object is to stimulate domestic industry or when they merely make foreigners pay a premium for tapping the domestic market.

Evaluation.—Most Americans feel that the U.S. has been naive about non-tariff barriers and has negotiated the lowering of tariffs with too little attention to these other barriers. AM feels that more specific information needs to be developed on how such barriers work and how effective they are. Armed with such information, we would be in a better position to negotiate their elimination on an equalizing basis or to justify the barriers we did install. In the absence of such information, a "Christmas Tree" trade bill (one with something for every special interest), such as the 1970 bill created in the House and defeated in the Senate, could become reality. The likelihood is that this would merely lead to reciprocal action by other nations.

CURB UNION POWER

By and large, the labor unions, in their efforts to secure decent working conditions and improve the income of their members, have worked for the benefit of the country and the economy.

Now, however, there are many who say the pendulum has swung too far, that the unions have too much power and that they are using it irresponsibly. They say that, because of exorbitant wage demands and because of restrictive work rules ("featherbedding"), it is the unions that are pushing the prices of American products too high for the world market and that are, at the same time, stimulating the flow of imports made by foreign workers. There must be some way to curb the power causing these evils.

Pros and Cons.—If there is, in fact, a way to curb union power, the result might eventually improve this country's competitive position in the world market and thus improve our trade balance. On the other hand, it might also start a trend back to the sweatshop conditions that gave rise to the unions in the first place.

Evaluation.—We do not believe there is any way to legislate a reduction in union power, nor do we believe it would necessarily be a good thing. We believe that the correct solutions to labor-management problems are more likely to be achieved through free collective bargaining, with the government staying neutral, than through any legalistic formulas or government intervention.

THE REAL SHAPE OF THE KEY

Let us review the basic problem. There is a drift in the United States economy from basic manufacturing to service that has long been evident. In recent years this drift has accelerated. One measure of that acceleration is the rising ratio of imports to exports in manufactured goods. Another measure is the rising volume of foreign capital investments.

A customer faced with a choice between two products for which the price, quality, and availability are equal, with the only difference being that one is domestic and one is foreign, will almost always select the domestic product. That is true anywhere in the world. Therefore, when our imports rise or our exports fall we are being beaten in price, quality, delivery, or some combination of these factors.

In most cases, we are being beaten in price. Price depends mostly on cost, and cost is essentially the cost of materials plus the

quotient of wages divided by productivity. As wages go up, cost goes up; a productivity goes up, cost goes down.

Not only has our shrinking trade balance contributed to unemployment, it has been the alarm reporting the extent to which inflation has unbalanced our economy. If we find the way to enlarge our ability to compete in international markets we will at the same time be finding the way to curb inflation at home and we will have found the key to full employment.

If you stuck with us this far, it should be clear, as it was to us at an early stage in our research, that the "key" to full employment is not to be found in a single technique. Not one of the fourteen groups of solutions we have reviewed here possesses the capacity of a cure-all. Yet several of them hold major promise as contributing factors. As we fit them together, we can begin to discern the real shape of the solution.

First, we must reject several of the most popular proposals. Each of these has a strong appeal to some group but each of them treats effects rather than causes or exact penalties that make them unacceptable.

We must reject the use of higher tariffs or quotas, however tempting, for the simple reason that they do not correct the problem, they hide it. Tariffs and quotas protect inefficiency and incompetence at home and invite retaliation abroad. The pressure of imports is today a strong and effective form of wage and price control at home. Without this pressure we would have to resign ourselves to an inflation that would curl the longest hair.

For the same reasons we reject the use of restrictions on foreign investment. Such restrictions do not help the balance of payments. They do not stop the export of jobs; they only insure that the jobs exported by loss of competitive ability will land in foreign firms as well as on foreign shores. Such restrictions often make it more difficult for domestic firms to establish the base they need to export effectively.

We reject proposals to curb union power. For unions to work as diligently as possible for their members is as natural as for politicians to seek votes and for corporations to seek profits. Illegal activities should be curbed, as they sometimes are not, and it is no longer necessary for government to lean on the union side to balance the forces in negotiations, but we do not believe that the American people want labor returned to its unorganized position, and we believe they are correct in this view.

Non-tariff barriers cannot be dismissed so easily. Each barrier has a different rationale and its promoters will deny that it is intended as a barrier. To foreign firms our boiler code, our insurance requirements for tests by Underwriters Laboratories, and our new Federal requirements on bumper height and shock resistance are each a non-tariff barrier, yet none of them were established for that purpose. We suspect that many barriers abroad were also started for other purposes. To many American firms the metric system is a barrier. Unfamiliar standards and specifications are barriers. For those exporting to Western Europe the value-added tax is a barrier.

The impact of many of these measures has been underestimated in past negotiations of tariff reductions. They need to be studied and then a balance developed by hard-headed negotiation just as labor contracts, tariffs, or other agreements are negotiated. Because the primary blame for our worsening trade situation does not belong to the non-tariff barriers, their reduction, while desirable, will work no miracles.

Archaic restrictions on exports such as those that prevent the shipment of once-strategic products now available from many countries should be reduced but again will not provide major help.

It is clear from the charts at the beginning of this report that if we are to restore vigor to durable goods manufacturing in ways that will stimulate full employment, we must create conditions that will stimulate sensible capital investment. This is the real shape of part of the key.

The most effective way to stimulate capital investment tried so far has been the investment tax credit. This magazine was one of the earliest supporters of the credit when John Kennedy first proposed it. At that time the credit was opposed by many businessmen and many legal and trade groups. It is now supported by many who once opposed it and opposed by many of its early supporters.

Four congressional battles over the credit, each lasting for months, produced indecision and confusion in planning and tangled the financial and tax records of companies in enduring ways. Currently the credit is seriously proposed as a useful temporary device specifically because it provides temporary stimulation both when it is turned on and when it is about to be turned off. Such misuse of the credit can only accentuate the unavoidable cycles in our economy. We like the credit and believe it is the most effective stimulant yet tried, but we no longer believe it can be made a permanent part of our tax structure. We had better look elsewhere for any real solution.

The conventional cry for three decades has been, under various names, for more rapid capital recovery for tax purposes. A thoughtful study of the problem was made last year by a politically mixed group of 15 lawyers, bankers, economists, and businessmen—the President's Task Force on Business Taxation. In essence, the proposal was to abandon the useful-life concept of depreciation and base capital recovery on economic considerations, including inflation. Types of assets would be assembled in groups and permissible lives shortened up to 40%.

In order to achieve prompt action, the Administration in January adopted by administrative order a series of changes, called the Asset Depreciation Range or ADR plan, that would achieve something over half the impact of the Task Force plan. Despite the protests this action has aroused, it seems likely to stand and thus seems a good pragmatic move. However, we believe the full Task Force proposals are a sound change of policy and urge the Congress to enact them into law.

But the underlying villain that has emerged as we have studied the problem is the corporate income tax. All of the problems with capital recovery that have developed in the last 30 years have developed because of the increase in that tax. Capital recovery provisions are significant primarily because of their impact on the amount of corporate income tax due.

During World War II this tax soared to new levels from the pre-war 31%. In the top "excess" bracket it took 95% of each new dollar of profit. This meant that a company in the 95% bracket was buying things with 5¢ dollars. This tax was an incentive to spend lavishly. Among other things it created the expense-account syndrome that persists to this day.

After the war the corporate income tax was reduced to about 50%, a figure around which it has since hovered. It is currently at 49% for manufacturing companies.

With a 50% tax rate, a company is buying with 50¢ dollars. In effect the corporate income tax is a tax on efficiency. It is also a tax on capital that discourages investment and encourages debt.

In the same way our "social security taxes" on workers and on employers, currently taking an amount equal to 10.4% of the first \$7800 payroll dollars of each worker, are a tax on labor that discourages the use of labor. Some people argue that the two taxes, the income tax which discourages capital and the

July 19, 1971

payroll tax which discourages labor, are countervailing. The declining comparative efficiency of our manufacturing establishments suggests, rather, that they are dragging each other down.

In contrast, the value-added tax is neutral. To substitute it for the corporate income tax would be a grievous blow to companies that now lose money. But every dollar saved would go directly to reduce loss or to increase profits. The greater leverage for the efficient and effective use of resources is evident.

If the value-added tax were substituted for the payroll tax it would reduce the cost of labor in relation to other factors in production and would substitute a neutral tax. To those who protest that the social-security "contribution" is part of a trust fund are out of touch with what is happening in Washington.

If the value-added tax were substituted for the corporate income and the payroll levies, our border tax problems with Western Europe would be solved. We believe, however, that this is less important than the impact it would have on the basic taxation of our manufacturing industries in ways that would stem their decline and move us toward full employment.

Norman Ture, an economist with the Planning Research Corp., has made a detailed and effective review of the case for this view in the report of the Task Force on Business Taxation. His views did not yet persuade the other members of the commission. They have persuaded us.

We think that is part of the key, but only part. Even if government provides the climate to encourage full employment, it is private business that must grow enough and operate efficiently enough to create the jobs. Unless, of course, we wish to abandon the free-enterprise system for some form of national socialism (and very few people who have seen a socialized system in operation do).

Earlier we pointed out that when our imports rise or our exports fall, we are being beaten in some combination of price, quality, and delivery. In contrast, when our imports fall or our exports rise, it is we who have some decisive edge in manufacturing effectiveness. If we look at the detailed table on the imports and exports of various industries in the past decade, we see many substantial rises in exports. Most industries have some winners and some losers even under the present ground rules. A close look at the ratios of the 129 companies in this report suggests substantial differences from industry to industry but equal or greater differences from company to company in each industry.

Improved tax treatment of investment will encourage the kinds of extension of automation that are needed to promote healthy, competitive industries. But obviously some companies are doing pretty well without that improved tax treatment.

And a healthy company also depends as much on effective scheduling, inventory control, motivation of workers, planning of production, control of quality, and other aspects of manufacturing management as it does on a good ratio of investment to gross installed plant. It also depends on an intelligent R & D effort along basic lines, in product development, and in manufacturing methods. These things too are an important part of the shape of the key.

We know of no government regulation, tax, or technique that can effectively distinguish good from bad management and eradicate the latter any more than we know a way to teach owners to recognize the difference between the manager who is motivated to make a record this quarter and the one who is motivated for the long run. But we think that improved capital recovery procedures like

those proposed by the Task Force will help the good guys (and there must be some of them in almost every company) sell the kinds of investment policies that build success.

And we might add that the impact of the value-added tax would be to so enlarge the difference in performance between the effective and the incompetent that ability of the stockholding public to distinguish between the two would be greatly enhanced.

Finally, some companies that are healthy now and some that would become healthy under this system know nothing of the intricate and different business of international trade. We have seen repeated examples of small firms that have been immensely successful. We have seen others that were not. Small companies need skilled help. Sometimes large ones do too.

Fortunately this little piece of the key is available and in good shape. The Bureau of International Commerce has done an increasingly effective job of export promotion in recent years. Its trade shows, its market studies, its specialized assistance have all improved substantially. It still has trouble with inept diplomats who don't care much for commercial matters and with bumbling from lack of bureaucratic coordination. A brilliant trade show and a simultaneous high-level diplomatic negotiation on trade with Mexico were torpedoed a couple of years ago by a simultaneous Treasury campaign to intercept marijuana that temporarily destroyed the U.S. tourist traffic to Mexico. Later a cooperative and more effective program of drug interception was developed but the original blunder undid a lot of patient BIC groundwork.

In this entire analysis there has been no discussion of fiscal and monetary devices for stimulating and depressing the economy. It is not that we don't think the level of taxes and the volume of money are economic factors. They are. But they are not quite the pin on which the universe turns—despite what most economists, politicians, and reporters seem to think.

The real shape of the key to full employment in this country lies in large part in our ability to restore competitive capability to our manufacturing abilities. The program that will do this, in our view, is:

1. A switch to the value-added tax from the corporate income tax and the payroll tax.
2. Enactment of the capital recovery proposals of the Task Force on Business Taxation.
3. Firm resistance to new tariffs or quotas.
4. Negotiated removal of non-tariff barriers.
5. Extended use of manufacturing automation.
6. Improved control of all aspects of manufacturing.
7. Review and modernization of archaic export curbs.
8. Increased use of the effective export promotion programs of the Bureau of International Commerce.

The most controversial of these, yet of central importance, is the form of tax collection from business. Because the value-added tax would have so much impact on how our economy operates it would take place in steps over a period of several years.

Because it is a concept of business taxation so alien to our experience, a lot of searching study, debate, and evaluation must go into its consideration. Because the threat to the manufacturing segment of our economy is real and immediate, it is important that we not waste time in undertaking that consideration. We hope every businessman, every politician, every labor leader, and every tax collector will begin a serious look at how it would affect our economy.

Let us begin.

GERMANY TO PAY PART OF U.S. TROOP EXPENSES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we now learn that our U.S. diplomats in Germany have been able to negotiate with that government to meet the going price of hiring U.S. troops to continue the occupation of Germany.

We can only hope that the troop contract contains an escalator clause for the cost-of-living rise, or at least some protection to our military men so that the Germans meet the proposed military pay raise.

It must be regarded as laudatory action by the West German Government to prefer to hire American soldiers to serve in Germany, rather than to force the young men of Germany to serve in the armed forces of their own country. The same cannot be said of the American leaders.

I insert a newsclipping at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1971]
WEST GERMANY AGREES ON U.S. TROOP
PAYMENTS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

West Germany has yielded to insistent U.S. demands and has agreed to help pay the cost of keeping a 200,000-man American Army within its borders.

The German agreement is a breakthrough acceptance of a U.S. contention that European countries should share the huge overseas American defense burden. The Pentagon will spend \$5 billion in foreign countries this year, including \$1.2 billion in Germany.

The exact amount of the German contribution still is being negotiated but officials say it will total more than \$150 million and could approach \$200 million.

The payment will not be large enough to satisfy Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield and other congressional critics of the heavy overseas U.S. military outlays. Officials stress, however, that burden-sharing now has been accepted and the hope is that larger payments will be obtained in the future.

West German Chancellor Willy Brandt has given only reluctant approval to the support arrangement for it will be politically unpopular.

Despite a U.S. contention that its troops are in Germany as part of a common Free World defense effort, many Germans look on the Americans as an occupation force and bitterly object to helping to support an occupation army.

Brandt has budgetary troubles, too. Inflationary pressures have forced the chancellor to keep a tight rein on government spending. He has been unable to carry out a number of projects he promised the voters and there will be angry criticism of a decision to give more than \$150 million to the United States while German domestic needs go unmet.

But Brandt has been impressed by the isolationist swing in the United States. He was shaken, as other NATO leaders were, when Mansfield proposed in May that the United States bring back half of the 300,000 troops it has in Europe and he has been persuaded that the American people are increasingly loathe to spend their tax dollars to keep a large military force in prosperous Western Europe.

The German burden-sharing arrangement

will be a two-year pact. It will cover fiscal 1972, which began on July 1, and fiscal 1973.

The payments to the U.S. Treasury will be part of a renewed offset agreement under which Germany makes a variety of financial concessions to help the United States cushion the balance of payments impact of its troop commitment. The last offset agreement expired on June 30.

Germany has rejected a U.S. request for an interest-free loan on the ground that it would be illegal but the pact is expected to include a loan of more than \$250 million at an interest rate that will be well below the going cost of money. The last offset agreement featured a 10-year, \$250 million loan at a relatively cheap 3.5 per cent interest cost.

Additional balance of payments aid will come from German purchases of American planes and other weapons. The Bonn government has offered to spend \$435 million a year in this country, but the Administration still is demanding a larger commitment.

The U.S. negotiators are pressing for the best loan terms and biggest defense orders they can get, but it is the burden-sharing agreement that is touching off a few small cheers.

The Germans are not making as generous a contribution as the Administration would like, but they will be paying part of the support costs for the first time and that is an important symbolic gain for the wealthy but overextended United States.

SENATOR MUSKIE'S PERSPECTIVE ON AMERICA

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, Senator MUSKIE, as a Democratic leader, has been speaking across the Nation on some of the major issues facing the United States in this decade. Taken together, these speeches represent a unique and hopeful perspective on the needs of America.

So that more people may be able to have the benefit of our distinguished colleague's views, I ask unanimous consent that these speeches be printed in the RECORD.

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

ELECTION EVE REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, CAPE ELIZABETH, MAINE, NOVEMBER 2, 1970

My Fellow Americans—I am speaking from Cape Elizabeth, Maine—to discuss with you the election campaign which is coming to a close.

In the heat of our campaigns, we have all become accustomed to a little anger and exaggeration.

Yet—on the whole—our political process has served us well—presenting for your judgment a range of answers to the country's problems . . . and a choice between men who seek the honor of public service.

That is our system.

It has worked for almost two hundred years—longer than any other political system in the world.

And it still works.

But in these elections of 1970, something has gone wrong.

There has been name-calling and deception of almost unprecedented volume.

Honorable men have been slandered.

Faithful servants of the country have had their motives questioned and their patriotism doubted.

This attack is not simply the overzealousness of a few local leaders.

It has been led . . . inspired . . . and guided . . . from the highest offices in the land.

The danger from this assault is not that a few more Democrats might be defeated—the country can survive that.

The true danger is that the American people will have been deprived of that public debate—that opportunity for fair judgment—which is the heartbeat of the democratic process.

And that is something the country cannot afford.

Let me try to bring some clarity to this deliberate confusion.

Let me begin with those issues of law and order . . . of violence and unrest . . . which have pervaded the rhetoric of this campaign.

I believe that any person who violates the law should be apprehended . . . prosecuted . . . and punished, if found guilty.

So does every candidate for office of both parties.

And nearly all Americans agree.

I believe everyone has a right to feel secure . . . on the streets of his city . . . and in the buildings where he works or studies.

So does every candidate for office, of both parties.

And nearly all Americans agree.

Therefore, there is no issue of law and order . . . or of violence.

There is only a problem.

There is no disagreement about what we want.

There are only different approaches to getting it.

And the harsh and uncomfortable fact is that no one—in either party—has the final answer.

For four years, a conservative Republican has been Governor of California.

Yet there is no more law and order in California today than when he took office.

President Nixon—like President Johnson before him—has taken a firm stand.

A Democratic Congress has passed sweeping legislation.

Yet America is no more orderly or lawful—nor its streets more safe—than was the case two years ago . . . or four . . . or six.

We must deal with symptoms—

Strive to prevent crime;

Halt violence;

And punish the wrongdoer.

But we must also look for the deeper causes . . . in the structure of our society.

If one of your loved ones is sick, you do not think it is soft or undisciplined of a doctor . . . to try and discover the agents of illness.

But you would soon discard a doctor . . . who thought it enough to stand by the bed . . . and righteously curse the disease.

Yet there are those who seek to turn our common distress to partisan advantage—not by offering better solutions—but with empty threat . . . and malicious slander.

They imply that Democratic candidates for high office in Texas and California . . . in Illinois and Tennessee . . . in Utah and Maryland . . . and among my New England neighbors from Vermont and Connecticut—men who have courageously pursued their convictions . . . in the service of the republic in war and in peace—that these men actually favor violence . . . and champion the wrongdoer.

That is a lie.

And the American people know it is a lie.

And what are we to think when men in positions of public trust openly declare—

That the party of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman which led us out of depression . . . and to victory over international barbarism;

The party of John Kennedy who was slain in the service of the country he inspired;

The party of Lyndon Johnson who withstood the fury of countless demonstrations in order to pursue a course he believed in;

The party of Robert Kennedy, murdered on the eve of his greatest triumphs—

How dare they tell us that this party is less devoted or less courageous . . . in maintaining American principles and values . . . than are they themselves.

This is nonsense.

And we all know it is nonsense.

And what contempt they must have for the decency and sense of the American people to talk to them that way—and to think they can make them believe.

There is not time tonight to analyze and expose the torrent of falsehood and insinuation which has flooded this unfortunate campaign.

There is a parallel—in the campaigns of the early fifties—when the turbulent difficulties of the post-war world were attributed to the softness and lack of patriotism of a few . . . including some of our most respected leaders . . . such as General George Marshall.

It was the same technique.

These attacks are dangerous in a more important sense—for they keep us from dealing with our problems.

Names and threats will not end the shame of ghettos and racial injustice . . . restore a degraded environment . . . or end a long and bloody war.

Slogans and television commercials will not bring the working man that assurance—of a constantly rising standard of life—which was his only a few years ago . . . and which has been cruelly snatched away.

No administration can be expected to solve the difficulties of America in two years.

But we can fairly ask two things: that a start be made—and that the nation be instilled with a sense of forward movement . . . of high purpose.

This has not been done.

Let us look, for example, at the effort to halt inflation.

We all agree that inflation must be arrested.

This administration has decided it could keep prices down by withdrawing money from the economy.

Now I do not think they will ever control inflation this way.

But even if their policy was sound, the money had to come from someone.

And who did they pick to pay?

It was the working man . . . the consumer . . . the middle class American.

For example, high interest rates are a part of this policy.

Yet they do not damage the banks which collect them.

They hardly touch the very wealthy who can deduct interest payments from their taxes.

Rather they strike at every consumer who must pay exorbitant charges on his new car or house. And they can cripple the small businessman.

Their policy against inflation also requires that unemployment go up.

Again, it is the working man who pays the price.

In other fields the story is the same.

They have cut back on health and education for the many . . . while expanding subsidies and special favors for a few.

They call upon you—the working majority of Americans—to support them while they oppose your interests.

They really believe that if they can make you afraid enough . . . or angry enough . . .

you can be tricked into voting against yourself.

It is all part of the same contempt . . . and tomorrow you can show them the mistake they have made.

Our difficulties as a nation are immense, confused and changing.

But our history shows—and I think most of you suspect—that if we are ever to restore progress it will be under the leadership of the Democratic party.

Not that we are smarter or more expert—but we respect the people.

We believe in the people.

And indeed we must—for we are of the people.

Today the air of my native Maine was touched with winter . . . and hunters filled the woods.

I have spent my life in this State . . . which is both part of our oldest traditions and a place of wild and almost untouched forests.

It is rugged country, cold in the winters, but it is a good place to live.

There are friends . . . and there are also places to be alone—places where a man can walk all day . . . and fish . . . and see nothing but woods and water.

We in Maine share many of the problems of America and, I am sure, others are coming to us.

But we have had no riots or bombings and speakers are not kept from talking.

This is not because I am Senator or because the Governor is a Democrat.

Partly, of course, it is because we are a small State with no huge cities . . . but partly it is because the people here have a sense of place.

They are part of a community with common concerns and problems and hopes for the future.

We cannot make America small.

But we can work to restore a sense of shared purpose, and of great enterprise.

We can bring back the belief—not only in a better and more noble future—but in our own power to make it so.

Our country is wounded and confused—but it is charged with greatness and with the possibility of greatness.

We cannot realize that possibility if we are afraid . . . or if we consume our energies in hostility and accusation.

We must maintain justice—but we must also believe in ourselves and each other—and we must get about the work of the future.

There are only two kinds of politics.

They are not radical and reactionary . . . or conservative and liberal. Or even Democratic and Republican. There are only the politics of fear and the politics of trust.

One says: You are encircled by monstrous dangers. Give us power over your freedom so we may protect you.

The other says: The world is a baffling and hazardous place, but it can be shaped to the will of men.

Ordinarily that division is not between parties, but between men and ideas.

But this year the leaders of the Republican party have intentionally made that line a party line.

They have confronted you with exactly that choice.

Thus—in voting for the Democratic party tomorrow—you cast your vote for trust—not just in leaders or policies—but for trusting your fellow citizens . . . in the ancient traditions of this home for freedom . . . and most of all, for trust in yourself.

"A PILGRIMAGE HOME" CLOSING REMARKS, MAINE SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN, 1970

I feel, and I know that Jane does as well, that these weeks of traveling among all of you—and there are so many from all sections of the State here tonight—that this traveling

has been in the nature of a pilgrimage, a pilgrimage home. We've had an opportunity to renew our energies, our faith in our people and our hope for the future of our State and of our country.

And to be able to end a campaign in a sense with this audience is very appropriate. This place where we stand and where we sit is close to the place of my origins. I went to school here in this city. In a sense I began my political apprenticeship with many in this room. The political campaign of 1954 which resulted in our first great victory of the modern era began on this stage.

Some memories come flooding in upon all of us who have been privileged to move down that 16 year old road. But this is not a time for memories. It's a time for looking ahead—and looking ahead beyond November 3.

This is my ninth successive statewide campaign beginning with that first one for Governor. And I've been a candidate in six of those campaigns. As I think about them, I'm conscious of the fact that the Democratic Party has always regarded a political campaign as an opportunity to talk about and deal with the people's business. I can't recall ever regarding a campaign as an opportunity to destroy somebody else's reputation.

Or to destroy his character. Or to misrepresent his life's work. Reinhold Niebuhr once said this, "There is just enough bad in human beings to make democracy necessary, and there is just 'enough good in them to make it possible.'" The challenge of leadership and of citizenship in our country is to try to make the good rather than the bad prevail.

What do people look for in candidates in a country like ours? Do they look for complete wisdom? Do they look for all of the answers instantly to all of the problems which press upon them? Do they look for gifts?

I think what they look for is men of character, men of judgment, men of intelligence, men capable from time to time of summoning up the understanding and the wisdom to deal with the complex problems that can afflict a complex country such as ours.

They don't expect and certainly never get perfection. They don't expect and never get men and women who never make mistakes. But in every campaign in which men and women seek public office, they've got a right to the opportunity to measure those who seek their support in accordance with the reasonable standards we would expect others to judge ourselves by.

They have a right to a reasonable opportunity to know the truth about candidates. And they've got a right, I think, to expect candidates to stick pretty close to the truth about each other.

I was born in this State. I grew up in a town not far from here. I was the son of parents who were deeply concerned that I learn the difference between right and wrong. And I was privileged to have a father who knew how to define in words understandable to his children what that difference was.

I grew up in an environment where it was relatively easy to face life at a pace that made it possible to grow up in good health, with a good opportunity to get an education, with chances to enjoy the woods and the lakes and the streams of Oxford County.

I was fortunate enough to have teachers who took an interest in their students as children and who were interested in doing more than simply teaching them reading and writing and arithmetic, who were interested in addition to helping their young charges to become good citizens, healthy adults, with a respect for each other and to understand each other.

The other day I read an advertisement in several Maine papers I never expected to see in a Maine political campaign. It began with

a question, "What kind of a man is Edmund S. Muskie?" And then it offered an answer.

I expect to get bruises in political life. I'm not a child. I've been in politics a long time. But I know also that Maine people, including my opponent, have had an opportunity for a quarter of a century to study me, to read or hear the thousands upon thousands of words that I've spoken, to evaluate all of the things I've done in and out of political life.

And I know that they've done so with greater care than with most political figures in this State because of the peculiar circumstances of my political career. They had a chance for a quarter of a century to know what kind of a man I am.

Why did they wait until less than a week before election day to tell the people of Maine that I was the kind of monster they described in that advertisement the other day?

If I am as evil as they painted me to be, they had a responsibility to say so before. I was under the impression that we in America had a capacity to grow up. That ought to apply to politicians as well.

Don't they know how to deal in a direct, honest man-to-man fashion with their opposition?

Don't they know how to go to a man and say to his face if they believe what they said about me in that advertisement last week?

Don't they have the backbone to rely on the facts of a man's life—what he actually says?

Do they have to distort what he says to try to defeat him?

Do they have to distort what he's done in order to defeat him?

What kind of people are these who would use the American political process to abuse the truth to which the American people are entitled in a political campaign? They challenge us to a debate. To debate what? Their falsehoods? To debate what? Their assassination of the characters of honorable Americans?

We live in a divided time in our country. If there was ever a time when we needed from leaders or potential leaders or would-be leaders a capacity to draw out the best of our people, now is such a time.

The Presidency and the Vice Presidency of the United States are more than political jobs. They are the most eminent places of leadership within the gift of this country to bestow.

If any political office has the capacity to call out greatness in a man, history tells us, those do. And we've got the right to expect of a man who occupies the Presidency, on the Saturday and Sunday before an American election day an appeal to the best that we can do for our country in the years ahead, the best of what we are for our country in the years ahead.

This is a time to ask the American people to make our country great, not small. This is a time when we ought to be reaching out to each other not simply to destroy each other. This is a time when political parties and political opponents ought to be testing their ideas against each other, testing their wisdom against each other, testing their capacity to think and to innovate against each other.

This is no time to be competing to see which Party is best suited to Halloween and the witches, the goblins, and the trick-or-treating and the pranks and the games that children play on that holiday.

Don't they understand that the fabric of a people's understanding, capacity for sympathy and compassion is a fragile thing. And it is that kind of a delicate, intangible thing that has great strength to bind us together, notwithstanding our great differences and our hostilities and our suspicions and our distrust.

Oh, I wish I could see a President in such a time appealing to his people to trust each other, to have faith in the perfectibility of other Americans, to believe that whoever we are, wherever we live we can, if given a chance, overcome our weaknesses and our shortcomings . . . that we can be, as we have been, a great people.

Presidents have done that in the past—great presidents. And they have led their people through difficult and perilous times—to higher plateaus and achievements in peace and justice for our people.

Why can't this President try that role? Why?

Is victory so important? Is a few more seats in the Congress so important? What kind of a country does he want to lead? A country made up of people who have a capacity for believing in each other? Or a country made up of people who are learning to hate each other?

What kind of a country does he want to lead? If he wants a whole country, if he wants a healthy country, if he wants a great country, if he wants a growing country, then why won't he treat us like that? He might be amazed how the American people would respond to that kind of leadership. These past two years have taken me more away from you and the people of Maine than has ever been the case—more than I like. And I suspect this will be true in the months ahead.

Before the election separates us again, I hope you always believe what is true—that I am one of you. I couldn't be anything else if I tried.

I can't expect that you will always know fully why I say what I do or why I do what I do, because you won't always have all the facts. But I want you to believe that whatever I say or do, I'll always measure it against what the people of Maine in my home town, in my State, have taught me of the fundamental values that ought to govern a man's life.

We have an election coming. I'd like to urge you to give all of your support to this young man who has served you well as governor and who has acquired the ability to give you great service in the next four years.

I hesitate to make this next point because Peter and Bill don't really need it that badly. But they've earned it as well and I know you're going to give them your support. . . .

But whatever else you do on November 3rd, and in all the days and weeks and months and years ahead . . . if you forget everything else I've said tonight, do this for me: learn to trust each other because unless you do, unless you can, freedom in this country has no future.

There's no other way to put it. There's no other way to keep it. There's no other way to make it grow. There's no other way to build a country. Learn to trust each other. Not only when it's easy to do, but when it's hard to do as well; not only when things are peaceful, but when they're turbulent and even violent.

That doesn't mean that you become foolish about those who would do you harm. That doesn't mean that you don't enforce the laws or write better ones in order to keep the weaknesses in people under control.

But underlying it all must be this fabric of trust and confidence that only you can give to your country. It's the most important gift you have to bestow upon freedom in the United States of America. I know you will because you've done it in the past. I urge you to continue.

With that may we all say or may I say, on behalf of Jane and myself and our family, you've been good to us. You've given us a meaningful life for a quarter of a century. We'll always be grateful for it and we hope to conduct ourselves in such a way that you'll never be sorry that you did.

VIETNAM: THE WAY OUT

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE at the Connaissance Lecture, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., February 23, 1971)

George Kennan once wrote that "A political society does not live to conduct foreign policy . . . it conducts foreign policy in order to live."

Our experience in Indochina is a tragic demonstration that our foreign policy affects us no less than it affects other nations.

Foreign policy is not a game. It should be a means for allowing us to get on with what ought to be our fundamental tasks—of building a whole society here in America, and of helping other nations improve the quality of life for their citizens. The time has come to return to these tasks.

Now is the time to do what we must; to end the war; to end the killing 10,000 miles away; to stop tearing our own country apart. For almost 200 years as a nation, we have proclaimed our belief in peace and in the dignity of man. Yet for too many years, we have permitted that belief to wither away in the jungles of Indochina. We have too often behaved in Indochina as if the use of force should be a first alternative rather than a last resort. We have too often behaved in Indochina as if our nation's men and resources were bargaining chips in an international game of poker. We have too often behaved, in Indochina and elsewhere, as if the preservation of the status quo abroad were essential to our survival here at home. We have too often behaved, in Indochina and elsewhere, as if international politics were a simple contest between the forces of darkness and the forces of light.

How, then, *should* we behave in a world where distrust and hostility still run deep, where the aims of nations continue to differ in fundamental respects? While remaining prepared to resist the threat or use of force, we must also be prepared to exercise the wisdom, moderation, and restraint which are necessary if man is to create the conditions for peace.

We must remember that saving men's lives is more important than saving face for governments. We must remember that a foreign policy which cannot be presented honestly to the American people does not deserve their support. I speak tonight out of deep concern that we have forgotten these very principles in Indochina, and so the war goes on.

I am deeply concerned that after this Administration has assured us it was winding down the war, it has taken new military actions across the face of Indochina. I am deeply concerned that this Administration has ruled out any further initiatives by our negotiators at the Paris Talks. I am deeply concerned by the news blackout before the invasion of Laos, and the conflicting reports of what is happening there now. Eventually, we will know, and the Administration will learn that it can embargo the news, but it cannot embargo the truth.

It is cynical for this Administration to argue that Americans are not engaged in ground combat in Laos when American helicopter gun crews are involved in ground combat, and American lives are being lost. A difference of thirty feet in altitude between helicopter gunners and the ground troops they are firing at is no difference at all in function.

I believe it was wrong to unleash South Vietnamese troops across the border of Laos and support them there, as I believe it was wrong to lead them across the border of Cambodia. What we have attempted, with a limited number of South Vietnamese, is an operation that has been rejected in the past for far stronger U.S. forces. Once again, this Administration has minimized the risks and exaggerated the benefits of a new mil-

itary adventure. Whatever the apparent or illusory short-term military gains, this action has resulted in a substantial extension of our military involvement and has further undermined the Paris talks.

I believe it was right for the President to have told us last June that no combat support mission would be flown across the skies of Cambodia. I believe it was wrong for his Secretary of Defense, six months later, to characterize this pledge and the words of the Cooper-Church Amendment as matters of "semantics." If these matters are semantics, then neither the pledge nor even the laws of our government can have any reliable meaning.

I believe it is wrong to increase once again the bombing of North Vietnam. And I believe it was wrong for the President to refuse to rule out an invasion of North Vietnam by the South Vietnamese—who could not attack the North without our support.

The longer we lend our presence to this expanding conflict, the longer this conflict will endure. And the longer it endures, the more profound will be the injury done, not only to the peoples of Vietnam and Cambodia and Laos, but to our own country—to our men who are killed or maimed and to their families, to our institutions of learning, to our procedures for governing, to our confidence in our society's ability to reach for its own ideals.

The President has had more than two long years to implement his so-called plan to end the war. But all that he has revealed is a program for maintaining a substantial American military presence in Indochina. Our troop level in South Vietnam will have been reduced to 284,000 men by May of this year. I welcome that reduction. I believe all Americans welcome that reduction. This Administration has tried to make us believe, however, that its policy is to train the South Vietnamese to take over the fighting so our troops can be withdrawn. But has the President said that this is his policy? No—he would only say last Wednesday that we will withdraw all our troops as part of a mutual withdrawal.

Then what are we to make of the President's refusal to say his policy will lead to a complete withdrawal of American troops? Must Americans fight and die indefinitely in Vietnam and Cambodia and Laos? Must our men in South Vietnam remain indefinitely as props for the Thieu-Ky regime? And how long must further thousands of our men in Thailand and on the seas off Indochina be committed to this war? These are the things we want this Administration to make perfectly clear.

This much we already know: Vietnamization is not the answer. Vietnamization is no answer for our American men still held captive as prisoners-of-war. Vietnamization is no sure answer for the safe withdrawal of our remaining troops. Vietnamization is no answer for a neglected settlement to end all of the fighting. Vietnamization perpetuates the illusion of ultimate military victory.

This administration now argues that its activities in Cambodia and Laos will protect Vietnamization and thereby hasten an end to the war. It is a curious logic that would conclude a war by widening it. What will happen if American troop levels continue to drop and our forces become more vulnerable to attack? Will there then be more invasions of Laos by the South Vietnamese, with continuing American support? Or will the President then resume the air war against North Vietnam beyond the vague limits of what is now called "protective reaction?"

Only last Wednesday, the President said he was "not going to place any limitation" on the use of conventional air power anywhere in Indochina, including North Vietnam. Let us remember that the bombing of North Vietnam accompanied a massive increase in American troops from 1965 to 1968.

The bombing left hundreds of American pilots prisoner in North Vietnam. The bombing did nothing to prevent the TET offensive. And when we stopped the bombing in October 1968, our objective was to begin substantive negotiations.

The President now says he will take no new initiative at the Paris talks. All that is left of the President's so-called plan is Vietnamization. Some say that plan will work. Some say it will not work. I say it is the wrong plan in either case.

If the plan does work, we can look forward to continued warfare among the Vietnamese and an indefinite American presence. If it doesn't work, this Administration does not exclude the possibility of attacks on North Vietnam itself. The dangers are incalculable. A plan which leaves only these alternatives, which gives us only these bleak expectations, is the wrong plan. It is the continuation of a war which must come to an end.

I am convinced that for the right policy we must look—not toward Vietnamization, but rather toward the peace negotiations and toward creating the conditions for peace. We must seek to negotiate in Paris what is negotiable and what can never be settled on the widening battlefields of Indochina.

We cannot hope to dictate the lasting terms or even the shape of a political settlement of this conflict. Only the Vietnamese can settle their political differences. Only they can fashion a settlement in which they have a stake. Only they can understand the political realities which such a settlement must reflect.

It should be clear to all of us by now that this war is essentially a war fought among the Vietnamese people for political ends. And therein lies a lesson of this tragedy. We cannot substitute our will and our political system for theirs. We cannot write the social contract for another people. We may, however, be able to reach agreements on those issues which concern us most, provided we make clear our intention to withdraw all our troops from Vietnam by a fixed and definite date.

I have no doubt we could then negotiate the release of our American prisoners-of-war before that deadline. I have no doubt we could then negotiate the safe withdrawal of all our troops now stationed in South Vietnam. In addition, there could be a cease-fire between our troops and theirs which could be the first step toward a complete standstill cease-fire among all the parties. At the same time, we could work toward agreements to end the fighting in Cambodia and Laos. And we could encourage the Vietnamese parties to negotiate a political settlement that would restore a measure of peace to all of Vietnam. These must be the goals of our policy in Indochina.

Many Americans believe that events have taken over, that things have gotten out of hand, that nothing they can do will change the policy of this Administration. But I believe you can make a difference, even before 1972. You can exert responsible public pressure upon the Executive branch for an American commitment to complete withdrawal, before 1972. You can support initiatives in the Congress to establish an Indochina policy which makes sense, before 1972.

That is why I introduced a sense of the Senate Resolution last May, calling on the President to establish a timetable for the complete and orderly withdrawal of all American troops. That is why I co-sponsored the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment in the last Congress. And that is why I have agreed to co-sponsor it in this Congress, and to support its establishment of a deadline of December 31, 1971.

It should be clear to us by now that for too many years, we have pursued the wrong policy in the wrong place in the wrong way. The price of that policy has been a terrible

cost in American lives and resources. The price has been a terrible cost in the suffering of the peoples of Indochina.

We have helped to destroy their countryside, their towns and their villages, the very fabric of their lives. And if we now have any commitment in Indochina, it must be this: we must help the people of this region rebuild their countries and heal the wounds of war. We must show in Indochina that we understand what foreign policy is all about, what wisdom and judgment and restraint are all about, what compassion and moral obligations are all about.

Isn't it clear then what we must do? After so many young Americans have felt compelled to demonstrate against their own government; after so many Americans of every description have come to doubt what their government says and to doubt that their government will listen; after so much division and disillusionment throughout this land; isn't it clear?

Of course, it is clear. It is clear that the only light at the end of the tunnel will be the one we strike ourselves. We must withdraw all our troops from Vietnam. We must do so by the end of this year. We must be willing—all of us—to say, "Enough."

TO RESTORE AMERICA'S TRUST: COMMENTS ON THE PENTAGON PAPERS

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE at the Eugene Nickerson Testimonial Dinner, Garden City, N.Y., June 20, 1971)

This is not really the right week for a political stump speech or predictions of partisan victory. This is instead one of those very few, very critical moments when we must think together about the future and the fate of America. So I would like to borrow some time from your celebration tonight to talk about a fundamental question—a question we must answer, not only for ourselves, but for our children and their children after them. It is a question about what kind of country America should be.

Our forefathers wrote the first answer almost eight generations ago in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. The words they left us are the principles of our free system, where the allegiance of Americans is supposed to come from their trust in a Government worthy of trust. On all the vital issues, our country's founders affirmed, people on every side have a right to know and to decide—and the Government has a responsibility to tell them the truth, to hear their voices and heed their will.

The skeptics—and they were most of the world then—scoffed at the principles of the first Americans. They believed that the exercise of power required a secure elite and could not stand real elections or real liberty. They pointed to the past—to Government by privilege, economic strength, and force of arms—and there they found proof for their case against the survival of a society designed, not to coerce, but to command loyalty.

How wrong the skeptics were. The whole long history of America confounds their view and validates the vision of our forefathers. Through time and trials and even in the toughest moments, we have remained a Government by the informed consent of the governed. We have seen the death of virtually every other system alive at America's birth. And we have kept our country and our freedom. Because Government has trusted people to choose, people have trusted Government to rule.

But not in 1971. In 1971, we are living with the results of an incredible erosion in faith during the last half-decade. You can see the erosion across our land.

A ten-year old who was opening toys under the Christmas tree in 1955 has now wronged his country and himself by joining the weatherman's campaign of violence

and terror. Some of his friends down the street have given up, copped out, and turned on. And there is also a new vocabulary for the feeling which pervades his parents and people everywhere. The phrase-makers call it a credibility gap. But behind the phrase, there is the simple fact that countless citizens no longer believe their government. What they do believe is that the government lies—and some of them are even convinced that government itself is a lie.

And disbelief has reached a new high with this week's publication of the Pentagon papers in the *Times* and the *Washington Post*. They are the daily front page story—and the urgent concern of anyone who cares about the tie of trust that binds America together. Few of us have read all of the documents. But most of us share a common sense of pain and danger.

There is pain and danger in the spreading suspicion that talking peace was a disguise for planning war.

There is pain and danger in the shocking evidence that what some officials were saying to the Congress was the opposite of what they were doing in the Pentagon.

And there is pain and danger in the certainty that we remain uncertain about whether the Pentagon papers were or were not contingency plans—whether they were or were not accepted by the President. The appalling reality is that the Senate, the House, and the Nation were never told that they were considered or even possible.

If the American people or their representatives had read those reports as they were written—if they had seen the advice to sacrifice lives in order to save face—if they had looked at the proposed diagrams for provoking a wider conflict—they would have resisted the policy of escalation then, perhaps even before it was made. But we cannot go back now—and we must go forward. The question is the direction we will take.

In a speech only hours old, the Republican National chairman opted for partisan recrimination. From him, the Nation is now hearing the hard, unsmiling hypocrisy of exploiting the disclosures he damns as irresponsible to damn the entire Democratic party as responsible for the war. It is as though all Republicans opposed Vietnam from the beginning—and as though nothing was concealed from Democrats outside the Executive branch. That is not true—and Senator Dole knows it is not true. He should also know how destructive it is to play politics with this tragedy. Too much is at stake.

We cannot pronounce history's judgment on men—all the facts are not yet in. But our own history tells us that we cannot risk a further corrosion of the trust which has nurtured and sustained America for almost two centuries. Our imperative task—yours and mine and Senator Dole's—is to restore that trust so we can believe again in our country and ourselves.

We must again be able to trust Government to make our policies a reflection of our People's will. The essential first step is to end the war by the end of the year. That is what more than seventy percent of Americans want. And as long as the administration refuses to set a date, millions of them will remember the past and doubt Washington's assurances about the future. We surely understand by now that our cause was a mistake. And we should understand that prolonging the mistake is surely not worth a lengthened shadow of suspicion here at home.

But a decision to stop the wrong will not alone make things right. We must also be able to trust Government to subject its past conduct to the scrutiny of our people. The Justice Department should drop the constitutionally dubious attempt to muzzle the *Times* and the *Post*. Unless they publish and unless the Pentagon papers are declassified, too many Americans will think

there is still something to hide. Whatever the facts are, they cannot inflict more damage than a rising tide of disbelief.

And more disbelief would be the sad result if newspapers had to prove their patriotism by sitting down with Federal officials to decide what they could or could not publish. A patriotic press should stand up and publish the news, which is almost never unfit to print. Such freedom is the only way to check the accuracy of Government—the only way to prove that Government trusts us enough to tell us what has really happened.

We hear arguments that the Pentagon papers are stolen property—property which belong to the Defense Department. But in a free society, the truth finally belongs to the people. And it is stolen property only when it is unjustly concealed from them.

We are cautioned that national security may be threatened. But the sole evidence is purely hypothetical charges from high officials and a report that the Government is still trying to establish a possible break in our secret codes. No American wants to play fast and loose with security. And the threat here is so slight that no American should want continued suppression of the news.

We are also warned of the potential harm to some reputations. But this is not Russia or the Politburo—and it is not the business of our Nation to protect anyone's bad name at the price of losing a free press or an informed public.

This does not mean indifference to the claims of those damaged by the Pentagon papers. We must not permit fragments of the story to form any completed assessment. And we must put as much as we can into the open as fast as we can.

We must begin now Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield's proposed investigation of the origins of the war—so we can discover every fact and give every official, in Senator Mansfield's words, "the right to defend himself from unfair accusations."

A total accounting could go a long way toward restoring trust. But the restoration will be a fragile and temporary thing, unless we act to assure that another Pentagon papers will never happen again. We must be able to trust Government to decide with the knowledge of the people.

Vital choices must be made in public view. In domestic affairs, that may be easy. In foreign affairs, it will often be hard. But it is perhaps the definition of liberty in a Nation that it is ready to do things the hard way.

When a genuine danger to security is present, the facts may have to be withheld from the people. But they must be given to the Congress—so the people's representatives will be full partners in any decision to commit America's sons and America's wealth and America's prestige to a foreign conflict. There will be rare cases where there is no time to consult. But more often, the temptation will be oversecracy in 1964, everyone including our adversaries was apparently aware of potential escalation—everyone except our own people. The next time, our citizens if possible and the House and the Senate for certain must have the chance to know and to react.

That is fine in principle—but virtually everyone who has violated the principle has paid lip service to it. What we must have is a procedure to insure that the principle will prevail.

That is why I intend to propose the necessary legislation to permit the Congress and the Executive Branch to create an independent board responsible for declassifying documents. After a two year waiting period, the board could make a document public. And at any time, it could send relevant documents to the appropriate committee of the Congress. This system would give the President and the departments the strongest incen-

tive to be frank about the facts—which would in any case come out almost immediately or very soon. At the same time, an independent board could protect national security without using it as an excuse to hide blunders or launch covert policies.

My hope is that the executive branch will co-operate by supporting this reform. Nineteen seventy-one has brought a vast widening in the credibility gap. It is not the time for the President to resist disclosure by retreating to institutional defenses like executive privilege. The national interest must overcome personal interest. We must give people a reason to believe anew in their ability to control the great events that shape and alter their fate.

And that is why the Board must also be independent in appearance as well as in fact. Members should serve a substantial, non-renewable term. One of them should come from the press, one from the Government, and the other five from private life. They should be split as closely as possible between the two political parties. And the Board's staff should be recruited both inside and outside the Government.

It is said that in the modern world nations always decide in secrecy. But in a free country, that is not necessary and it is not safe. Fair procedures can strike the essential balance between security and the right to know. And what we have now will only forfeit more trust and weaken the bonds of allegiance to Government.

A free society has never been easy. But our forefathers out on the edge of the only world they knew, with danger on every side and so much to lose, had the courage to start the first modern experiment in liberty. In 1971, we are the most powerful Nation in the world and we can at least sustain the awesome inheritance they left us. We must heal the doubts and restore trust and build a nation worthy of their beginnings.

We often tend to think of America's foundation principles as obvious or even cliches. We have heard them in school and on the Fourth of July and from every politician. And so we sometimes forget that the principles of liberty exist not only to be listened to, but to be lived up to. Recent events should remind us of that—and of some words spoken by an embattled President in our country's hour of maximum danger, when the survival of America itself was in question. Abraham Lincoln knew what he was fighting for then—and we must fight for the same goal now. It is a goal so simple to say, so hard to reach. It is the hope that "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

A JOB FOR EVERY WORKER

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE at the Detroit Economic Club, Detroit, Michigan May 24, 1971.)

America's economic heartland is the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan. And in 1971, this is also the heartland of America's unemployment.

Across the country, six percent of our working men and women are out of work. But as bad as things are everywhere, things are even worse here. In this city and this State, the unemployment rate is now over eight percent.

Six percent and eight percent are only numbers. They sound very precise and very abstract. But behind the numbers, there are people—and in 1971 it is people who are in trouble.

A machinist in Port Huron sits idle on the front porch of the home his family may lose—because there is no money left for next month's mortgage payment.

A shocked aerospace engineer walks from agency to agency in Seattle with a portfolio that proves he is good enough to get almost any position—but the interviewers

keep telling him there are no positions to be had.

In New York City, a worried cleaning woman knows the tenants are moving out of the offices in her building—and she wonders what will happen to her kids when all she has is a dismissal slip instead of a pay check.

In Washington, D.C., an eighteen year old who believed the television ad about staying in high school is tired of looking for the job the ad promised. Next week, he will decide to go with the numbers dealer or the pusher man.

That is what the unemployment crisis means in America. It means five million human casualties in a war against inflation that puts productive workers on the front lines. It means the loss of overtime and enforced part-time. It means that, in the first three months of 1971, 400,000 Americans gave up on America's economic system and just stopped looking for a job.

No wonder job security is a constant worry for the majority of workers. No wonder your own University of Michigan survey research center reports a postwar low in consumer confidence. No wonder businessmen are reading daily about losses instead of profits. Henry Ford knew that the prosperity of industry depended on well-paid and secure workers to buy the products of industry. We are learning that lesson the hard way in 1971, as sales are squeezed by the caution of people who are afraid to spend even what they can earn.

The administration set out to trade inflation for unemployment. What it ended up with was a bad deal for every businessman and every worker.

In recent weeks, we have heard new predictions of success for the old game plan. The proof for the prediction is a rise in industrial production. But apart from the resumption of automobile output after last year's strike, the pace of production certainly did not quicken and probably slowed in the first four months of 1971. An artificial recovery due to the after-effects of a labor dispute is not the kind of recovery any corporation or any worker can rely upon.

And there is another persuasive reason to doubt the administration's claim that the economy is headed for good health. Homebuilding—which accounts for only four percent of the gross national product—has been responsible for more than half of the recent upturn. But a very small part of the economy cannot indefinitely sustain a rise in the entire economy. There is simply not enough evidence that, this time, prosperity really is just around the corner.

To borrow President Nixon's phrase, what we need now is not more promises, but more performance.

To reclaim prosperity, we need a program of self-terminating fiscal stimulation. We need a temporary tax cut and temporary expenditure increases. We must not commit the federal government to an inflationary budget in future years. But this year's budget should put an additional six to eight billion dollars into the economy. That would create jobs for people and business for industry.

To guarantee the value of the resulting wages and profits, we also need a stronger attack on inflation. The administration should immediately establish a program of voluntary price and wage restraints. The record of the guideposts in the early '60s was somewhat uneven, but very encouraging. They permitted prosperity with price stability then—and I believe they can do it again. I also believe that an administration too ready to keep intervening in southeast Asia should be less reluctant to start intervening in our own economy. Too much is at stake—not only material progress—but the hopes of our people.

Of course, it is always easier to be critical than correct about economics. What has been

called the dismal science is also the inexact science. Fiscal and monetary policy created the wartime overheating the Nixon administration inherited. And in the hands of the Nixon administration, they created the recession of 1970. But I believe the same tools which have been so badly mishandled for so long can now bring our economy back. What is required is the will to use them right.

But a worker without work cannot just wait for recovery. Recessions are made in Washington—but they are felt in the homes and neighborhoods of your town and mine. When national economic decline destroys jobs—when breadwinners out of work have shopped out the job market—they should be able to turn to the Federal Government as the employer of last resort. They should be able to keep their self-respect and self-reliance instead of standing hopelessly in an unemployment compensation line.

Every relevant authoritative study estimates that there are at least hundreds of thousands of vital public service jobs unfilled because they are unfunded. The Federal Government could put the jobless into those jobs. The program would not be mere make-work—and it would make a real difference in our hospitals, our schools, our social services and our environment.

And it would make economic as well as human good sense.

Individuals would enter the program as a recession begins—and their income would help to stimulate the economy. As the recession receded, they could return to the private job market—and government spending would be reduced. Obviously, we would face difficulties in translating this concept into a working and efficient reality. But I am sure they can be solved, with careful planning and constant attention to detail. And I am also sure that public employment is better than relief—better for society, better for the economy, and better for people.

But policies for prosperity and for public employment in the meantime are not alone enough. Too often, we tend to behave as though recovery from a recession freed us from our concern for the unemployed. Too often, we forget the workers who are left out—and the local areas which are falling behind.

The technical name for their problem is economic dislocation. The stark reality is that, even at the peak of prosperity, one million Americans are unemployed because economic change has wiped out their jobs. The demands for the products they once made has disappeared. New products are probably manufactured in a different city or town—and even established production is often shifted to another location. Communities are left with a lot of houses and streets and no job opportunities. Workers are faced with finding a retraining program, finding another job, and finding another place to live.

This kind of change is an inevitable and continuing process in a free market economy. In 1971, you can see the signs of the process everywhere in America.

As foreign shoes become less expensive, American shoes become harder to sell. That's why the shoe industry is in trouble in New England.

As we withdraw some of our troops from Vietnam, hundreds of thousands of veterans who served their country are finding it tough to get a job which suits their skills. That's why a national magazine recently ran a long story about a soldier who came home to Indiana—and to unemployment.

As we slowly shift our priorities from the task of killing abroad to the tasks of life at home, defense workers must start to search for non-defense jobs. That's why there is a sign outside Seattle that says: "Would the last person to leave Seattle please turn out the lights?"

As air travel undermines rail travel, people who have always worked the rails watch their trains and their jobs disappear. That's why the Penn Central crisis threatened the livelihood of 94,000 employees with a total weekly income of \$20 million.

And as new regulations save our environment so man can survive, polluting plants may decide to shut down instead of controlling their pollution. That's why Saltville, Virginia, now faces the loss of 600 jobs.

Many of these economic shifts are evidence of the vitality of an economic system with a genius for adaptation and progress. They are not only inevitable—they are also indispensable. But telling communities or workers in jeopardy that the G.N.P. will go up or the railroads will run on time is not an acceptable answer.

Economic change benefits two hundred million Americans. A million Americans should not have to bear the burdens alone. The country should not make progress on the backs of some towns and workers. We must cushion the impact of economic and human dislocation. We must save communities and stem the tide of migration to overcrowded urban centers, where too many people are already chasing too few jobs. Three-quarters of the welfare mothers in New York were born outside New York. Most of them came north when the pattern of agriculture in the south moved from small to large farms.

A just society must do better than exiling them to dependence on relief and dumping the resulting tax burden on already overtaxed cities in crisis.

One solution—the wrong solution—is to supplant the free market mechanism instead of strengthening it. We are asked to purchase more arms than we should—so there will be more jobs in the defense industry. We are asked to spend hundreds of millions of dollars more on an environmental disaster called the SST—so thousands of aerospace workers can waste their talents and their time instead of applying them to our most urgent national tasks. And we hear those requests from the same forces that last year killed a bill to provide 40,000 jobs in essential public services. By government fiat, they want to buy useless new products the free market could not otherwise sell.

Their mistake is matched only by men who deal with market changes by denying them—by trying to hold on to the past and hold off the future. Apply their arguments throughout American history. Should we have subsidized the kerosene industry when electric power came along? Should the Government have bought buckboards and stagecoaches to make up for the competition from cars? Should the Congress have appropriated money to keep the number of blacksmiths equal to the number of gas stations?

Surely, none of us would have supported any of that—and none of us should support anything similar now. What we should support—and what we must work for—are policies that put our resources into our opportunities for progress. But when we spend less on defense—when we reshape our economy with new technology and new products—when we shift from war to peace and from pollution to a clean environment—we must make certain that every American breadwinner and every American community have a decent chance for a decent share of a prosperous country.

I believe that is possible.

I believe that Marx was wrong.

I believe that we don't need war for prosperity—or subsidized waste for employment.

I believe we can strengthen the free market system by underpinning it, instead of supplanting it.

I believe we can give every American who heads a family or supports himself the right to a job.

We must begin now the tough, tedious

nuts and bolts work necessary to make that right a reality.

Specifically, we must design a system for an equitable prosperity which will meet five priority goals.

First, the system must guarantee every eligible unemployed worker access to an effective retraining program.

Second, the system must guarantee truly adequate financial support to every eligible unemployed worker who is entering retraining or must move to take a new job.

Third, the system must guarantee a better match of jobs with workers by combining present scattered programs into a comprehensive effort—and it must also use technology to guarantee the relevance of retraining to future skill needs.

Fourth, the system must guarantee incentives sufficient to bring new industry to depressed areas.

Fifth, the system must guarantee short-term emergency grants to local communities like Seattle, where even basic services are threatened by economic crisis.

Finally, the system must guarantee that the Federal Government will act as an employer of last resort, not only in a recession, but in a time of national prosperity.

There will always be competent, able-bodied breadwinners with no immediate place to go in the free market system. We must protect them by giving them absolute access to a job. If a worker is too old to retrain or relocate, he should receive a decent early retirement income—if that is what he wants. But he should also have a chance to choose public employment. The gifts of experience and age could contribute in countless ways to communities across the country.

Building a system for an equitable prosperity will require hard choices—about wages and standards—about financing and administration. But it is the only choice we have.

This year is the 25th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946. For a quarter of a century, the act has failed its own title. We have made some progress. We have endured no second great depression. But we have not produced the full employment we pledged twenty-five years and two wars ago.

It is time for something better.

It is time to commit our Nation to the right to a job.

It is time to abolish the concept of unemployment in America.

Unemployment occurs when there are more people to work than things to do. But there are plenty of tasks in our society for every pair of willing hands in our economy. And I am convinced that a new partnership between the genius of a free market and the genius of a free government can bring workers and work together.

Then, we can mean it when we say to the American breadwinner: "You'll get a decent job—and you'll get a decent paycheck."

And we can mean it when we say to American business: "You'll make a fair profit in a prosperous country."

All that requires is to stamp three simple, vital words on to the employment Act of 1946: "This means you."

THE FORGOTTEN AMERICAN FARMER

(Wisconsin State College, Stevens Point, Wis., May 16, 1971)

I'm proud to speak in a congressional district that has gone in a few short years from Melvin Laird to David Obey.

I've heard of good trades before—but even the Green Bay Packers have never done that well.

A week or so ago, the President celebrated Salute to Agriculture Day by throwing a big dinner for farmers at the White House. Over a hundred people were on the guest list. But only sixteen of them were farmers. . . . I

guess the President realizes that, after four years of his administration, there may be just a few farmers left in the United States.

At the dinner, the President was asked if he was going to serve butter. He replied: "Oh, butter—is that the margarine with the extra food coloring?"

Even though farm income may be going down, I think he should give the administration credit for the things that are going up . . . unemployment, prices, and the cost of postage stamps.

At this rate, the recession will last as long as a speech by my friend Hubert Humphrey. I promise to finish this speech in a lot less time than that.

And I would like to begin by sharing with you some fascinating facts I read the other day.

You would be more likely to hear about them in a classroom than in a stump speech. But I think they tell us something important about our business here tonight—and about the everyday business of farms and factories across America.

Scientists have discovered that the physical structures they call genes are the essential building blocks of life. From generation to generation, genes transmit the traits that make every man human and each man individual. They are our most direct link to the past—and our only certain bequest to the future.

There are three billion people on this planet and each of them has 100,000 genes. But if we put all those genes together, the result would be a ball only one millimeter in diameter. That is the small margin between our humanity and a mere physical protoplasm.

And there is another, equally small margin that we must also live with—because we could not live without it. The atmosphere surrounding our earth—the atmosphere that gives us the air we breathe and the water we take for granted—is just a thin layer of life support in an almost empty universe. Above it, there is only the black darkness of outer space. Below it, there is only the black darkness of the inner earth. We survive by the grace of a resource we have constantly contaminated. We can endanger it—and we can destroy it and ourselves.

Some of us were concerned about that threat years ago. But only in the last few years have our warnings been heeded. Only recently have Americans realized how fragile our environment really is. And only recently have we started to see the similar fragility of our own genetic structures.

Now we know that everything that is important is also fragile. And that simple truth applies not only to the earth God made—but to earth man has remade. Our political and social institutions sustain us only if we sustain them. There is no invisible hand protecting our principles or our economy. Not fate, but the work of our own hands, is what keeps us prosperous and free.

And when our hands falter or fall, the strain on our fragile but vital institutions is felt immediately. In recent years, we have often faltered and occasionally even failed. And you can now feel the strains everywhere in America.

You can see them on the nighttime streets of our cities—where there is often no one to see and the only thing that walks the sidewalks after dark is fear.

You can hear them in the words of the Vietnam veterans against the war—who found out what it was like over there and wonder now whether anything is right back here.

And you can sense the strains in the new divisions that separate our country—black and white, young and old, longhair and hardhat.

We have not tended to America's needs. We have neglected America's ideals. We have

damaged the fragile institutions that hold America together and move America forward.

The most recent damage is the recession inflicted on the National economy by falling Federal policies. Our economy is supposed to provide prosperity for our people. In 1971, it is instead putting working men and women out of work—and pushing productive farmers into bankruptcy. We are painfully re-discovering how fragile our economy really is.

In the last two years, unemployment in America has soared to over 6%. That's not just a number—that number is people—people standing in welfare lines instead of payroll lines—people nailing a "For Sale" sign to their homes because they can no longer meet the monthly mortgage payments. And that number is also your friends and neighbors. Between February, 1969, and February, 1971, unemployment down the road in Wausau climbed from 1400 to 2700.

The administration's game plan traded away Wausau's jobs for lower prices—but the only prices that are going down in 1971 are farm prices. And that is one place where income was already far too low.

The average non-farm family makes \$8,800 a year—\$3,000 more than the average farm family. The administration responded to this injustice with the agricultural act of 1970—an act that threatened an even further decline in farm income. I am proud that I voted against it. And I am proud to speak up against a policy that reduced the parity ratio to 69% in April, 1971—and then attempted to cover up the reduction by changing the base period for calculating the ratio.

No wonder the decline in the number of farmers has accelerated. No wonder farmers have to work away from their fields for nearly 50% of their income. No wonder family farms are disappearing so fast that we may soon see them only in a Grandma Moses painting.

The only wonder is that the administration still refuses to act. In the midst of this crisis, President Nixon remains the first President since Herbert Hoover who has not sent a farm message to the Congress. And he is the only President ever who tried to abolish the Department of Agriculture. What he may succeed in abolishing is the security and growth of American agriculture.

A county fair on the White House lawn is no substitute for a better life on Wisconsin's farms.

And the mere promise to restore prosperity in our factories and farms is no substitute for new jobs and a milk parity price of 90%.

From the middle of 1969 until November, 1970, a coalition of farm organizations constantly asked for an appointment with the President. Their request was constantly rejected. The administration apparently did not want to listen to them—just as it does not want to listen to the voices of peaceful protest against the war. And the refusal to listen is turning a fragile society into a brittle society. It is eroding our bonds of trust and our tradition of prosperity. Refusing to listen—to farmers or students or United States Senators—is no service to America. It is the way to make a brittle society break.

None of us wants that—now or ever. We know that there is only a thin margin between the future of America and the failure of America.

If we can create such a society in our land, we will strengthen the fragile enterprise we call America. We will shape a future worthy of the hopes our fathers brought with them from the old world to the new.

I believe that we can do that much. I believe that we can do no less.

And I believe that we can do even more. The Democratic Party has pointed the way—in Wisconsin and in the Nation. And the people will follow us—all the way to Washington in 1972.

A COALITION OF INTEREST: BLACK AND WHITE TOGETHER

After years of practice, white politicians know the right things to say to an audience of black people. But we cannot really comprehend the depth of the wrong done to black America.

A white politician can speak about the shame of segregated slums. But he cannot feel the pain of a black father living in a neighborhood of boarded windows and sagging buildings, far from a decent job or a safe place for his kids to play.

A white politician can talk school integration. But he cannot feel the anguish of a black mother sending her sons and daughters off to classrooms with too few books, too many pupils, and too much risk of failure.

A white senator can vote against a mediocre appointment to the Supreme Court—and his vote can deny the insulting claim that this was the best the South could give to American justice. But he cannot feel the insult it was to blacks to even consider the nomination of a man whose most famous public remark was a racial slur.

So I did not come here tonight to lecture you on the wrongs you have endured for so long. You understand them in a personal, everyday way, far better than I ever could. And I did not come here to tell you again where I stand. I hope you already realize that I am with you now as I have been in the past. I believe now more strongly than ever that the future and the fate of America depend on our fight for racial justice. And I believe it is time to win that fight.

Presidential commissions and Senate Committees and executive task forces have already parsed and analyzed the crisis. They have studied the prejudice which surrounds you. They have denounced the discrimination which deprives you. And they have pointed the way to something better. They have left us with eloquent pleas and detailed plans for equity in America.

But defining the solution is no longer the problem. If we do not know by now what must be done, then we will never know it or do it. The challenge of racial justice in 1971 is not to construct a stronger case for a cause already so clearly and completely right. Our real challenge is to construct a strategy which will permit that cause to prevail.

We must build a coalition for change in America—a coalition that reaches beyond one race and any single group—a coalition with enough power and enough votes to make the American dream a reality for every American.

I am talking about a coalition of conscience, committed to creating a nation worthy of our hopes and our boasts. White Americans must ask themselves and each other—again and again—the same question President Kennedy asked them eight years ago: "which of us would willingly trade place (with a black man)?" In the last decade, the answer was a stream of civil rights legislation which left our people equal in law, but not in life.

Now we must answer, not only with a coalition of conscience, but with a coalition of interest. For we are learning that millions of whites share something of the black man's fate. We are learning, in the words of Congressman William Clay, that blacks "have no permanent friends and no permanent enemies—just permanent interests."

Since 1964, the social commentators have trafficked in words like "backlash" and "hardhat." They have identified the whites with lower and middle incomes as a center of popular resistance to racial equality. But those same white Americans are also deprived and pressured and ignored. In a very real sense, they have the same permanent in-

terests as black Americans. And I am convinced that in a coalition of interest, the things that unite us can overcome the things that divide us.

A coalition of interest, blacks and whites together, can fight for prosperity and against poverty. Americans of every race have a vital stake in the outcome.

When a worker loses his job, the lay-off slip is not white. It is not black. It is a common gray color of tragedy for the breadwinner and his family. Today, ten percent of all black workers are living that tragedy. Their unemployment rate is nearly twice as high as the National average. But millions of white workers are also out of work. And millions more see their job security threatened on every side.

Their concern is not the color of the next worker's skin, but the chance to work at all. They want jobs—and they want them now. They want federally-funded public service jobs—to provide an absolute and constant guarantee of employment for every unemployed breadwinner. They want far more summer jobs for the young than the administration's proposal of a mere 600,000—because they want far less teenage unemployment than the current rate of 40% for blacks and 15% for whites. Most of all, they want to restore the dignity of the productive adults who are losing their hope and wasting their talents on endless welfare and relief lines.

A coalition of American workers can muster the influence to create a prosperous economy—where people of every race can be partners in progress instead of rivals for scarcity. Returning veterans should never have to be told that being out of the service means being out of a job. But that is what happened to 60% of the veterans in New York City who turned to the State Employment Service in 1970. They were black and they were white. They deserved a better response than the discouraging reply that no help was wanted. And they must never hear that reply again.

A coalition of American workers can also muster the influence to insure a stable economy—where this year's higher wages no longer buy less than last year's lower wages. In 1970, the average family of every race actually suffered a decline in real income of over 1%. Breadwinners carried a sandwich lunch and gave up a vacation trip and put off the new car—but in the end, inflation drained their savings away. That, too, must never happen again.

And a coalition of American workers can muster the influence to build an economy of opportunity—where the majority of the poor who are white and the minority of the poor who are black can earn their own way to a decent future. In the first twelve months of this decade for the first time since the statistics were kept—there was a significant increase in the number of Americans who had to subsist on less than subsistence requires. In 1970, over one million more blacks and whites fell below the poverty line. They must not be forced to stay there—and we must help them help themselves up.

So there is a solid and promising basis for a coalition of interest on the issue of the economy. Workers of every race care about jobs, inflation, and poverty. That concern can bring them together. And, together, they can do something about economic decline. They can reverse the appalling recession which has hit whites as well as blacks and blacks even harder than whites.

But economic conditions are not the only tie that can bind a coalition of interest. The plight of America's great cities is another reason for common concern—and another invitation to common action.

According to some of the experts, the urban crisis is a crisis of minorities—of blacks and Chicanos and Puerto Ricans. But the urban

crisis is in fact a crisis of the majority. It touches and threatens citizens of every race.

When industry flees our urban centers, it leaves thirteen million blacks behind. But such departures also endanger the forty-five million whites who have made their homes in our cities. Some of them follow industry's exodus. But many of them are like most blacks—they cannot afford to flee. Blacks and whites together, urban Americans become victims of urban decline.

As jobs shrink and welfare rolls soar, so do the rents that reflect property taxes—and the tax bills of the small homeowner. And in return for paying more, the citizens of most cities are now receiving less. Basic services like police and fire and sanitation face cutbacks, while basic problems are getting worse instead of better.

Next year taxes in New York City will go way up—while the quality of life will probably go way down. Across the country, overcrowded schools, deteriorated housing, and obsolete transportation are shortchanging urban blacks and urban whites. By circumstance if not by choice, the races are united in a coalition of frustration about the cities they inhabit.

And that frustration can inspire a new coalition of interest on the urban issue. At the municipal level, the coalition can work for modern and efficient government—so cities can get the most out of the resources they already have. At the state and federal levels, the coalition can use its voice and its votes to insure a sensitive, responsive policy toward urban America.

There is nothing in public life more powerful than fifty-eight million urban citizens of every race demanding their due. Almost alone, their power could secure reforms to keep industry in our cities—and fast public transportation to carry people from the cities to jobs in the suburbs. Business must stop running away from urban centers. And workers must have real access to available employment.

Our Nation's cities are far from finished. They can endure—and they can flourish again. The remarkable renaissance of downtown Chicago is proof of their essential vitality. But so much more must be done—for urban America—and for the Black Americans and the White Americans who live there. It can be done by them—and only by them—in a coalition of interest among all the races.

I think the black people and the white people of our cities care enough about urban survival to do enough about it together. And I think they also care enough about their own survival to form a coalition of interest on a third vital issue, the future of health care in America.

Even in the distant days when inequality was an accepted principle and practice in our land, there was one inescapable equality. It is with us now and will be with us always. It is our most basic common link—the simple fact that we are all mortal.

And in 1971, the sad truth is that America's failing medical care system is helping our mortality along.

In the last decade, hospital charges increased six times more than other prices—and doctors' fees climbed twice as fast. The tragic results are visible everywhere in America.

Poor blacks are abandoned to uneven and often inhuman public health services. Their babies die twice as frequently as white infants. Their wives die four times as frequently in childbirth. And their life expectancy is seven years shorter. Black Americans are the worst victims of the system's failure—as they are often and in so many different ways. But they are not the only victims.

Poor whites suffer, too. And the middle class is caught squarely in the middle—too well-off to qualify for Government help—too pressured to help themselves with comprehensive insurance. They often end up with

an excruciating choice between losing their health and losing their savings. And that is why the United States has ended up with an infant death rate higher than fourteen other countries—and a male life expectancy lower than nineteen others. That is why young people in America are dying before their time and old people are dying when there is some precious time left. That is why the Nation which is first in the world in wealth is not first in the world in health.

If there is any place for a coalition of interest, this is surely it. What hangs in the balance is nothing less than life itself—and skin color will protect no one from sickness or death. A coalition of blacks and lower and middle income whites can insist on a medical bill of rights for themselves—and for every American of every race.

They can insist on the right to care within their means—Federal health insurance that takes the dollar sign out of medical services. They can insist on the right to care within their reach—Federal subsidies to train enough doctors and nurses and then to locate them where the people and the problems are. And they can insist on the right to care within their needs—medical attention which is comprehensive in scope, preventive in emphasis, and restricted only by the range of scientific knowledge.

America's concern over health services has reached a high water mark in 1971. A coalition of interest can make certain that something comes of that concern—a new health care system for blacks and for whites—and for every medically deprived American.

In the economy, in our cities, and in medical care, a coalition of interest could transform our lives and our politics. Obviously, its sweep would be potentially far broader than this speech. Education and business opportunities and a host of other critical endeavors could command its attention and its efforts.

And in the final analysis, a coalition of interest would be our single best hope for racial justice—because it would also serve the vast majority of our people. The legal guarantees of equality will become an everyday reality only when blacks and whites have equal rights to American prosperity as well as equal rights in American law.

But some Americans are pulling against a coalition of interest. They are worried about the breadth of the changes it would bring. They suspect that it would disturb established power and privileges—and they are right. Where they are wrong is in their confidence that racial and economic rivalry will inevitably destroy the coalition from the start.

In recent years, we have seen repeated attempts to divert our people from the pursuit of common interests by appealing to groundless fears. Perhaps the most vicious implication we have heard is that black Americans are against law and order. No one quite says it that way—but there are voices which convey that meaning—voices which use law and order as a code word for prejudice instead of a keynote for crime control.

But blacks suffer more from crime than most of our society. In our cities, they are the victims of a majority of all rapes and homicides and a near majority of all robberies. And long before drugs touched white America they were preying upon the despair in black America.

No wonder every indication we have tells us that blacks overwhelmingly support our police—to make them as effective as they can be—and as fair as they should be. No wonder black leaders have spoken up for courts which swiftly convict the guilty and swiftly release the innocent. No wonder they have also demanded reforms that will make our prisons places for rehabilitation instead of schools for crime.

Those who are banking on black opposi-

tion to law and order to break up a coalition of interest should remember what crime has done to black people. And they should recall the reaction of Harlem when two policemen—one black and one white—were brutally gunned to death only weeks ago on a public street. Ministers preached from their pulpits against terror and violence. Citizens cooperated with the police in the search for the killers. And Harlem showed us all what law and order really means. Harlem showed us that a coalition of interest can be strengthened rather than subverted by the rising threat of crime.

But there is another obstacle to any new coalition—the economic rivalries which have been used again and again to dissolve an alliance of blacks and whites. The whites who are least able to pay are often told that they must bear the social costs of racial justice. A black worker's advance comes to be seen as a white worker's setback. And shared concerns are lost in a tide of mutual suspicion.

To survive, a coalition of interest must stand against that tide. Progress for the poor financed on the backs of the near poor would mock its own purpose. It would destroy the chance for coalition and the chance for change. So our first priority—the priority upon which all the rest depends—is to put the burden of reform where it belongs—on the individuals and the institutions which can afford to pay the bill. When millionaires are paying lower taxes than their secretaries or none at all—when great fortunes are passed through tax loopholes virtually intact—when giant corporations spend millions lobbying for tax preferences and save billions from them, it is time for thorough and total tax reform. Then we can finance guaranteed jobs, decent schools and cities and national health insurance without "elling lower middle and middle income Americans to sacrifice beyond their means. That is the way to build and sustain a coalition of interest.

I have talked with you tonight about the common needs of your race and mine because I am certain that the success of the civil rights movement—now and in the years ahead—requires our common commitment to common goals.

I think the barrier is suspicion and fear, some of it accidental, some of it purposeful, and none of it founded in fact.

But the barrier can be overcome by helping people on both sides to perceive their shared interests.

You can see encouraging signs throughout the country. In Detroit, a black-Polish conference has enlisted the leadership of the Polish and black communities. In the new south, blacks and whites together have elected governors and senators who are pledged to serve all the people.

Our task—your task and my task—is to turn those beginnings into a lasting coalition of interest.

Nothing could better fulfill the tradition of the NAACP—or the ideals of America.

Nothing could bring us closer to Whitney Young's hope for an "open society"—where anyone can live anywhere and everyone will have every chance.

Like you, I am frustrated because we will not get there tomorrow. But I am hopeful that with leadership like yours we will get there in the 1970s. And I am convinced that whatever we can do, and whatever we dream we can do, we must begin now.

REFLECTIONS ON DEATH OF JOETHA COLLIER
(By Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE at Rivier College Commencement, Nashua, N.H., May 30, 1971)

Last Tuesday night, more than a thousand miles away from Rivier College, there was another commencement at a small high school in Drew, Mississippi. At the end of the ceremony, where the graduates were told to

"make America a better place," eighteen-year-old Joetha Collier was killed by a sniper in a passing car.

No one knows why Miss Collier was singled out to die. There were only two things about her that most people noticed after she was murdered on Tuesday night. She was clutching her diploma in her left hand—and she was black. When her mother heard the news, she recalled her daughter's determination to finish high school and her own efforts to help. She told a newsman, "It's been so hard."

But Joetha Collier made it—all the way to graduation day. And next fall, she was supposed to go to Mississippi Valley State College. Now she is dead—and so is the once distant dream which would have become a reality for her only four years after her commencement.

Here in the sunshine and the green hills of New Hampshire—here, where the sidewalk bloodstain that marks her killing seems so far away—here, and on this happy day, we must ask some sad questions about Joetha Collier—and about our own country.

What has happened to America—when some men decide to take out their hate on teenagers and children?

What is wrong in America—when Dr. Milton Eisenhower warns a Senate committee that the radical left and the radical right are arming themselves with guns and bombs?

What will be left of the American future—if we must continue to endure the random and wanton killing of innocents?

In a very real sense, it is easy to ignore those questions because they should be asked so often. It is almost like seeing the Vietnam war on the television news—after a while, the numbers of the body count begin to sound like the numbers of the weather report. There have been so many Joetha Colliers and so much violence in America, that there is now a ritual of reaction for each new atrocity.

Public figures express their condolences and their outrage.

The local police and the FBI investigate. Someone is usually caught—and sometimes even convicted.

The story is on page 1, then page 9, and finally it is not mentioned at all. Buried in a past we cannot change and want to ignore, the last tragedy is forgotten until the next tragedy shocks us again.

Surely, we can muster a better response to recurring tragedy than recurring numbness. Surely, we can find a larger consolation than the narcotic thought that it will all be over when the latest victim is buried.

Our duty—as Americans and as human beings—is to make sure that it is never all over—until we can be sure that it will never happen again.

Obviously, we cannot expect to erase altogether the stain of violence. But we can at least, by our words and our deeds, begin to rebuild peace in this nation.

In recent days, there has been a striking and encouraging sign of hope. Some little noted Americans—some of the ordinary people who really count—have served clear notice that they will not accept or permit the subversion of America's soul by violence. Last week in Harlem, they showed us the simple decency of caring about human life.

Two policemen—one black and one white—had been brutally gunned to death on a public street. The news of this unprovoked attack stirred speculation about the reaction of the Harlem community. Some commentators hinted that the murders reflected the neighborhood's real attitude. But the men and women of Harlem had not read the commentators. They looked into their consciences and made the grief of the patrolmen's families their own.

Ministers preached from their pulpits about their congregation's responsibility to stand against terror and violence.

Citizens co-operated with the police in the

search for the killers. They are watching their streets and their playgrounds and their apartment buildings for a trace or a clue.

Harlem has told itself, its city, and the world what even the most neglected Americans are really like. Their society has done far less than it should for them—but they are ready to do as much as they can for their society.

That alone should offer us more hope for America's survival. Beyond all the programmatic specifics and all the cost analysis, behind the Senate bills and the debate over defense spending, what will finally make the crucial difference is our feeling for each other. We call ourselves Americans. Are we ready to give that name and grant its meaning to every one of the two hundred million citizens who share this country with us? Are we ready to respect their dignity though we disagree with their views or their conduct? Are we ready to care about another man's life and another man's rights as though they were ours instead of his?

I do not know how every public official would answer each of those questions. I think I know the answer of America's people. I think people are tired of the hatreds and the prejudices and the assorted stupidities that have driven us further and further apart. I think people are angry about the anger which inflicts so much pain and suffering. I think people—your parents and my family and our friends—want to believe again in the common enterprise we call America.

In Harlem and Nashua, in Seattle and Los Angeles, every individual, each in his own life, can start to move in a new direction. Understanding and compassion toward others can touch and reshape our country's future. We have all heard that in the past—but we have not done enough about it in the past. But in 1971, we must not only hear but also heed the voice of our shared humanity. The people of Harlem listened and responded. Now, for every American in every section, it is time to use the things that unite us to overcome the things that divide us.

Every individual must try—but individuals cannot succeed alone. Government, too, has a critical role to play. And it cannot bring us together merely by adopting those words as its slogan. What national leaders say to the public and what they do with their power can tip the balance for or against the strength of our common bond.

Our leaders must stop the war in Vietnam—a war no general can win and few citizens still support. Only in peace, can we restore the faith of all Americans in the vitality of the American system.

Our leaders must insure a job for every worker—to end the humiliation of relief and the tragedy of unemployment. Only in a growing America, can we make whites and blacks and every race partners in economic progress instead of rivals for economic scarcity.

Our leaders must spend their resources to save cities in crisis from the threat of financial and social collapse. Only in cities which are livable and safe, can we live without frustration, fear and suspicion.

And finally, our leaders must work to make the promise of racial equality a reality for every citizen. Only in justice, can we secure a lasting domestic tranquility, free from the tensions which have wracked us in recent years.

Almost ten generations ago, the first Americans had the courage to launch the first modern experiment in government founded on liberty. There was a difficult and hostile time. All they had was a little community of colonies out on the edge of the world. They were locked in struggle with a great empire and their great idea was hanging in the balance. But they believed in one another. With danger on every side, they wrote about the inalienable rights of man. Then they took their declaration and put it into

practice even before their independence was fully won.

Our challenge and our chance is to make America equal to those beginnings. From the time when we were the newest nation in the world, we must reclaim the faith that can keep us the greatest nation in the world. It is nothing more—and it is nothing less—than a faith in the capacity and freedom of the individual human being. Government must guarantee the exercise of that freedom and the opportunity to realize that capacity. Unless our country lives up to such principles, we will never be able to live together.

I cannot help thinking as I speak with you now of the fundamental choices you must soon make for all of us. You will decide, as much or more than anyone, what shape American society will take. You can choose to care, as the people in Harlem have. Or you can succumb to the pressures of this terribly troubled time and choose to give in, drop out, or turn on.

Too many in your generation have already traded away their responsibility in return for the bitter promise of a hypodermic needle, or a hallucinogenic pill.

You cannot let that happen to you. We need you too much—just as we have always needed the young. Where would we be in the fight for peace and civil rights and personal liberty if the young had not pushed and prodded us toward a more decent society?

Your task now—in our communities and in our nation—is to make the American dream work. And no American can do that by pursuing the false dreams held out by drugs.

I am convinced that most of your generation understands that.

I am convinced that the best young generation we have ever had is keeping its commitment to our best chance for change—from violence to reason—from despair to hope—from war abroad to peace at home.

I am convinced that you will persevere, as Joetha Collier did. And so I would like to end this commencement speech with the words she heard on her last day, her commencement day:

"Make America A Better Place."

THE FIFTH FREEDOM

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND MUSKIE at the Four Freedoms Award Dinner, New York City, May 20, 1971)

The program says that you are here to honor me. But you and I both know the truth. We are really meeting to honor a very special man among men—and the ideals he left to all mankind.

In the midst of war, Franklin Roosevelt had the courage to proclaim a new vision of peace. He looked beyond the death and the destruction to affirm the hope for a decent life.

Thirty years later, his hope still lights our way. We are still fighting for the future—and that is why we are still fighting for the four freedoms.

We believe in freedom from fear. But we live with the terrible fear of world war and the grim reality of an Asian war. Nations agree again and again to a contest of arms, but seldom to the control of arms.

We believe in freedom of speech and the press. But we hear constant attacks on the networks and the newspapers that are trying to tell us the truth. Their right to report the news is threatened by men who have inherited Franklin Roosevelt's place, but not his principles.

We believe in freedom of religion. But we too often forget our first moral duty—to grant each person the full equality God gave all people. Prejudice and hate have no place in any man's faith.

We believe in freedom from want. But we witnessed in 1970 a rise in the number of Americans forced to survive on less than

survival requires. This Nation once proudly announced a war on poverty—but there was almost no reaction to last year's defeat.

America is still far from the four freedoms—and we are now learning that even the four freedoms are no longer enough. We are learning that we must also fight for another freedom—the fifth freedom—the freedom to achieve.

In 1971, people will not settle for just enough food and just enough shelter. Even in the midst of want, they are intent on more than freedom from want. Whether they are black or white—whether they have a poverty level income or a blue collar income—millions of Americans are now looking for an opportunity to achieve.

They are looking for hiring lines instead of welfare lines—so they can earn their own livelihood in dignity and with respect.

They are looking beyond dead-end jobs to new skills and new chances—so they can test the range of their talents and reach for their dreams.

They are looking for good schools—so their sons and daughters can learn the way to a more rewarding life.

They are looking for the right of every American to compete fairly against any American.

Three decades ago, barely past the disaster of the great depression, many of our people would have welcomed minimum material security. But not in 1971—when even deprived Americans see all around them the promise of American life. They know how prosperous things can be—and they will not accept things as they are.

They will not accept a six percent unemployment rate. They will not accept a subsistence farm wage or a depressed factory wage. They will not accept disrupted and declining schools. And they are right. Those things are unacceptable. Those things deny the freedom to achieve. No accident of birth should ever decide who goes to college and who goes to boot camp.

We once thought of relief and unemployment compensation and public housing as landmark social advances. They were and they are. But we must advance beyond them now. We must commit our society to the realization in our time of a new freedom to achieve.

And the commitment must be total.

Franklin Roosevelt's four freedoms were supposed to reach every American. Now a new freedom to achieve must include all of us, women as well as men. The mother and the daughters of any family should have an equal chance to become the best artists—the best professionals—and the best politicians.

Franklin Roosevelt's four freedoms were supposed to reach "everywhere in the world." Now a new freedom to achieve must encompass every part of the third world. In Africa and Asia and in Latin America, poor countries are working desperately against long odds for social progress. They are determined to create an agricultural system that can feed the millions who are literally starving. They will not rest until they build an industrial plant that can make the reality of their economy equal to the potential of their independence.

And their concern is not so different from ours. In a very real sense, our country and the poor countries are the common casualties of a common tragedy.

I believe that we cannot gain the freedom to achieve anywhere in the world until we guarantee freedom from fear everywhere in the world. As long as we spend \$200 billion dollars a year so we can kill people, we will never muster the resources to enhance people's lives. The burden of our defense is breaking the back of our best hopes. Nuclear bombs and non-nuclear weapons alike are stockpiled in every nation. The result is an arms race that breeds insecurity—and an in-

security that breeds an escalating arms race. The vicious cycle has many victims.

Sometimes, the victims are the villages bombed into rubble, the children dead before their time, the aged killed when there was some precious time left.

More often, the victims are economic plans that have to be abandoned—cities that must remain in crisis—schools that are allowed to decline—job opportunities that cannot be created—and housing that cannot be built—all because our wealth is diverted to rifles that cannot heal and missiles that cannot teach. What it all adds up to is the pervasive fear that put the freedom to achieve beyond man's grasp and sometimes even beyond his vision.

You can see the result in the condition of the great powers, who have barely started to make their societies as good as they could be.

You can see the result in the new nations, which have been left with societies that are less than they should be.

That is the steep price we have all paid to enter the arms race. The price is people—their aspirations and their rights. The price is an American student who could not afford college last year in Brooklyn—and a Russian machinist who had to turn down a better job because he couldn't find an apartment in Leningrad. The price is too high—and the world must stop payment now.

In January, Governor Harriman and I spent four hours talking with Premier Kosygin in Moscow.

I told him then essentially the same things I have told you tonight.

I voiced my concern about what the competition in arms has given us in return for all our expense: Nothing but more insecurity between nations and more insecurity within nations. I believe we must repeat and re-emphasize a vital truth until it becomes a rule of behavior: The security of every nation depends on the mutual arms restraint of all nations.

As I said on my return from Moscow, I sensed that the Soviets may be ready to negotiate specific agreements for a specific reduction of arms.

Today's news from the SALT talks is an encouraging sign.

The United States and the Soviet Union have reached an agreement about what to negotiate. Now we must negotiate an agreement that actually reduces the weight of arms.

That is the most urgent priority.

The talks must also begin to deal with improvements in the quality of weapons, not just increases in their number.

And, ultimately, the world must move beyond strategic weapons restraint to limits on the conventional arms of all countries as well as the nuclear arms of the great powers.

It is time for the nations of the world to give the people of the world the freedom to achieve. The first step and the most crucial step is to win freedom from fear.

It may take a long time. There will be difficulties and frustrations and defeats. But if we persist, peace will ultimately prevail—in our own nation and around the globe.

We must believe that the four freedoms are essential to the establishment of sane and rational relations among all men.

We must believe that the power of these ideals can persuade other peoples and other societies to make the same commitment.

By our example and by our initiatives we must convince others of our own commitment to the specific steps which must be taken if we are to achieve them.

We have the opportunity in arms control and in so many other areas. We must seize it now.

In Southeast Asia, we must negotiate an end to the fighting—we must withdraw our forces by the end of the year.

In Berlin, we must make the agreements

that may make it possible to heal the division in Europe.

In the Middle East, we must support efforts by the parties themselves to negotiate a settlement that provides security.

On our trade policies we must work for the day when men will trade goods and never bombs.

In our aid program we must do as much as we should and more than we are doing in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

The most powerful nation in man's history surely has the power to change man's destiny on earth from the potential destruction of his prospects for life to the enlargement of his prospects for hope.

We can do so not just by reliance on arms, but by a demonstration of our capacity for leadership—leadership which has the faith and the strength to build upon man's potential to be human.

That was Franklin Roosevelt's faith when he proclaimed the four freedoms. That is your faith when you present the four freedoms award. I am proud to accept the award tonight because I have always shared that faith.

I believe that together we can make our common faith the common fate of man.

A MEDICAL BILL OF RIGHTS

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, New York City, May 27, 1971)

When politicians speak at college commencements in 1971, careful students raise their guard. You wonder what we really have to say—and whether you should even try to listen. The world in your time has left you with a sure sense of skepticism about public men and political life.

A graduate of Einstein has seen too much in recent years to accept very much of the rhetoric he hears.

For as long as you have been in college, America has been in Indochina. Your generation has stood up for peace—and your protest has persuaded most of my generation to oppose the war. But still the fighting rages on—and still our free system fails to bend our policy to the will of our people.

For as long as you have been in medical school, you have witnessed in some neighborhoods of the Bronx the starkest evidence of man's inhumanity to man. You long ago heard the pledge of new priorities—but daily you encounter mothers without food, workers without work, and children hooked on heroin. Politicians have always made promises to the south Bronx—but they have seldom made progress for the families who live there.

Finally, for as long as you can remember, the stain of racial prejudice has mocked our claim to national equality. We have talked civil rights and supported civil rights and even proclaimed civil rights. But how would white Americans now answer President Kennedy's probing question: "which of us would willingly trade places with a black man?"

So I understand whatever skepticism you bring to this ceremony today, I know that my words cannot erase your doubts. Only the deeds of government in the years ahead can restore your confidence and renew our country. But I think we can do what we must—and I think that we will. I think that ultimately America will turn from the tasks of death abroad to the tasks of life at home.

I cannot prove my conviction. But I ask you to share it—in spite of the wrong you have seen—and because of the right you have experienced. Your education alone is vital evidence of an ability to build justice here in America.

In 1954, Dr. Samuel Belkin founded Einstein, not only because New York City needed another high quality medical school, but because the Nation needed another nondis-

crimatory medical school. His faith and the faith of his fellow founders can be reduced to a single, simple truth. They believed that something better than bias should determine the chance to learn how to heal. They believed that general quotas could not measure individual qualifications. And they translated their belief into a place that is first rate in its profession and first rate in its principles.

In 1971, Einstein is a quietly eloquent testament to the good that Americans can create. And Einstein's remarkable record gives us reason to hope that our institutions can respond to our conscience and our social crisis.

Between 1958 and 1971, your medical school graduated only 15 blacks and Puerto Ricans. In 1974 alone, it will graduate 20. The difference is that Einstein is no longer waiting for minority applications. It is actively seeking them—and it is succeeding in its search. Your institution has done what some say no institution can do—it has adapted the practices of the past to the present and the future needs of people.

But Einstein's response has not been limited to serving the cause of racial justice. This new college has also discarded the old prejudice of the medical profession against women. Twenty-nine of them become doctors here today—twenty-nine more than almost any medical school would have wanted or accepted only a few years ago. Their hands and brains will save lives—because Einstein has broken with an ancient tradition that was wrong from the beginning.

And now Einstein is pointing the way to further reform. In response to the shortage of doctors, it is increasing its enrollment and reducing its course of study. The result of the three-year program will be more doctors of equal competence trained in less time. And the result of that will be more health care for more Americans.

Anyone privileged to graduate from Einstein cannot be completely skeptical about institutions and their potential to advance the cause of compassion and decency. You should be proud to come from a medical school which is serving, not only your special profession, but our entire society. Its example is a lesson to take with you as you leave here today—a lesson equal to any you have learned—a lesson as important as anatomy or physiology or biochemistry. For you, like your college, have a social as well as a professional service to perform.

This morning you receive a piece of paper and swear a solemn oath that will permit you to cure the sickness of people. But the diploma and the oath will require something more from each of you—a constant commitment to cure the sickness of a medical care system which too often keeps doctors and the people who need doctors far apart. The technical name for the system is "health care delivery." The human reality behind the name is painfully visible everywhere in this city.

In the South Bronx, a young couple dips into their meager savings, not to send a son to school, but to bury their youngest child. It is no consolation for them to learn that their neighbors share their sorrow—that the rate of infant mortality in the South Bronx is double the rate of communities to the north.

In Brownsville, a seven-year-old is brought to an emergency room with stomach cramps from eating lead paint. After treatment, he is returned home to more hunger—and to a further risk of lead poisoning—a risk that each year becomes a reality for at least 900 children throughout New York City.

On the lower east side, a Spanish speaking mother takes her injured daughter to the hospital. After waiting around for seven hours, she is told in words she barely com-

prehends to return tomorrow. She does not know enough English to understand the explanation that there are not enough doctors. All she is left with is a worried night alone with her child.

And on Staten Island, a widow discovers that all the insurance and investments of years have been drained by the \$30,000 bill for her husband's cancer treatments. She is discovering a hard fact of life and death in America—that sickness is often a financial as well as a physical catastrophe.

Multiply all these tragedies a hundred-fold—reduce them to categories and numbers—and you will end up with the sad statistics of a falling health care system.

Between 1966 and 1980, the number of workers who cannot work due to illness will climb from 18 million to 21 million.

75,000 newborn babies die in the United States each year.

The number of general practitioners has declined 35% since 1957—and foreign physicians now constitute more than 25% of our nation's doctors.

150 counties across the country have absolutely no health professionals of any kind. In most central cities, the situation is as bad—or just a little better. In the Kenwood section of Chicago, there are only two physicians for 48,000 people.

The cost of medical care has skyrocketed to over \$60 billion annually. At the same time, the health insurance industry has used its actuarial studies to exclude segment after segment of our society from access to medical protection. The poor are abandoned to uneven and often inhuman public health services. And the middle class is caught squarely in the middle—too well-off to qualify for government help—too pressured to help themselves with comprehensive insurance.

In the end, millions of Americans go without adequate medical care. They cannot afford it. They are afraid it will break them. Or they cannot find a doctor. Some of them die. Others are left destitute. And most of them fall victim to needless pain and needless suffering. They are your parents or mine—your children or mine—our friends and our fellow citizens.

The disaster we call medical services makes most Americans forgotten Americans. It betrays each of them and all of us. Our system of medical care is in fact a system of medical neglect. It is in the deepest sense un-American.

Despite our power and our strength, despite our trillion dollar G.N.P., we have let young people die before their time and old people die when there was some precious time left. How will history judge us, a country which was first in the wealth of its resources, but far from first in the health of its people? And more importantly, how will we judge ourselves in those quiet, inner moments, when we remember that what finally counts is not how much we have, but what we are?

It is time for us to do more until we have done enough to sustain and enhance the health of our Nation.

Countless medical students and some doctors have already answered the call to a new kind of service. In the early 1960s, student health organizations from Los Angeles to Boston pioneered concepts for comprehensive health care. In the summer of 1967, students like you joined together in New York City to found the student health project of the south Bronx. Their historic initiative was a sign of a new generation's determination to make medicine work for people.

But the young and the concerned in the medical profession cannot do the whole job alone. Your voices have been heard—and sometimes even heeded. But your own efforts will take too long. And the results will be too uncertain. The only certainty is that en-

trenched and established forces will oppose you every step of the way. We cannot wait or gamble on the outcome. Human life and human health hang in the balance.

Four decades after organized medicine almost adopted a report favoring uniform financing for medical services—four decades and a hundred million illnesses too late—we must enact a medical bill of rights for all Americans. The constitution commits our country to protect political freedom. Now, by legislation, the Congress must commit America to protect the physical health which alone makes possible the exercise of liberty.

The first medical right of all Americans is care within their means. Admission to a hospital or a doctor's office should depend on the state of an individual's health, not the size of his wallet. And we cannot depend for reform on half-way measures and half-hearted compromise. A right to medical care which left the burden of cost on the poor and the near poor would mock its own purpose. The only sure security is federally funded universal health insurance. That is our best hope for the future—and a priority goal in 1971.

We must take the dollar sign out of medical care. We must destroy the financial barrier between deprived people and essential medical services. We must end the terrible choice so many Americans face between losing their health and losing their savings.

The second medical right of all Americans is care within their reach. Even if we guaranteed the payment of health costs, millions of our citizens could not find sufficient medical services. The system is not only inequitable—it is also undermanned and inefficient. It is on the verge of collapse. The Nation must now respond with Federal financial incentives that will insure real reform.

There are not enough doctors. But Federal incentives can persuade medical schools to follow Einstein's lead and expand their enrollment. New schools can be created and sustained by Federal loans and grants. And Federal funds must also be provided to help medical students who should have something better than money to worry about. A program of scholarship aid must include all who are in need—and it must encourage minority students who intend to return to the old neighborhoods.

Yet the number of doctors is not the whole answer. If we produce 50,000 additional physicians and plug them into the current structure, our efforts for reform will certainly fail. Some of the health manpower legislation now before the Congress would do just that—and the result would be too many more doctors serving too few people at too high a cost.

Here, too, Congress must set up financial incentives that can move medicine in a new direction. We must encourage a shift from a system dependent on the individual doctor to a system built around the concept of the health team, composed of primary care physicians and other medical professionals. Teams would allow us to allocate medical resources with maximum efficiency and to maximum effect. They would employ paraprofessionals to relieve nurses and doctors from routine, time-consuming tasks. They would gather together diverse skills—from internists to pediatricians—and patients would deal with the team, not just a single physician. Einstein has experimented with the health team concept. The Federal Government must make Einstein's experimental national policy.

And health teams must be sufficient in distribution as well as in number. Federal bonuses must make it worthwhile to practice in the inner city and in rural America. Medical care cannot reach people unless people can reach doctors. And people must have

more than geographic reach. A health team should also be subject to the reach of local influence.

Location incentives for health services must be designed to create responsive, personal structures. It was never right—and it is no longer possible—to satisfy Americans with distant, impersonal medical care. The system must respect everyone's identity—and sacrifice no one's dignity. And we must always remember that it is easier for a patient to reach a health team that he knows—than a shining new medical center walled off from surrounding rural poverty or a nearby urban ghetto.

The third medical right of all Americans is care within their needs. The present health insurance system is heavily biased toward high-cost hospital treatment and against preventive health care. That is incredibly expensive—and incredibly insensitive to the real needs of people. It has filled hospitals with patients who should not be there and would be better off elsewhere. A new national health program must reverse the old priorities. It must guarantee a range of medical services, comprehensive in scope, preventive in emphasis, and restricted only by the scope of scientific knowledge.

America's concern over the quality of health care has reached a high water mark in 1971. You are graduating from medical school at a time when the whole medical profession may be profoundly altered. You should welcome change—and work for change. Only in the context of a medical bill of rights for every American, can each of you truly and in the most literal sense profess your profession—which is nothing more and nothing less than the protection of human life.

And that requires not just a medical bill of rights, but a social bill of rights. The real cure for lead poisoning is not hospital care, but decent housing. The most effective treatment for malnutrition is adequate food. And the best guarantee of good health is a physically and emotionally healthy environment.

As health professionals, you must commit yourselves to total health care. And total care includes virtually everything that determines whether we are sick or well. You cannot confine yourselves to the technical skills you have learned here. You must also practice the fundamental human concern of a school like Einstein.

You must speak out for a fair and sensible medical care system.

You must stand up for social progress and for people—whether they are your patients or migrant workers two thousand miles away.

You can cure individuals—and you must help America build a compassionate society.

It will take time. There will be setbacks and frustrations and defeats. But men and women who come from Einstein have good reason to believe that we can finally fashion a country that is great enough to be good. You have seen in your own lives what a difference one school can make. Now all of you have a chance to make a real difference in the lives of others.

The practice you choose and the practices you follow may not change our country overnight. But you can remind us by example of Aristotle's ancient truth: "Health of mind and body is so fundamental to the good life that if we believe men have any personal rights at all as human beings, they have an absolute moral right to the measure of good health that society is able to give them."

That is our challenge and our chance. Two thousand years after Aristotle wrote, we must secure a medical bill of rights for our own people. We can wait no longer—in health care or in society. In our individual lives and in our national life, whatever we can do, and whatever we dream we can do, we must begin now.

HEALTH CARE FOR OLDER AMERICANS: A RIGHT, NOT A PRIVILEGE

(Opening statement by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Chairman, at a hearing by the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly, U.S. Senate Special Committee on the Aging on "Cutbacks in Medicare and Medical Coverage", Los Angeles Calif. May 10, 1971)

Today the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly of the Senate Special Committee on Aging begins a series of hearings on the health crisis that confronts our older Americans. During the year we hope to explore various facets of the problems: the high and rising costs of health care; some rigid Medicaid regulations that frequently prevent medical care from being effective or efficient; an inadequate supply of medical and paramedical personnel; and outmoded health care institutions that cannot deliver a decent standard of health care.

The hearing today will focus upon the standards of health care that older Americans are receiving under the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Because of its high concentration of older citizens, Southern California is an appropriate place to begin this study. We hope to examine carefully what impact recent cutbacks in the Medicare and Medicaid programs have had upon the lives of senior Americans. In order to obtain this information, we have invited health consumers, medical practitioners, and medical administrators to appear this morning.

Before we begin, I would like to outline briefly the problems which have created this health care crisis for millions of our elderly. Much of this recent data comes from a Working Paper written for the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly by Mrs. Agnes Brewster, a health consultant who has been of great service to this Committee in the past.

Our elderly require greater health care than any other age group. Americans over 65 are twice as likely to have one or more chronic conditions than younger persons. They are in hospitals more frequently for longer stays caused by more serious illnesses. In 1970 the average stay in a hospital for an older American was 13 days.

Those who suffer most from illness—our elderly—can least afford to pay for health care. Persons 65 and older comprise about 10 percent of our population, but they account for nearly 20 percent of all persons in poverty; they are twice as likely to be poor. One out of every four persons 65 or older lives in poverty. Over half of all persons 65 and older who live alone have annual incomes below 2,000 dollars.

Yet, the cost of health care for the elderly—despite Medicare and Medicaid—is rising:

In fiscal year 1970, the average health bill for a person 65 or older was 791 dollars, six times that of a youth (up to 18) and three times that of people between 19 and 64 years old.

Medicare covers 43 percent (down from 45 percent in fiscal year 1969) of the total health care cost of the aged, leaving uncovered an amount larger than the total health bill for the average younger person.

Despite the valuable protection that Medicare and Medicaid affords, the older person must still pay annually 226 dollars out-of-pocket for health care. This is more than double the out-of-pocket payments for those under 65.

Thus the elderly—with less than half the income of those under 65—pay, themselves, on the average twice as much for health services.

Even with Medicare and Medicaid, many elderly do not receive a decent level of health care.

What this means in human terms is that our elderly, even with our health care programs, must still spend a huge part of their

limited income for health care. Many cannot afford it. Serious illness can mean destitution. The threat that major illness will wipe out a life's savings still haunts millions of older Americans.

This is a serious problem for older people who are poor, and is becoming a threat for all of those who retire and face major health problems.

Recent cost-cutting cutbacks and regulations have saved money, but at the price of denying urgently needed health care to our older citizens. By placing limits on care available and by increasing costs, we have merely decreased the health and the happiness of our older people. Too often the choice must be made between food or medicine.

Untreated minor illnesses become major diseases. Cancelled doctor visits and home care mean later expensive hospitalization. With health care primarily on an emergency only basis, preventive medicine becomes near impossible. Without attention or drugs many older Americans are forced to face the pain and terror of sickness alone.

When this Nation adopted Medicare and Medicaid, it made a commitment toward providing adequate health care to those who spent their lives building America. We began turning a dream into reality—that all our older citizens could live their years with the best health care available and without the fear of financial ruin caused by serious illness. These programs were not a complete answer, but they were a solid foundation upon which we could build.

Now we seem to be turning back upon our commitment, and instead of pushing towards better health care, we are dismantling our first effort. We are turning our backs upon older Americans, forcing them to face illness and pain alone.

This is not the way a great Nation should treat a generation that helped make it great. It is not generous. It is not fair. It is not decent. Every person over 65 should receive the health care he needs. Let us make good health care a right, not a privilege.

"CITIES OF HOPE—A CHANCE FOR THE NEW SOUTH"

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE to the second annual symposium of the L.Q.C. Lamar Society, Atlanta, Ga.)

Thank you, Brandy Ayers, for that kind and generous introduction. As a country boy from Maine I can tell that you haven't lost everything you picked up on the farm.

When Brandy first asked me to join you for this symposium, I couldn't say, "No." After all, it was to be a pleasant gathering of friendly people like Brandy who wanted to talk about cities. He didn't tell me it was a meeting against northern cities, which puts me in the position of being the sinner on exhibit at a revival meeting.

It may be, though, that I can help bridge the gap between northern cities and southern civilization. After all, I have spent the last twelve years in Washington, a city President Kennedy said was noted for its southern efficiency and northern charm.

There was a time when I saw some irony in requests that I speak as an authority on cities. I grew up in a small town in a rural state, and I turned down a chance to practice law in New York City. I ran for mayor of Waterville, Maine, once, and was defeated. Waterville's gain turned out to be the Senate's loss, and the Senate gave me a chance to learn about cities—among other things.

There are some advantages in coming upon the problems of the city from a rural perspective. You know what a sense of community can mean, and you can understand the attraction and the horror of first encounters with a large city.

There is excitement in the life and movement of the city. There is also fear and loneliness.

A city generates a sense of power, while many of its residents feel powerless. The city holds great promise, but too many of those who rush to it feel cheated.

Thomas Jefferson feared the city, and hoped his country could avoid its horrors. We know that cities cannot be avoided, but we have not yet learned how to make them places of hope.

What is it that we want from our cities?

I suspect each of us wants from a city what we all want from whatever community we call our own. We want a place to share with others who care about that place, because they have roots there, because they feel that they belong, and because they believe they will have a chance to grow there. We want to live in a community where we can help shape its future, where we can control our own destinies.

Those feelings are a part of our national traditions. Some of us have experienced those traditions. Some have read about them. Too many have been excluded from them.

I am one of those fortunate ones who experienced the life and politics of trust. If my father forgot to lock his tailor shop, he did not wake in panic, dress and go down to make sure everything was alright. He went back to sleep, quite sure nothing would be disturbed. The ordinary commerce of life: Walking down the main street, getting a quart of milk at the Grocery, attending the PTA, passing the time of day after church, all the everyday rituals were a series of accidental but pleasant encounters.

In such a world, where the natural environment and the environment man created were comfortable and unthreatening, our sense of family and community grew. We were participants in our community. Even government was not distant and unapproachable.

Everyone knew his town selectman and state legislator, and many even knew the Congressman. There were familiar faces in the town hall, people we knew, who lived nearby or across the town. And anyone who has attended a New England town meeting knows that "participatory politics" is not a new invention.

I guess it was an attempt to recapture such pleasant memories of an earlier day that led those who could afford the journey on the great crabgrass stampede to the suburbs.

It hasn't worked, and that is as plain to the suburbanites as it is to the armies of strangers left behind in the dying shells of the central city. In an attempt to plant new roots, many suburbanites have found their lives to be rootless, without a sense of belonging anywhere. The poor who have come to the cities find that they have arrived nowhere.

The city is nowhere when it lacks job opportunities, when financial resources are drained to the point where schools cannot be funded, where health programs are practically non-existent, where housing is overcrowded, filthy and unsafe, where crime and drugs rule the scene, and where living is a hazard, not a pleasure.

For many southern communities, this is the nightmare of the future. For too many northern cities, this is the reality of the present.

Your symposium is a timely one, but the time is late.

The south still has a lower density of population than the north, but the pace of in-migration is quickening.

The south still has a fair mix of residential patterns, racial and economic, but the pattern is changing. In the last ten years, for example, southern suburbs became ninety

percent or more white, as did northern suburbs.

The south still has open space around its cities, but from the air the unmistakable signs of suburban sprawl are scarring the landscape.

And Southern mayors and county executives are part of the parade of local officials trying to get the President and the Congress to respond to the desperate financial plight of our cities.

With the history of urban blight in the North, the signs of blight in the South, and the trials and tribulations of the South, is there any hope for the future of Southern cities? I think there is.

If we are looking for signs of hope that our Nation can deal with its enormous social problems, we will find some of those signs in the South. That may sound like a sardonic statement to many of you who have been through the agonies of the past fifteen or twenty years. But the history of the South during the past decade offers proof that it is possible to achieve fundamental social change in this country. Customs and practices which seemed fixed in concrete have been overturned.

The changes in the South have proved that personal courage, among whites as well as blacks, can make a difference. Out of a troubled and tortured past, you are creating a brighter future for yourselves, and you have a chance to show the way for the North.

You still have a chance to structure your communities in a way which will make equal access and equal opportunity an advantage for all.

This is not to say the South can or must solve her urban problems by herself. The Nation has an obligation to help relieve the fiscal burdens of the cities. We have an obligation to correct those national policies which encourage the destruction of inner-city resources. We have an obligation to help cities and metropolitan areas improve the efficiency of their public services. We have an obligation to increase Federal assistance for education, health services, public safety, public transportation, environmental improvement, and the stimulation of healthy economic growth.

I do believe we need to go beyond the traditional, categorical grants-in-aid, to provide general budget support for social services in the cities. Such support, designed to help cities meet the operating costs of fire and police protection, sanitation, health, and—where appropriate—education, would lift an enormous burden from local taxpayers.

The Federal Government can provide that kind of assistance only if we put more of our resources to work for the building of our society, and less of our resources are invested in weapons of destruction. Our commitment to the well-being of our citizens will be measured by the steps we take to end the war in Vietnam—not someday, but now. That commitment will be measured by the moves we make to end the upward spiral of the arms race—not someday, but now.

I have been in Washington long enough, however, to know that neither I nor anyone else in the Nation's Capitol has all the answers to our urban problems. We can supply money, we can identify national priorities, and we can provide support for certain approaches to the problems of the cities. But we cannot, and should not, pretend to have the solution.

Urban renewal was supposed to answer the problem of city slums. Urban renewal has torn down slum buildings, but it has not restored the life of the city.

Our housing programs were supposed to end shortages in middle income and lower income housing. We have built housing, but too many of the middle income houses have

been in the suburbs, contributing to the flight from the city, and too many low income housing units have been in new ghettos of isolation.

Our highway programs were supposed to end traffic congestion. They have increased the flow of traffic, accelerating the flight to the suburbs and destroying houses and communities in the city.

Our farm programs were supposed to keep the farmer on an equal footing with his counterpart in the city. But instead of improving and enriching rural life, we have forced people off the land and into the cities totally unprepared for new jobs and new lives.

Now, in our effort to overcome the crisis in urban finance, in our attempt to control pollution and improve the environment of the cities, and in our search for better ways of governing metropolitan areas, we are trying new ideas for metropolitan government.

These suggestions—for annexation, for regional pollution control agencies, for metropolitan-wide land use controls, for regional school systems, and for more comprehensive law enforcement jurisdictions—all these suggestions make sense. After all, one small jurisdiction cannot hope to control pollution in a metropolitan area. Pressures to zone businesses in and low income families out to broaden property tax bases cannot be resisted very well by one small jurisdiction. Restricted school districts cannot meet all the demands for high quality, equal opportunity education. And limited law enforcement jurisdictions cannot begin to handle highly mobile criminal activities.

Arguments for efficiency can drive us inexorably toward dependence on larger units of government, just as arguments for a massive attack on slums drove us to dependence on urban renewal. That approach alone will not lead us to the sense of community we so desperately need.

We can, confronted with a paradox, a seeming conflict between the needs of efficiency and community, and none of us has the answer to it.

But I have an underlying faith in the intelligence and good sense of the American people that they can resolve that paradox, if given the opportunity and the right kind of leadership.

Almost two hundred years ago, a group of American citizens met in Philadelphia to resolve a similar paradox. The weak and quarrelsome confederation of American States was confronted with international threats, domestic disruption, economic chaos and governmental inefficiency. Big States and small States were suspicious of each other. Regional pride ran high, and mutual confidence was low. They wanted a more perfect instrument of Government, but not at the expense of local control.

The result of their labors was the Constitution of the United States, a remarkable instrument of Government which has survived the test of time as a framework for endless adjustments in the body politic.

But the Constitution provides a national framework, and a statement of common objectives. It provides no blueprint for the governance of metropolitan areas, whose growth and complexity the Founding Fathers could not foresee. If we are going to make it possible to govern these areas, we must do it ourselves.

There are those who have suggested another constitutional convention—one they call an "urban convention". I think the time is indeed ripe to pursue new ideas and new relationships between State and local governments, and between people and their State and local governments. No single solution will meet the varying conditions in all parts of our country. But new ideas can stimulate a variety of solutions, adapted to local needs

and consistent with our objective of a humane, responsive and responsible society.

Your symposium marks one of the most hopeful signs in the struggle of thoughtful Americans toward the creation of cities—and communities—of hope. I suggest that you carry your discussions beyond this point: that you explore the possibilities of "urban conventions", within your region and within your States.

These urban conventions could bring together Governors, legislators, mayors, county executives, and other leaders from public and private life, all dedicated to the goal of cities of hope in the new South.

The agenda at such conventions would be full, but your work would be given direction and purpose by your goal—the goal of planning the basic changes in government needed to create humane, livable cities of tomorrow.

You could tackle the problem of creating and implementing a state urbanization policy, in which zoning authority, land use and building regulation, and other fundamental determinants of the quality of urban life would be shaped to serve public needs.

You could go to work on building a high-quality state-local tax system, effective in its capacity to raise revenue, efficient in its administration, and fair in its impact on the tax-paying citizen.

You could deal with the question of disparities in public services between neighborhoods of different economic and social character, and you could consider the development of enforceable minimum standards designed to achieve fairness in the provision of services in education, sanitation, and other areas of fundamental human need.

In your urban conventions, you could go to work on that paradox I mentioned a moment ago—the paradox of efficiency and community. Perhaps this would be the most important task of all. If we are to make our cities places of hope, we must have more than efficiency, important as that is. We must insure that in our cities, as in smaller communities, individual citizens have a measure of control over their lives. They must have a real voice in the shaping of their neighborhoods, the patterns of transportation, the educational opportunities for their children, and the exercise of law enforcement authority. They must have a direct relationship with their elected representatives, and those representatives must have an effective voice in the governing of the city.

And so, as we consider expanded, simplified metropolitanwide government, we must also consider new ideas for neighborhood government, to overcome the alienation between big city government and its citizens. It has been suggested that state legislatures authorize city and county councils to establish neighborhood sub-units of government, each with an elected council, and with power to undertake self-help projects and to influence city actions having special impact on the neighborhood. Each neighborhood district could also elect its own representatives to the overall governing body of the metropolitan area, and each could serve as the focus of community and social contact. These ideas, their promises and their problems, are all part of the agenda for your urban conventions.

You have before you, then, an opportunity to make the south a laboratory for the future, rather than a reminder of a troubled past. Your urban conventions can be the preparation, and the inspiration, for national urban convention, which could mobilize our energies to build the new America of the third century of our history.

In making this suggestion tonight, I speak for the millions who live and work in the cities of this land, who have witnessed the death of civility and the loss of a sense of belonging. They are the millions of Americans who suffer from loneliness in the midst of

crowds, while their retreats of privacy are destroyed.

I speak for them when I appeal to the people of the south—and through you to your city councilmen, and mayors, county executives, legislators and governors—I appeal to you to make this region, in this decade, a great laboratory for the creation of the humane city. You have the tools and the talent, and I believe you have the imagination and the will. I know you have the leaders, from my contacts with your mayors and many of the members of this society.

But make no mistake, it will not be easy. It will not be the meek who inherit the southern land before it is bulldozed and buried under miles of concrete.

It will not be the timid who control the instruments of Government which shape the future of the south.

It will not be one class or one group which determines how the south shall grow.

What are the choices? And who shall the south be for? Will you abandon your cities to development by the random, insensitive blades of the bulldozers, fueled and piloted by short-term profits. Bulldozers and highways do not vote. They feel no pain and have no sense of community: Neither do they need privacy.

Privacy, hope, love and trust, dignity, kindness: An eye for beauty, an ear for laughter, sympathy for the sorrowing—these are human traits, not the desires of economic man or political man, but man, period. Cities must be built and governed by those who put those traits first, for every man and woman, not those who put economic gain and political power first.

I believe the people of the south can find the way. That is why I came to be with you and to listen to you this week. I believe you will make the urban environment yield to the necessities of man, not to his machines. And if the great urban laboratory of the south succeeds, as I think it can, then you will have discovered something you can present as an example and a gift to the nation.

REBUILDING URBAN GOVERNMENT

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE to the American Jewish Committee, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, May 14, 1971)

There are places where every concerned politician should speak—and the American Jewish Committee is at the top of the list.

For generations, the leaders of America have not only been talking to you, but learning from you.

Your innovative ideas and perceptive position papers have pushed and prodded our society toward something better.

You have probed for our failings and enhanced our potential for success.

And in 1971, the American Jewish Committee is still standing on the high ground of American life—for decency and justice, and for the compassion that can come only from a caring nation.

Any public official should be honored to visit with you. But when he comes, he better have something to say. I hope I can meet that obligation this afternoon. I know I have something on my mind that is high on your agenda. It relates to the crisis in our own country. But it is not unrelated to another crisis thousands of miles away.

Last week, an American in Israel told his hosts that they had suffered the agony of war and now they must suffer the agony of peace. His advice deserves an answer—and the answer is obvious: Israel has suffered enough. It is time for an end to the agony and the beginning of a just peace.

In my recent visit to Israel, I learned anew what a just peace means. It means security guaranteed by border adjustments. It means that those adjustments must be negotiated by the nations involved. And it means that

the United States must do nothing to undermine Israel's bargaining position.

The American Jewish Committee has been Israel's staunch ally in seeking all of that. You have spoken up for a fair settlement—and you have labored for it, day after day, for more than two decades. You have been effective—and you have also been criticized. There are those who have questioned your right as Americans to work for the rights of Israel. They wonder whether you should care so much and fight so hard.

What they do not understand is that your concern for Israel is a healthy sign of how special our nation really is.

Here in America and only in America, can free men affirm a common patriotism by celebrating their roots in a hundred different countries and cultures. Handing away the heritage of the past is not the admission ticket to America. My father did not do that when he came from Poland to Maine almost seventy years ago. He was a tailor—and I still have a suit he made for me. I also still have the tradition he passed on to me. I have not forgotten it. And the members of the American Jewish Committee have not forgotten the tradition they inherited. That's why you care about Israel—and that's why you should care.

It is perhaps the essence of America's greatness that our national unity gains strength from our group diversity.

But today that unity is threatened—not by our differences in cultural heritage—but by dangerous social divisions. You can see the danger in this city—and in every part of America. We worry about whether we can continue to live together—black and white, longhair and hardhat, young and old.

And that danger is perhaps the greatest danger we face. Americans have always been able to overcome a crisis of substance. In our own lifetime, we have seen supermarkets built where soup kitchens used to stand. But seldom in our history and not since the Civil War, have we seen a crisis of the American spirit. In 1971, the real test for our country is not a test of our power, but of our people. It is a test of our pluralism and our tolerance—and of our ability to work together in the enterprise we call America.

So our first priority and our toughest task is to heal our land. It may take a long time. But we must begin now—at every level of government and in every sector of society.

Our elected national leadership must stop using our divisions to win our votes. A Southern Strategy is no substitute for American progress. And progress is the key to unifying our people.

We need progress in our economy—to still the fear that jobs for black people will put white working men and women out of work. We must give all Americans a chance to be partners in a prosperous economy, instead of rivals for economic scarcity.

We need progress in our cities—where federal inattention today creates group competition for services that are in desperately short supply. Neighborhood should not have to stand against neighborhood to get the garbage picked up or the streets cleaned.

And we need progress toward peace—so that we can win together in America what we can never win in Indochina—a better future for our own country.

The Administration tells us to watch what they do, not what they say. But what they are doing—and not doing—is driving Americans further apart. And what they are saying spreads even more suspicion and mistrust. In action and in rhetoric, the Administration now has one overriding duty—one promise that must be kept—the promise we heard three years ago: Bring us together.

Sensitive national policies are the best way to fulfill that pledge. But they are not the whole answer. In New York and Houston, in Seattle and in Portland, Maine, in every town and village in America, the ability of people

to live together also requires the best energies of local government and private groups.

The American Jewish Committee has already responded. At Fordham University in 1968, you sponsored the first National Consultation on Ethnic America. Since then, you have convened similar consultations across the country. And you have not stopped with a few conferences. You decided to establish—and you are still sustaining—the National Project on Ethnic America. Its progress and its publications have pointed the way, not to a mythical melting pot, but to a true cultural pluralism. And your committee has also worked to make urban government more responsive to urban people.

Of course, your ultimate success—and the success of other private groups—depends on whether public officials listen to what you learn. Only they can change the structures of power. And structural change is one reform our cities really need.

The efforts of the American Jewish Committee have given shape and direction to that reform. Your studies emphasize not just administrative decentralization, but political decentralization as well. That is a dry, rather technical term for a vital and exciting concept—putting power where the people are. It is perhaps our best chance to create livable cities.

Too often in 1971, the problems of people are at the end of a vast, virtually immovable municipal bureaucracy—while the power to do something is at the other end, beyond any citizen's reach. People feel isolated and helpless. A pothole in front of the house or a broken street light on the corner becomes what New Yorkers call a big deal—and it tends to stay that way. A complaint often commands too little attention—and even less response. More basic decisions seem even further removed. Usually, they are heard about only after they are made.

The inevitable result is resentment and angry resignation. The beginning of an answer is to give people some real influence over the choices which affect and alter their lives. We have seen some progress in block associations, neighborhood organizations, and community planning boards. But most of them give people nothing more than advisory authority. And that is not enough. In every neighborhood of every city, people must have an opportunity to dissent and to decide, to propose and to veto. We are told that there are issues inappropriate for community consideration—and that is true. But there are a host of other issues that should belong to the people, not to some distant public official.

Neighborhood voices should be heard—and neighborhood views should be heeded. And if they are, we will see different neighborhoods in different cities. We will see cities whose citizens again believe that they can make a difference. And we will see neighborhoods whose residents again work together and truly live together—instead of imprisoning themselves in the tragic solitude of houses, isolated each from each by frustration and suspicion.

I was brought up in a town with a population probably equal to the number of people who live between 78th Street and 79th Street on Riverside Drive. There is no way that block and Rumford, Maine, can ever be exactly the same. But that block should be able to have some of the good things I had in Rumford. Neighbors should know each other's names. They should meet together and decide issues together. And they probably should even talk about the argument two friends down the street had at the last community meeting.

I believe that urban neighborhoods can be that way—if we give urban neighbors a reason to learn about each other and work with each other. When you strip away all the bureaucratic and academic language, that's what neighborhood government is really all about.

But when we talk of the need for smaller units of government, some planners are quick to remind us that many of our problems require larger units than we already have. Anyone who lives in a city feels the impact of the surrounding region. Newark smog is also New York smog. Jersey City's pollution does not stay on the Jersey side of the Hudson River. And a housing shortage in Queens is invariably felt in Fairfield County.

In short, many of our local challenges are really regional challenges—and they require a regional response. But how can we create a metropolitan urban planning without destroying the hope for neighborhood power? How can we satisfy legitimate demands for local control without sacrificing our chance to control an urgent regional crisis?

I am convinced that we can answer those questions and I am convinced that the answer is in our own history. Americans have always believed that each public function should belong to the level of government that can carry it out effectively and efficiently. But in recent years, we have allowed our practices to slip away from our principles. Cities have ended up with power that should be assigned to larger units of government—and to smaller ones as well.

The only solution is a thorough structural reform of public power. As we approach the two-hundredth anniversary of our Nation's beginnings, we must make a new beginning in urban government. That may even require that we take another lead from our forefathers by calling a multitude of "urban constitutional conventions"—conventions where governors and mayors, legislators and community leaders can raise and resolve some of the hardest problems our cities and suburbs face. With a little luck and a lot of reform, we might end up with government subunits in every city and a government superunit in every metropolitan area.

That really doesn't sound very glamorous. It would require tough, tedious nuts and bolts work. But that is also the only way to make the system work for people. And that, after all, is the real meaning of American politics.

Of course, turning that meaning into a reality is never easy. Urban constitutional conventions would have to overcome the influence of special pleaders and the pull of vested interests. The stakes would be high. The struggle would take time and energy and commitment. Success would be as difficult to achieve as success at the national level in bringing people together.

But I think we can win both of those battles.

I think we can build a society good enough to be great.

I think we can create rational governments that pursue rational policies.

I think we can make ourselves again one people, each of us different and all of us united.

And when we grow tired or discouraged, we can always look to Israel. Surrounded by hostile forces, the Israelis have fashioned a nation where there was none before. They started with only an idea and a prayer. And there is no end to what they have accomplished.

Their example can help to light our way. And we can realize here in America the hope we also hold for the Middle East: a time of peace. Shalom.

REVENUE SHARING

(Statement of Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE before the Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., June 9, 1971)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you and the members of your committee for allowing me this opportunity to appear before you this morning.

Whenever I enter this room, I am struck

by the awesome responsibility of this committee to originate all measures of Federal taxation—a responsibility given to the House of Representatives by our Founding Fathers.

Mr. Chairman, the nation owes a debt of gratitude to you and to this committee for its remarkable legislative achievements under your chairmanship. Landmark legislation like the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Medicare Act of 1965, and the Tax Reform Act of 1969 all bear testimony to the labors of this committee.

And, as you know, Mr. Chairman, you and I were in substantial agreement on all of those matters.

Today, this committee is considering another matter of landmark importance—the question of how the Federal Government can provide financial relief to State and local governments.

Mr. Chairman, while I in no way intend to minimize our differences over the issue before your committee, I believe we have substantial areas of agreement as to how the Federal Government should proceed in aiding the cities and States.

We agree, for example, that most State and, in particular, most local governments, face heavy financial burdens and are in critical need of relief.

We agree further that the Congress should and will provide them with that relief. Mr. Chairman, you made that point very clearly just two weeks ago when you told the members of the Illinois legislature: "I will assure you that this Congress does intend to provide relief to both State and local governments. But we will do it in the right way."

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we agree that the Administration's general revenue sharing bill, as presently drafted, is not the answer to assisting State and local governments. It does not, to use your words, "do it in the right way."

The President's bill does not meet the three standards I believe must be met by any legislation Congress enacts to provide financial assistance to State and local governments.

First, it does not channel the most assistance to those cities and counties that need it the most.

Second, it does not contain incentives to the States to improve their own systems of raising revenue. For the Congress to pass general revenue sharing legislation without these incentives would be to give the State governments a carte blanche to perpetuate the inadequate revenue raising systems that have gotten them and local governments into their current fiscal crises.

Third, it does not contain what, in my view, are adequate protections against the shared revenues being used in a discriminatory manner.

I would like to dwell for a moment on what I believe is the most serious deficiency in the President's proposal—its failure to include need as a criterion for apportioning assistance to local governments. The President's formula distributes assistance at the local level merely on the basis of revenue raised. As we have determined from careful examination, that formula simply does not get the most assistance to the cities and counties that need it the most. It does not take into account the desperate needs and the eroding tax bases of our cities.

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the terrible plight of our central cities. We all know that cities today are called upon, like never before, to provide additional services—more police protection, better sanitation services, better schools, treatment of addicts, public health services and many others. More and more our cities are becoming repositories for the poor and the elderly. Because of increasing numbers, substantial taxpayers and businesses are fleeing to the suburbs, city governments have become hard pressed to find the revenues to pay their

bills. Yet all city residents, rich or poor, young or old, demand and deserve decent services.

Last week the mayors of ten of our largest and most hard-pressed cities dramatically brought their plight before my Senate Subcommittee which is considering the same question you are examining here this morning. Mayor after mayor described cutbacks in vital services, and warned of more drastic cuts to come. In Cleveland, for example, there will be no city-run recreation centers this summer. And that city has had to fire 1500 public health doctors and nurses, garbage collectors, and recreation workers. Cleveland's plight may be a little more severe than some of our other large cities. But it is not unique.

In Newark, of 20,000 drug addicts, only seven percent are in treatment. In New Orleans, crime was up 43 percent last year and visits to VD clinics up 32 percent, but the numbers of police and health workers, for lack of funds, remained the same. In Pittsburgh, the city government cannot afford to buy new police patrol cars or build new fire houses.

In New York, Newark, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Atlanta, to name just a few, city workers face the prospect of being laid off within months if no new revenue is found. Indeed, in most of these cities some layoffs have already begun and vacancies are no longer filled.

The harsh reality is that no matter how hard they try, there is no way without outside help the cities can raise the kind of money they need to meet the rising cost of government. In Baltimore, for instance, only one out of six residents has a taxable income of more than \$3,000 a year. In Newark property taxes are so high they are no longer just regressive, they are confiscatory. Buildings in that city are being abandoned so fast that a nine percent increase in the property tax rate this year resulted in a three percent decrease in revenue from that tax.

In short, our cities have reached the end of the line. Unless they get help—and get it fast—city after city in this nation may fall into bankruptcy.

There is little doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the State governments are, in many ways, responsible for the sorry status of the cities. State governments have all too often denied the cities the power they need to raise adequate revenues. And the States in too many cases have shirked their responsibility to provide cities with financial help.

But now is no time to assess blame. The demise of our great cities would not be just a local or a State tragedy. It would be a national tragedy. That is why it is incumbent upon us—the members of both Houses of the Congress—to see to it that that tragedy is averted.

No revenue sharing legislation, at the funding levels proposed, will by itself avert that tragedy. But I believe revenue sharing, properly tailored, can move us in the right direction.

Unfortunately, the Administration's revenue sharing bill is inadequate. It would maintain the status quo.

It does not provide our large urban areas with the kind of assistance they need to survive. Rather it gives a distinct advantage to those communities which are enclaves of wealthy residents—too often residents who have fled the cities. The President's formula results, for example, in Commerce, California, receiving nearly four times as much per capita as Los Angeles, and in Highland Park, Michigan, receiving two and one-half times as much per capita as Detroit. And it results in Miami Beach receiving nearly twice as much per capita as Miami and Tampa and four times as much per capita as Jacksonville.

That is why I have introduced an alternative to the President's bill. My alternative

would provide \$6 billion in general financial assistance to the hard-pressed cities and to the States.

S. 1770 apportions financial assistance to cities and counties in relation to their needs as well as their population and tax effort. And my bill contains incentives to encourage the States to improve their own systems of raising revenue.

I believe S. 1770 would represent a sound beginning to solving the fiscal crises of State and local governments. It recognizes that the need for financial assistance of cities and counties with large percentages of poor people are greater than the needs of wealthy communities which can raise additional revenue on their own with little effort.

The bill accomplishes this by incorporating a "poverty ratio" into the formula for distribution to local governments. That "poverty ratio" measures two factors which have a direct bearing on the ability of a city to raise its own revenue—the percentage of families within it who receive public assistance. Cities like New York, Detroit, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and hundreds of others, large and small, would be compensated for the fact that a large number of their residents are too poor to pay their way.

To cite just one example of the effect of the "poverty ratio" in apportioning assistance to local governments. Under the President's bill, which has no need criterion, Montgomery County, Maryland, an affluent county, receives just one-third less per capita than does Baltimore City. Under the formula in my legislation, which includes the "poverty ratio," Baltimore City will receive approximately six times as much per capita as does Montgomery County.

I think there is another aspect of the pass-through formula in S. 1770 which will be of interest to this committee. Unlike the President's bill, my proposal does not attempt to decide in Washington how much assistance each local government, no matter how small or no matter what services it provides, should receive. Rather, its statutory pass-through formula applies only to those cities, counties and townships with populations over 25,000. The shares for communities below 25,000, under my bill, would be decided by the State governments, which are in a better position than we here in Washington to determine the specific needs of small communities within their boundaries.

As I mentioned earlier, I believe general revenue sharing legislation without incentives to the States to improve their own systems of taxation could only serve to perpetuate existing inadequate revenue raising systems. For that reason, I have included two provisions in my bill to encourage, but not coerce, the States to improve their tax structures.

The first would offer a bonus to those States which collect a State income tax. The bonus would be equal to ten percent of the State's income tax collections for the previous year.

The second provision would offer the States the option of utilizing the machinery of the Federal Government to collect State income taxes for them. Both of these provisions are intended to encourage the States to make better use of the progressive income tax rather than continuing to rely so heavily on regressive taxes like the property tax and the sales tax.

During the past decade, Mr. Chairman, the Congress has repeatedly responded to the needs of the cities and States. It declared a national war against poverty. It committed the nation to rebuilding our core cities through the Model Cities program. It has vowed to preserve our environment through programs to control air and water pollution. We must continue these important initiatives, and expand them. And we must undertake new initiatives to solve national problems, as this committee has done in yeoman

fashion by reporting urgently needed welfare reform legislation.

But we can never get maximum benefit from the war against poverty, from the Model Cities program, from the air and water pollution control programs, or from welfare reform so long as the streets of our cities are strewn with garbage for lack of money to collect it, or so long as our cities remain hotbeds of crime and violence because they cannot afford police to prevent it.

What the cities and States need now is financial assistance they can use to pay the operating costs of government. They need money to pay for police and fire protection, schools, and garbage collection. It is time for the Congress to respond to this need.

Mr. Chairman, my proposal, to be sure, is no panacea for the financial ills of city and State governments. But, I believe, it is a reasonable alternative to the President's program, and I believe, its provisions merit careful consideration by this committee.

I would like to say again that it is a privilege for me to appear before this distinguished committee. Thank you for your patience, and I'd be delighted to try to answer any questions members of the committee may have.

"BEYOND URBAN SURVIVAL"

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Philadelphia, Pa., June 14, 1971, to the U.S. Conference of Mayors)

We meet today in a moment of hope for the cities of America.

Our hope comes from another meeting last week in Washington—a meeting of mayors, governors, and key congressional leaders called by Democratic National Chairman Lawrence O'Brien. Its results have been widely reported. Because I was there, I feel safe in saying here that cities everywhere in America have a chance to survive in 1971.

It has taken so much time to secure even that much hope. Our cities have been in danger for more than a decade. Washington has been indifferent for almost as long. I have witnessed the indifference again and again during my twelve years there.

In 1959, my first year in the Senate, I was given committee assignments closely related to urban affairs—an issue clearly regarded as equal to the lowly status of a freshman Senator.

In 1962, my proposal for a subcommittee on intergovernmental relations stirred very little opposition—because there was very little competition for the opportunity to worry about State and local finance.

In 1966, as the floor manager for Model Cities, I had to agree to a cut in funds to gain enough support for the bill—and even then it was still touch and go until the votes were finally counted.

And in 1969, my subcommittee held the first congressional hearings on revenue sharing—but we were advised not to report legislation to the Senate because there was no prospect for its passage.

Those years were a time of Federal failure. They were frustrating and they seemed almost endless. Most mayors and some Senators and a few Congressmen were trying to teach a vital lesson—but it often looked as though almost no one was learning. Now, in 1971, the message is finally coming through. If the cities go under, so will the suburbs and the towns and ultimately the country—and that's the only domino theory I know of which is true.

Fortunately, the events of recent days will probably prevent a testing of that truth. In response to the fiscal plight of States and counties, the Congress is likely to enact a phased Federal takeover of welfare cases. And the outlook for the cities is now enough new Federal money to stay in business.

That money is the real question. The name of the game in the cities is survival—and the

name of the survival dollars is unimportant. I have introduced a revenue sharing bill which your legislative action committee has endorsed. I believe in that bill. But I also believe that this is not the time to argue over titles or authorship. How much credit there is for any individual is far less crucial than how much money there is for every city.

Our goal now must be survival dollars for the cities—in sufficient amounts, with sufficient local discretion, distributed according to need.

A program for survival must provide at least as much help as my revenue sharing proposal—which gives the cities far more than the President's bill. A program for survival must allow very broad discretion in allocating aid—which is the only way mayors can meet the mounting price of public services. And a program for survival must put the money where the problems are—which cannot be done by an administration formula that leaves a gold coast resort like Miami Beach with twice as much aid per capita as its hard pressed neighbor, the city of Miami.

When we first discussed distribution according to need, we were told that it just couldn't be done. But it has been done. It will be the basis for the plan that finally emerges. And it will be better for the big cities and better for this country, which simply cannot afford anything less than a focused attack on urban decay.

Each of us—mayors and senators alike—must work together for this kind of survival program. Your legislative action committee has been flexible—and you must remain flexible in the days and weeks to come. The outcome will be a bill you can live with—and a bill your cities cannot live without.

We have fought long and hard for the substance of revenue sharing. Now we see the possibility of victory—not for a specific name or a specific proposal—but for the reality of dollars to the cities. It is a victory that once seemed so distant and today seems so close. It will be a victory for all of us—for mayors who worry about the future of their cities and for concerned citizens who care about the fate of our country.

But there is a danger in the possibility of victory perhaps not as clear but almost as serious as the danger in defeat. Some politicians seem to think that survival dollars alone will satisfy the federal obligation to urban America. We must not permit their view to prevail. We must persuade the Congress and the administration and the nation to look beyond urban survival.

The blunt inescapable truth is that this year's likely legislation will leave the cities about where they were when the Kerner commission reported—with just enough money to finance austerity. Budgets, just enough services to stave off total breakdown, and not nearly enough resources to do enough of the critical work which must be done. Rescue from imminent urban disaster is not equivalent to urban salvation. And each of you know that in a very direct and very painful way.

Mayor Ray Gribbs of Detroit could use survival dollars to rehire 600 laid-off employees, to retain 1,000 who are now in jeopardy, and to reverse reductions in essential health and safety functions. But he would still be helpless in the face of a 45% unemployment rate among black youths in central Detroit.

Mayor John Lindsay of New York could spend survival dollars to restore recent job slashes and to maintain the present, inadequate level of police protection and sanitation services. But he still could not begin to rebuild the sections of Brownsville which look like Dresden after World War II.

Mayor Henry Maier of Milwaukee could use survival dollars to avert what he describes as "drastic cutbacks". But he could

not stop the deterioration in housing and schools which has driven 24,000 citizens out of Milwaukee in the last ten years.

Mayor Ken Gibson of Newark could put survival dollars into so many urgent tasks that I would not even try to list them now. But what could he do about 20,000 drug addicts and 114,000 citizens dependent on welfare—a third of Newark's whole population?

And Mayor Jim Tate of Philadelphia could plug survival dollars into the \$90 million budget gap which forced the city council to make slashes across the board in police patrols, prison security, and food allowances for needy children. But he could not repair the terrible blight which afflicts so many homes and apartments in the slums just blocks from this hotel.

Most mayors here today could tell similar stories of deprivation and disaster. What it all adds up to is a fundamental urban tragedy that will barely be touched by revenue sharing or its substitute. Unless Washington does much more in every area of concern, most of you will return to this conference next year as little more than caretaker mayors of caretaker governments in cities where survival is a code word for slow disintegration.

I have heard it said that this is what you deserve—that archaic and inept local administrations have bred their own problems—that the mayors are solely responsible for the urban mess. I have heard the charge that you cannot spend wisely and the implication that greater wisdom resides in Washington. And I cannot believe what I am hearing.

Mayors are not prolonging the war in Viet Nam—a war no general can win and no reason can now make right—a war which has drained our treasure from the tasks of life at home to the tasks of death abroad.

Mayors have not driven our prosperity into the ground, pushed our prices out of sight, or made the jobs of working men and women pawns in a falling economic game plan.

Mayors have not impounded \$800 million dollars of desperately needed domestic funds. Mayors have not decided that an ABM deserves priority over decent housing. And mayors have not vetoed increased appropriations for the education of children.

All of that was done in Washington by supposedly wise Federal officials. Mayors are responsible for none of it. But their cities and urban citizens are living every day with the painful impact of such mistakes—mistakes mayors did not make and cannot reverse.

So in the 1970's, the Federal obligation is larger than mere survival dollars to hold the line on decay. It is as large as the damage Federal policies have already inflicted on our cities. Washington must recognize that there is no urban crisis. Not because there is no crisis. But because it is not just urban. It is a total national crisis—and it requires a total national response.

That goal is so easy to say, so hard to reach. How hard, we have found out in recent years. Despite the warnings of the Kerner Commission—despite the earnest words of mayors and the best efforts of worried Senators and Representatives—despite the resolutions of this conference—we have not come even close to what Senator Humphrey once called a Marshall Plan for urban America. No wonder the cities have remained so far from their potential for a truly civilized life.

We cannot accept more of this failure. The key to our success now is power—a coalition for progress in the cities with enough power in the country to make change happen. In these last hopeful days, we have seen what such a coalition can accomplish. Just weeks ago, the prospect for even a few new urban dollars seemed so bleak. The cities were

drowning—and Washington was standing on the dock debating the shape of the life preserver. But together, mayors and city officials and congressional leaders have moved the debate off dead center and toward survival for urban America.

So this is not the moment to disband our coalition, but to expand its scope. Nineteen seventy-one may be the year of survival. Nineteen seventy-two and the year after and the rest of the seventies must become a decade of progress in the cities.

A coalition for progress must make its voice heard and its views count—all the way from city hall to Capitol Hill. It must exert a maximum effort for three minimum demands.

First, the Federal Government must guarantee a job for every worker.

Even when the indicators told us there was a boom, there was no boom in your inner cities. And the current bust has hit harder there than anywhere else. Only when the Federal Government becomes the employer of last resort, can we ease the despair of countless urban Americans—workers without work—workers whose anger could snap urban tensions into urban explosion at any moment. We must create jobs for them in the public sector—and we must begin with the current public service employment bill.

The President vetoed the bill last year—and he has threatened another veto in 1971. That is not the way for this administration to keep its pledge to take people off of welfare rolls and put them onto payrolls. America must fulfill that pledge. And mayors and Senators must play their part by demanding a Federal job guarantee for every worker.

Second, the Federal Government must assure a livable urban environment.

I am not just talking about pollution. I am talking about the total physical environment. I am talking about cities strangled in their traffic because they cannot sell enough bonds to build enough mass transit. I am talking about schools where students fall further and further behind and hospitals where patients grow sicker while they are neglected. And I am talking about slum children who cannot move to housing that is not there—and cannot avoid the lead poisoning that is everywhere.

We have discovered and studied and even endured the decline of the urban environment. Now we must do something to change and enhance it—to make the reality of our cities equal to the promise of urban life. The Federal Government must muster the resources to build and sustain mass transit, better schools, and quality housing. We must reform our medical care system and enact national health insurance. We must make cities more than places to exist. We must make them truly places to live.

Third, the Federal Government must mount a maximum attack against urban crime.

Creating jobs and repairing the total physical environment is not our entire urban task. It is also essential to restore the rule of law in the streets of our cities.

In the urban America of 1971, too often the only thing that walks the sidewalks after dark is fear. Crime has subverted the sense of community and trust and driven more and more families into the isolation of their own homes—guarded by triple locks and the solitude of separation from the neighbors who should be their friends. The people of our cities have a right to be more than prisoners of suspicion and apprehension. They have a right to safe streets and secure lives and parks where a careful mother can let her children play.

But the federal government has done so little to protect that right. We have a new attorney general and new restrictions on the bill of rights and a swing toward strict construction. But violence and theft and addiction have continued to climb.

What the cities need from Washington is more resources, not more tough talk. The cities need federal aid for additional policemen, better trained and better equipped. The cities need an all out federal campaign against drugs, at home and abroad, to destroy the curse of addiction which spawns half of our urban crime. And cities and states alike need help to make our courts sure and swift in convicting the guilty and freeing the innocent—just as they need federal help to make our prisons places for rehabilitation instead of schools for crime.

In short, billions of new federal dollars must be poured into every area of urban endeavor for every year of the seventies. The cost in money may seem high—but the cost of what we are doing now is human suffering and human deprivation.

And we can afford to pay the price for urban decency. We can afford less than seventy-five billion dollars for defense. We can afford to stop a war which is infecting brave young Americans with the disease of heroin. We can afford to invest the savings in the salvation of our cities. And we can afford nothing less.

For half a decade and more, mayors have been standing on the thin margin of disaster. I am convinced that in the last week you and your cities have won a chance to step back from the edge. You have probably won some time for urban America—something which was in desperately short supply just a few days ago.

We must now use that time to move beyond urban survival.

If foreign enemies were destroying our neighborhoods, undermining our health, poisoning our air, and spreading crime and violence in our streets, this nation would stop at nothing to stop them.

And that is almost what is happening to urban America. The only distinction is that the enemy is within—the enemy is indifference and neglect.

We must begin now to defeat that enemy—or we will ultimately lose our cities and our country.

As mayors, you have been in the thick of the battle year after year.

You and your allies at every level of government have gained some vital ground.

Now together, we can win the urban battle. Our cities can do more than survive. They can prevail.

A WAR AGAINST HEROIN

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, to the New Hampshire Bar Association, Bretton Woods, N.H., June 18, 1971)

Whenever I think of coming home to New England, I remember the green hills and the clear air and the sense I have always had that this is the place to live.

From here, the problems in Washington seem so distant. From here, the Senate may appear as just a place of honor, not a chamber for tough work and hard decisions. Here, men and women take confidence from the past and keep confidence in the future.

But in this last, difficult decade, the crisis of America has intruded on the calm of Northern New England.

Your sons have been sent to fight and kill and die in a war started without our consent or even our knowledge—a war no general can win and no reason can now make right.

Your neighbors in the factories and stores of Durham and Newport have felt the swing from bust to boom and back to bust again—a swing which has put workers out of work and pushed prices out of sight.

And each of you has learned through this time and these trials to wonder about the future and the fate of America—something which once looked as secure as Mount Washington.

I wish I could tell you now that all of this will soon pass. But any politician who says

that after the events of recent days would not be serving you or the truth. There is too much we do not know—and too little we can still be certain of. So tonight I want to speak with you about another threat which has invaded your communities from the larger world—a threat to your children and New Hampshire's safety.

I am talking about the evil white powder Stewart Alsop calls the "city killer"—the powder that produces half of our crime and most of the fear which stalks our streets.

I am talking about the epidemic of heroin—the sickness of an addiction which has already afflicted people in every part of our land.

And I am talking about the countless condemned Americans:

About 1,000 babies born each year in New York City as addicts, helpless heirs to the terrible pain of their mother's habit.

About the thousands of veterans exposed to heroin in Vietnam who are now carrying a horrible curse home to their families and our towns.

About more than 100,000 despondent and disillusioned people whose health and will and hope have been shattered almost beyond repair.

And their disease has infected New Hampshire. For almost a generation, your state and my state seemed virtually immune. But now we know that no place anywhere is immune. Now we know that drugs and addiction can strike at any town or any family. Rockingham County District Attorney Carleton Eldredge warns: "Our county is experiencing an epidemic of drug-related burglaries, larcenies, and robberies. Unless we approach these problems with more effective measures, both drug abuse and drug related crimes will increase—and what is now an epidemic will become a chronic condition."

Yet we are doing so little about a danger that jeopardizes so much. And the little we are doing adds up to even less action against the deadliest drug of all. In Washington, I have seen the crisis of heroin noticed and studied and denounced. I have seen Washington talk a good game against heroin, but the facts show that everywhere people are losing.

You can see why in the sad statistics of the current, half-hearted federal effort.

This year, the federal government will spend only \$62 million enforcing our drug laws. That's less than the price of shutting down the SST.

This year, the federal government will spend only \$7 million on drug education, \$20 million on drug research, and \$43 million on treatment and rehabilitation. That equals the cost of the Vietnam War for one day in 1968.

Last year, the National Institute of Mental Health treated only 1,100 patients—at the incredible cost of \$10,000 each.

Last year, the Community Health Centers Act reached just a few more than 3,000 addicts.

And, while 25% of all addicts are veterans, the Veterans' Administration maintains exactly five drug treatment units with an average of fifteen beds each.

In short, the federal government is helping just 2% of the addicts in America. Any system with a record like that is nothing less than an absolute and total failure.

Obviously, we can and must do more by spending more on law enforcement, research, and treatment. But that is not the whole answer or even most of the answer. As long as drugs flow freely into our country, heroin will hook people faster than we can educate them, faster than we can catch them, and faster than we can cure them. We will not even begin to defeat addiction until we care as much about his fix as the junkie does.

We must care at home and abroad. We must care in every neighborhood and in

our foreign policy. The federal government must launch a war against heroin as broad as the world that produces it and as defined as the addict who craves it.

That is why I introduced new narcotics legislation in the Senate in May. The legislation calls for two major reforms. I believe both of them are essential.

We must set up a central federal agency with overall responsibility for fighting drug abuse.

This agency must have as much money as it needs. It must be directly responsible to the president. And it must devise and implement a coherent national effort to pull all our present programs together and push them to their maximum limits. A single office of drug abuse offers far more hope than a federal effort fragmented among several cabinet agencies—each of them hobbled by inadequate power and insufficient skills—all of them partly responsible for a problem none of them can resolve.

Destroying heroin at its source will be difficult. It will take a long time and it will cost money. But this country spends \$75 billion on defense and war. Surely, we can afford a fraction as much to protect our children, our cities, and our safety.

Today, the Administration sent the Congress a bill similar to my proposal for coordinating the domestic war against heroin. I welcome the bill. Though it is somewhat different from mine, the aim is the same—to exterminate addiction in America. That goal is so easy to say, so hard to reach. And it is too vital for destructive partisan disputes or debates about who deserves the credit for what. That is why I am co-sponsoring the Administration's bill—and that is also why I will try to strengthen it. I will have criticisms and I will offer amendments—not as a Democrat against Republicans, not as a Senator against the President, but as a concerned American, worried about what drugs are doing to America.

I think the Administration's program is not enough—and I hope that together the Congress and the President can do better.

The Administrator's bill provides coordination only for treatment and education programs. Law enforcement and veterans' problems are still left in their current condition of fragmented disarray. Moreover, the bill simply ignores the challenge of foreign heroin production. It calls for no expansion in our efforts to substitute other crops for opium around the world—an expansion that is essential to any successful attack on heroin.

Finally, the Administration has asked for some new funds to fight drugs. The amount will just about make up for the failure to request the anti-drug money Congress has already authorized. Last year, for example, Congress authorized \$102 million for narcotics treatment and education. But this January, the Administration requested less than one-quarter of that amount.

A nation with as much wealth as ours must do more than this for the health and safety of our people.

The Administration's bill is a late but encouraging beginning. Its provisions must be toughened and its financing must be vastly increased.

There are no easy answers to heroin—and there is no single answer. Methadone maintenance can pull some junkies away from heroin—but it cannot help others and it is itself addicting. Antagonist drugs may someday virtually immunize heroin's victims from further disaster—but there is too little money for research and probably too much time to wait. Perhaps the most vital step would be a truly effective anti-drug education program in our schools—to teach our children the terrible truth about the dream in a hypodermic needle or an amphetamine pill.

And beyond all this, we must ask ourselves why this has happened to America—and we must do something about the answer.

Only a month ago, an army psychiatrist reported that the reason soldiers in Viet Nam were turning to heroin was because they did not want to be there. "The men," he said, "were reacting to Viet Nam much like the deprived in a ghetto." So our task—yours and mine and every American's—is not only to battle heroin directly, but to go after the conditions which breed addiction. Not just poverty in housing or in income, but the poverty of soul which leads people to lose faith, to drop out, cop out, and turn on. Not just the wrong of a war over there which drives young Americans to drugs, but the wrongs back here which leave so many with the sense that there is no way to build a better life or make the system respond.

You and I realize that the American ideal can work. Now we must make it a reality for every American.

No one can claim that this will wholly control heroin. We also need a tough, all-out effort by police and prosecutors, courts and treatment centers, schools and parents. But in the final analysis, all of that will fail unless we build a country worthy of our beliefs—a country where prosperity and politics alike serve all of the people.

When I visit New Hampshire now I think here as elsewhere of the problems of American life. But here, too, and across New England, I see the promise of American life.

I see what our fathers and their fathers before them were able to do.

I see the character that gives us the strength to fight for what is right—in our own towns and wherever else America is in danger.

I see people who understand how to live in peace with each other and in harmony with their surrounding.

And I am convinced that the promise of our country can be kept. Recession and war, credibility gaps and drug addiction will test America. But they will never defeat America—if we care enough to do enough about them.

You know how much you care—and so do I.

And that is why I believe we will prevail—in New Hampshire, in New England, and in the nation.

You know how much you care—and so do they.

LAW AND ORDER: BEYOND THE CODE WORD, SUMMARY 1971—PART I

This is a difficult moment to write about America. In the one hundred and ninety-fifth year of our history, our people's faith in our country's fate is profoundly shaken. A recent survey tells us that almost half of them now expect our national divisions to lead to national breakdown. That is so easy to say, so hard to comprehend. Most of us have assumed the durability of the system which has always sustained our hopes. Through time and trials and in the toughest moment, our country and our country's principles have prevailed. Despite the dangers and the doubts, most of us have felt a sure sense of security about our place in America and America's place in the world.

Our unease now is unusual—and it will not be easy to cure. We are told that our most urgent task is to heal division and build confidence and restore trust. But no one can fulfill the promise to bring us together unless he can also show us where we are going. We must believe again that we can find out what is wrong and begin to make things right.

So it is not possible, in a borrowed phrase, to just "cool" America. There is too much people will not be cool about. They see their sons sent to war and their jobs disappear. They are living everyday with the disquiet-

ing question a national news magazine asked more than a year ago: "Why doesn't anything work anymore?"

And nowhere is there less cool and more worry than in the tide of anger and apprehension about crime in America. Too often, on the night-time streets of any town, there is no one to see and the only thing on the sidewalks after dark is fear. In the last decade, crime across the country climbed by an incredible 148%—and violent crime alone increased 130%.

Those numbers were election issues in 1968 and 1970. They are likely to be an issue again in 1972. But those numbers are also people—and in 1971 it is people who are in trouble. A cabdriver in the city of New York refuses to change anything larger than a five dollar bill—but he still worries that his next passenger may kill him for the petty cash. A father in the slums of Detroit does his very best with the very little he has—and then one day he finds heroin and a hypodermic needle hidden on his fourteen-year-old's closet shelf. A housewife in the suburbs of Los Angeles wants to read the late evening edition of the next morning's paper—but yesterday's news warns her not to test her safety with an 11 P.M. walk to the corner store. A merchant in the center of Dallas buys burglar alarms and safety locks and shatterproof glass—but repeated robberies drain his profits and finally destroy his business.

No matter what else we do for our country, we must do far more to combat the mounting wave of crime. So much is at stake. What will we gain from prosperity—if crime continues to threaten our livelihood and our lives? What tranquility will come from peace—if crime turns more urban streets into virtual free fire zones? Americans will not settle for that—and they should not have to settle for it. They have the right to live and work free from fear.

There are men in high places—men of the law who should surely know better—who ask us to rely on tough talk and a turn toward repression. They are trying to enforce order by stretching the law. They are trying to preserve the country by whittling away at constitutional rights. And their tactics are a real danger to justice in America. American justice is endangered when an official voice proclaims the guilt of a suspect still presumed innocent—and when, in the midst of the Calley case, it takes a letter from a young army captain to remind the President of the United States of his responsibility to the rule of law. American justice is endangered when disrespect for legal principles becomes an accepted public practice: disrespect in the form of wiretapping without a court order—which is simply and plainly unconstitutional; disrespect in the form of preventive detention—which the Administration's own study tells us will not work; and disrespect in the form of "no knock" procedures—which violate a citizen's precious right to privacy in his own home.

And perhaps the worst tragedy is that repressive tactics like this have made no gains against rising crime. In the last two years—years when we were promised success—we have seen more and more failure as the crime rate continued to soar. Tough talk and repression may satisfy a psychic longing to strike back at lawlessness. They may win a few more precincts or a few more votes. And they will also defeat the cause of liberty and distract us from the real work of fighting crime.

But I believe that there is hope—that we can make our streets safer and our homes more secure. I believe in this America—that the system has not failed, though some leaders may have failed the system. I believe we can use our country's principles to build law and order—and law with order—and crime control instead of code words. We will not find any of those in campaign speeches

or epithets or sudden dramatic shifts in the Supreme Court. Instead, we must ask hard questions, settle for no easy answers, and insist on solutions which can really turn the tide against lawlessness.

We have already been told much of what must be done. Presidential Commissions and Executive Task Forces and Senate Committees have parsed and analyzed the crisis. In 1969, the President's Commission on Violence in America estimated that it would cost an additional \$6 billion to mount an effective fight for law and order. But we are still spending far less than we should—and accomplishing far less than we must. It is time to act now—in all the ways we know are critical. I hope to outline a program for action in my next column.

LAW AND ORDER: BEYOND THE CODE WORD, SUMMER 1971—PART II

In my last column, I wrote about the urgent threat of crime and the Administration's failure to build law and order. But merely naming the threat and pointing to the failure is not enough. A victory for the rule of law and the security of people will require reform throughout the criminal justice system.

We have been warned again and again that the system is overburdened with victimless crimes. Too often, we have tried to deal with personal problems that are social problems by outlawing them. Now federal help and local reform must develop alternative methods to treat offenses like drunkenness. We can no longer afford to tolerate the policies which force the police and the courts to waste their time instead of protecting people and property from crime.

Police departments should not be a dumping ground for our neglected social ills. And neither should policemen be forced to act as clerks. A recent study in a medium-size city reported that over 50% of police time was committed to administrative assignments. A patrolman belongs on his beat, not behind a desk—and Washington must make that possible with money to train and hire administrative help. Washington must support our local police—to make them as effective as they can be and as fair as they should be. They deserve better pay, better equipment, and better training. Only then, will society deserve and command the best possible law enforcement.

But more policy with more resources are not the whole answer because our police cannot do the whole job alone. So much ultimately depends on our courts and our correctional system. And their persistent defects have led to repeated disaster.

If justice delayed is justice denied, there is far too little justice in America's courts. Across the United States, according to the Census Bureau, over half of the persons in prison or jail are not there because they have been judged guilty of a crime. Most of them are simply waiting, often as long as eighteen months, for a day in court. It is like the Red Queen's jurisprudence in *Alice in Wonderland*: first the punishment, then the trial. And the results should not be surprising. To clear the backlog, judges and prosecutors allow thousands of defendants to plead guilty to reduced charges. In the end, whatever sentence is passed is frequently less than it should be and usually long after the offense. No wonder the President's violence commission concluded that court delay was contributing significantly to a nationwide breakdown in law and order.

I am convinced that we can change all that. We can act at the national level to pay at least some of the bill for modernizing court procedures, hiring professional administrators, and streamlining jury selection. If computers can program our intercontinental defense, they can surely program court calendars to assure swifter

justice for every suspect—and a stronger defense for every city and neighborhood. With the right investment, we can achieve Chief Justice Burger's goal of a sixty-day limit before trial—and that would mean fairer law and more order everywhere in America.

And we must make a similar investment in our correctional system. Today, we are giving less than 3% of our criminal justice funds to penal reform and convict rehabilitation. What are we getting in return? Prisons that are schools for crime—prisons that turn first-time criminals into repeat offenders instead of productive citizens. How ironic that we are willing to spend so much to catch a thief—and so little to change him so that we will not have to catch him over and over again.

A commitment of will and resources to reform the criminal justice system can begin to build law and order. But we must do far more.

We must try to root out the causes of crime. I am not talking about deteriorated housing or the shame of poverty—we must respond to them because response is right, not for the sake of a distant relief from crime. And I am not talking about Supreme Court decisions—few prospective lawbreakers hear of them and even fewer read them.

I am instead talking about the evil white powder Stewart Alsop calls the "city killer". I am talking about the epidemic of heroin which is responsible for 50% of our urban crime. And I am talking about people twisted into addicts and lawbreakers: about a section of New York City, where 18,000 men and women—out of a total population of 58,000—are helpless slaves to a heroin habit; about the city of Washington, where 67% of the addicts are less than 26 years old—because very few addicts live to be very old; about the soldiers who did not go to jail or flee to Canada—and are now carrying a horrible curse home to their towns and their families; about 250,000 Americans who attack countless fellow citizens and steal billions of dollars to feed an expensive, murderous, implacable addiction.

A large part of the answer to the question of what causes crime is heroin. But for heroin itself, there are no easy answers and there is no single answer. So much has failed and so little has succeeded. And at least part of the reason for failure is our half-hearted effort. Together, federal, state, and local programs are today reaching less than 10% of America's addicts.

Over a month ago, I sponsored new narcotics legislation in the Senate—and the President called for very similar legislation two weeks later. But because the heroin threat is so urgent, I am now certain that every recent proposal from every source is too little and too late. We are accomplishing and even asking for much less than we should.

What can we achieve? Obviously, there are both strengths and drawbacks in every current treatment method—from antagonist drugs to methadone maintenance. But those methods in combination can cut sharply into the rate of addiction. One authority tells us that methadone alone can become a heroin substitute for half of our potential criminal addicts.

We cannot neglect such an opportunity. The federal government must guarantee a comprehensive drug treatment program in every city and town facing a serious drug problem. And every local program must have enough room for every local addict—whether he volunteers for treatment or is required to take it after arrest. There must be no more waiting lists—while addicts wait, citizens are robbed and mugged. And there must be no competition for scarce federal funds—we must find enough money to combat heroin wherever it strikes, in our cities and among our soldiers.

A truly broad national program would cost \$5 billion in the first five years. That is a lot of money—but it is only a fraction of the financial loss in the same period from the crime spawned by addiction—and it is a small price to pay for the security of our families, our friends, and our fellow citizens.

That's why I recently joined with Senator Harold Hughes and Senator Jacob Javits in introducing a bill to reform the entire federal attack on dangerous drugs. The bill will provide desperately needed funds to state and local governments to establish and evaluate their own treatment systems. It will provide new dollars for research and experimental programs. And it will expand nearly four-fold the federal commitment to treat addicts through local community centers. In all, it will add almost half a billion dollars to the war against narcotics.

That is a great advance, but the country still has a long way to go. The bill will create the basic structure for a comprehensive attack. We must use that structure to the maximum by appropriating more and more money for it over the next few years until we reach the level of a billion dollars a year—enough for a comprehensive federal guarantee. We owe that much to our children and ourselves.

There is no cheap way to conduct a war against heroin or a war against crime. There will be no gains without financial pains. And there is no escape from a fundamental choice.

We must decide to put our priorities where our problems are—in the streets of our own cities and the farms of our own land. We cannot tolerate a \$5 billion cost overrun in a dubious ABM system—a 50% price increase in just two years—when we are spending less for a national war on cancer than the cost for one week of war in Viet Nam. From Seattle to Miami, in crime control and every other field of domestic endeavor, we must now turn again to the vital goals Lyndon Johnson so well advanced in the middle years of the last decade. We must find a new direction for America so we can bring Americans together.

The American system has been good to most of us. It now asks in return for our voices, our energy, our faith, and our trust in each other. I hope Americans are ready to respond—because together we can succeed. And success for America is the only aim worthy of our common heritage—which teaches us how good and how great our country can be.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW AND THE RIGHT TO BE LEFT ALONE

(An address by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE to the National Magazine Editors Award Luncheon, New York City, April 26, 1971)

I take particular pride in the invitation to address this distinguished audience when I recall that your counterparts in the newspaper business had President Nixon as their guest speaker this year. The newspapers, of course, are inevitably concerned with the here and now, but magazine editors can take the long view. I hope you and I are taking the same long view.

In one respect the President was more fortunate than I. He used the occasion of the newspaper editors' dinner to get his 1971 Presidential Press Conference out of the way. Those of us who are not presidents do not get off so easily.

Those of us who are not presidents also hear a lot these days about the need for preserving traditional values against destructive attacks from all sides. These attacks, it is said, are part of a conspiracy to overthrow the head of the FBI and replace him with a regime that will take orders from some outside power—such as the Government of the United States.

At a time of crisis in our values, it is not surprising that our leaders should be con-

cerned with preserving traditional standards. But it is astonishing that, while professing such concern, they should be conspicuous accomplices in the erosion of values as fundamental to a democracy as the right to know and the right to be let alone.

Such political values serve a special need in our society. They are among the dreams of liberty that have given meaning to our history. More than most peoples, we have found our identity and our unity in our national dreams. At a time when there is so much disillusionment with the present state of the union, and so much bitter division as to where we should go from here, we can ill afford to be careless with our first principles.

I hope that carelessness is the proper word to describe the attitude of the present administration toward the public's right to know about their government and their government's policies. I am sure that you of the periodical press need not be reminded of the repeated attacks the Administration has mounted on some newspapers and most television journalism.

I do not believe that the freedom of the press makes journalists immune from attack by men in public office. I would hate to think that the freedom of the press means that politicians must always turn the other cheek. In fact, a hostile editor or writer is always a tempting target. Some of my best friends are journalists, but I have noticed that as a general rule they are likely to be even less popular than politicians.

While political leaders may be entitled to hit back at the press from time to time, a government firmly dedicated to the public's right to know and to the principle of freedom of the press must bend over backwards to avoid any hint of threat or intimidation.

In this Administration there has been no such bending over backwards. Apart from ritual disclaimers, this Administration has made no serious effort to dispel the widespread belief among television newsmen and broadcasters that its attacks are designed to make them more responsive to the party line. Even if these beliefs are mistaken, their existence is a threat to the public's right to know.

Such fears are not quieted by the Administration's aggressive use of its subpoena power to obtain reporters' confidential notes and sources. Nor can such fears be allayed when the government tries to force a major television network to disinvite an opponent of legislation supported by the Administration so that the Administration's own lobbyist might state his case without opposition.

Moreover, the Administration's war with the press is being fought in an atmosphere that is dominated by evidence that it is indifferent to the public's right to get the facts. The Administration attacks the press, not so much for opposing the Administration's policy, but for reporting facts that contradict the Administration's line. Among the new executive prerogatives now being claimed by the government is the right to prominence, if not to dominance, for the official version of the facts, whether or not that version is the right one.

If the Administration has decided that there is no hunger in America, it will seek to discredit the press that finds hungry people.

If the Administration has decided that the invasion of Laos was a glorious victory, we went to the reporters who feature evidence of a defeat.

If the expert interpretations of the monthly employment statistics by labor department civil servants conflict with the Administration's official gloss on those statistics, then the expert briefings have outlived their usefulness.

In the things that it thinks matter most to the public, the Administration's basic in-

stinct is to hide the ball and, if possible, the players. This attitude is understandable in an Administration in which the medium is so large a part of the message, and in which the message is so often contradicted by the facts. But it is an attitude that does not dissipate the impression that this Administration is hostile to the public's right to know.

To judge by what we have been reading in the press of late, and particularly in some of your magazines, you would think the right to know belongs only to the government.

We have learned that army units have been compiling dossiers on people who attend antiwar meetings.

We have learned that the FBI has been compiling dossiers on people who attend anti-pollution meetings.

We have also learned that the FBI keeps close tabs on people who consort with black activists or student activists or, so it seems, almost anyone who supports changes in our society.

We have learned from Senator Ervin's subcommittee that all sorts of governmental institutions are compiling impressive volumes of personal information about people who come in contact with the government. And we have been reminded of just how frequent a tool of government the practice of wire-tapping has become.

Thanks in no small part to the courageous work of magazine editors, we are beginning to realize that this is an area in which the public's right to know has been almost wholly ignored. Even now, we know only that the government is watching more of us than we thought. We do not know which of us or how many. We do not know what information is in our own dossiers, or what are its sources. We do not know whether it is accurate, or what use will be made of it.

We are told, for example, that the FBI infiltrated Earth Day meetings in order to watch a few individuals with known propensities for violence. Yet the FBI's report on Washington's Earth Day activities runs to eleven pages and hardly mentions such individuals. Instead, it takes a general inventory of the participants, and focuses on the presence of members of certain controversial political organizations.

It does not seem too much to ask of a free government why they happened to collect all this information about ordinary political activity of ordinary citizens, and what they propose to do with it now that they have it.

Who will be told, and with what implications, that each of many thousands of Americans concerned about the desecration of their environment were consorting on Earth Day in the company of radical political groups?

This is one case where what we don't know *does* hurt us. The immediate hurt that all these unanswered questions does to us is plain enough. They give rise to the suspicion that people will be known to the government by the political company they keep; they may be one day held accountable by their government for their efforts to change its policies. Such suspicions destroy the spontaneity of a free society and paralyze the workings of a free political process.

It is in order to answer these gnawing questions and hopefully to allay the suspicions they raise, that I recently proposed a means of supervision and control over our domestic intelligence operations.

But the indifference of the Administration to the implications of widespread government surveillance of ordinary citizens does more than chill the exercise of political freedom, just as its hostility to the news media does more than chill the freedom of the press. In both cases, the harm done to our shared ideals may well be the more lasting injury to our society.

I do not need to preach to this audience on the overriding importance of the freedom of the press in our system. In fact, I once knew a magazine editor who thought the freedom of the press was established in the First Commandment.

But the first amendment has had a heavy load to carry in recent years. It has had to bear the onus of protecting, not only the press—which is burden enough—but also the rights of dissent and protest and academic freedom. In the process it has become identified with most of the wrenching changes and much of the turbulence of our times. The elementary right of the press to inform has been swept up in the controversies involving these other important First Amendment freedoms. In too many instances the Administration has used public uneasiness over those controversies as a weapon in its effort to damp down challenges from the press. The right of information is too basic to be destroyed in a society which claims to hold its governors accountable for their acts. No government can be held accountable, except arbitrarily, by men who are ignorant of the crucial facts. And no government can be held truly accountable if it controls the information on which it is judged.

Furthermore, great as is its practical value to a free government, the symbolic value of the public's right to know is equally great; for it represents our faith that we can still control our government.

The public's right to know is protected by the press's right to be let alone by government. But the right of the rest of us to be let alone is a different sort of right. It represents to us our faith, not that we can control the government, but that in some things at least we can escape its control.

Justice Brandeis once called the right to be let alone "the right most valued by civilized men."

In some areas, the right to be let alone is explicit. The First Amendment makes it clear that we have a basic right to be let alone in anything that concerns our religious or political beliefs. On that ground alone, general surveillance and reporting of political activities is offensive to rights which ought to be beyond attack.

The Bill of Rights also protects us explicitly against unreasonable searches and seizures of our homes and of our persons. That protection is good enough to keep the government out of our closets, and it may well be wondered if it is not also good enough to keep them off our telephones.

But the right to be let alone is more comprehensive than these specific constitutional protections. Freedom is not a simple thing or a some time thing. And the Constitution was intended to protect against more than the midnight rap on the door. Our Government was put together on the theory that free men were their own sovereigns except for the specific powers that were conferred upon government.

Our founders' concept of freedom revolved around the notion that a part, and indeed the greater part, of a man's life was his own business and none of his government's. They believed that the state was ultimately an instrument for serving men, and not the other way around. They put the burden on government to justify its intrusion upon the lives of citizens.

Today, in a complex society, where the role of government is very nearly pervasive, these concepts of liberty mean even more to us than before. In the last analysis, the right to be let alone is the guarantee that we still retain the sovereignty, the power of control, over the parts of our lives we call our own.

It is, therefore, an affront to our most traditional values to hear the government say, as we have heard it say, that it will vigorously oppose any restraints upon its right to collect and file information about its citizens.

It is an affront to hear the government say, as we have heard it say, that it has the "inherent right" to tap the telephones of anyone who it believes may pose a threat to our national security, without answering, or explaining, or justifying to anyone, without obtaining a warrant from a magistrate, and without complying with the rules laid down by the Congress to control electronic eavesdropping.

It is an affront to hear the government say, as we have heard it say, that we must have faith in its own good sense and self-restraint.

These bold claims insult our history and stand our very concept of freedom on its head. As a federal judge pointed out a few weeks ago, in rejecting the claim to an inherent right to wiretap, we threw out notions such as that, nearly 200 years ago, along with the divine right of kings. It is difficult to believe that we now have a government that would wish to restore them. Perhaps those new uniforms for the White House Police that entertained us a year ago were more serious straws in the wind than we knew.

I do not believe that the Administration has set out to destroy our liberties. If it had, I do not think that it could succeed in the short time remaining to it. But mere insensitivity to our first principles can do them grievous harm when it is displayed by the government. It can tear the already frayed fabric of our community of common ideals. A government which mistrusts large numbers of its own citizens and turns on the values that give substance to the society will soon have something to fear, even if it had nothing before.

The public's right to know, and the citizen's right to be let alone, are not only the hallmarks of a free society; they are also the ideals and the symbols that still unite us. The right to know and the right to be let alone are, in a real sense, the flags we can all wave. It is unforgivable that our government should trample them.

The only way to keep those ideals from being trampled is to uphold them.

That's your job, and mine too.

ARMS CONTROL: A STEP TOWARD SURVIVAL
(Remarks by Senator EDWARD S. MUSKIE, to the town meeting, World Affairs Council, Philadelphia, Pa., April 6, 1971)

I have chosen to speak to you tonight about nuclear weapons and the need to control their cost and their dangers.

Today the United States and the Soviet Union have enough nuclear weapons to destroy each other many times over. They are each capable of ending civilization on this planet.

Nevertheless, in their search for military security, they have been building new offensive weapons. And each has developed defensive weapons in an attempt to neutralize the offensive missiles. This has led to new offensive weapons to overcome the defensive weapons.

The result is an arms race in which each side is less secure than before. Each has put precious resources—amounting to billions of dollars each year—into more expensive and more dangerous weapons because neither dares to stop.

For one and a half years the two countries have been engaged in strategic arms limitation talks—usually referred to as SALT talks. The purpose of those talks has been to reduce the pressure to develop new weapons and to end the push for more weapons. That, at least, has been our hope, but what are the prospects?

The fact is that there is no sense of urgency about the negotiations. Both sides seem to ignore the risk that, as the talks continue, still more weapons will be built, as they have, raising new uncertainties and new fears.

I wish I could say that the arms talks will soon lead to a firm agreement, or that the talks are slowing down the arms race. But this is not so. We are not likely to get an agreement during the current round of talks.

The talks are in trouble for several reasons. First—while the talks go on—the Soviets may be making changes in their offensive weapons deployments. We do not yet know what these changes will prove to be. Whatever they are, they increase our uncertainty as to Soviet intentions, and they make it more difficult for us to conclude our agreement to halt the arms race.

Second—since the talks began—the United States has begun to deploy a vastly improved new warhead system, the MIRV—a multiple, independently-targetable re-entry vehicle. Our Minuteman missiles are each being converted to carry three of these warheads. That means that each Minuteman missile can attack three separate targets instead of one.

We are now putting MIRV warheads on Poseidon missiles aboard 317 submarines. There will be ten warheads on each of the sixteen missiles carried by each submarine. Each submarine will be able to attack as many as 160 different targets. The first submarine fitted with these missiles was launched last Wednesday.

When these programs are completed, our arsenal of nuclear weapons, capable last year of delivering about 2,500 missile warheads, will total more than 7,000 warheads. Each of these warheads is considerably more powerful than the atomic bomb which killed 68,000 people at Hiroshima.

Understandably, the Russians are making every effort to match this weapon.

Third, while the talks go on—the United States is continuing to install the defensive Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system to protect three offensive Minuteman missile sites. The Russians, on the other hand, have one obsolete anti-ballistic missile system around Moscow.

Our ABM system does not threaten the Russians' ability to retaliate, because it is too small and it does not protect our cities. But it does permit military leaders in the Kremlin to argue that our ABM system can be expanded. Therefore, it can make them uncertain about our intentions.

In addition, as we build the Safeguard system the pressures to keep it will become stronger.

Fourth, while each side has made a proposal in the talks, neither proposal has been given any encouragement by the other.

If we are to solve these problems, the Russians will have to give positive evidence that they will restrain their nuclear weapons program. They will have to be more responsive to our ARMS limitation proposals.

But we, too, must be willing to restrain our program and to respond to Soviet proposals. We must be willing to take the initiative in moving toward the other side.

In June, 1969, before the announcement of the opening round of SALT, I urged a six-month moratorium on the testing of our MIRV warheads. That moratorium would have permitted the talks to open on a positive and constructive note. The Nixon administration rejected my suggestion.

When the second round of the SALT talks opened a year ago, I recommended that we try to negotiate an interim standstill by both sides on all strategic weapons. That standstill would have placed an immediate freeze on all further deployments of offensive and defensive strategic weapons systems. It would have halted the testing of multiple warheads.

If that standstill had taken place, the arms race would have come to an end, for all practical purposes. All that would have remained would be a formal agreement. But my proposal was ignored by the Nixon administration, as was a similar proposal, which passed the Senate by a vote of 72 to 6.

We have seen the consequences, both in the continuing arms race and the slow pace of the talks.

I remain convinced that such an interim agreement would greatly improve the prospects for success at the arms talks. I urge the President to propose such a standstill in strategic weapons. It should cover the testing, production and deployment of offensive and defensive missiles.

I regret to say that the Nixon administration does not seem ready to take such an initiative. Instead, it seems to be operating on a double standard. It has called for Soviet restraint in deploying weapons; yet it is not willing to exercise comparable restraint. It fears the development of a Soviet MIRV—which the Soviets have not even tested adequately, if they have tested it at all: yet it refuses to admit that the Soviets have cause for concern about our MIRV, which is already being deployed.

At the SALT talks, we have proposed to include an ABM agreement in a package that would also place a numerical ceiling on both sides' offensive weapons, and a special sub-ceiling on the largest of the Soviet missiles. The Administration's package puts numerical limits on both offensive and defensive weapons, but it does not limit qualitative changes in the weapons systems.

The Russians have proposed a limitation on ABM defensive systems.

Each of these proposals is a limited—not a comprehensive—proposal. Ours involves a wider range of problems to be solved before agreement can be reached.

The question, then, is whether we should try to work out an ABM limitation as a first step toward a broader agreement. The Nixon Administration has apparently rejected this possibility. It has said that such an agreement would reduce the incentive for the Russians to bring the entire arms race to a halt.

I disagree. An agreement on defensive missiles would reduce the pressure for further development of offensive missiles.

Therefore, if we cannot get the Soviets to agree on the United States proposal at this round, I urge the President to try to negotiate an agreement limiting or banning anti-ballistic missiles. Such an agreement should be made with the clear understanding that it is the first step toward broader controls of offensive weapons as well. Both sides would have the right to reconsider the commitment if, after a specified time, they had not achieved further progress toward arms limitations.

Such an agreement would be in the interest of each side and could lead more quickly to the next step.

It is important to take that first step at a time when there is a balance in nuclear weapons, when neither side dares attack the other, and before ongoing developments on each side upset that balance.

Such a first step can slow down the waste of precious resources on a fruitless arms race, which only increases our danger, while reducing our ability to meet pressing human needs.

The costs of the arms race are very high. This year alone, the Nixon Administration is asking about \$3 billion to carry on construction of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missiles systems and deployment of MIRV warheads.

This \$3 billion could virtually cover the cost of Medicaid this year; or could help us to make major strides in providing good schools and adequate health care for all our citizens; or it could pay for the budget of the Environment Protection Agency more than six times over.

In coming years, funds committed to nuclear weapons programs could provide untold benefits for our people in a host of critical areas.

We face, therefore, a basic decision. How

can we best take advantage of what may be a fragile opportunity to reduce the dangers and the costs of nuclear arms?

If each side holds out for its own proposal in this fourth and crucial round of the arms control talks, the prospects for agreement may be reduced. I urge, therefore, that we improve those prospects by taking the most likely first step which I have described.

It would be a step in the right direction—a reduction in the hazards to survival for all mankind.

A STRATEGY FOR PEACE IN EUROPE

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, U.S. Senate, May 18, 1971)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, that there is no magic or sanctity about a European force level of 300,000 Americans.

I have supported him in seeking a reduction in our troop level in Europe.

I have supported him in pressing our European allies to pick up a greater share of the burden.

I applaud the results that he has achieved. It is time to take a new look at Europe—East and West—and to accommodate our policies to the perspectives and prospects of the 1970's.

Mr. President, I do not believe that Senator Mansfield's amendment is the right way to do it at this time.

I believe that negotiated cutbacks by both the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries are now the most potentially productive path to a reduced American military presence in Europe, a reduction of tensions, and more open relationships between Eastern and Western Europe.

The Senate should encourage the administration to vigorously and strongly pursue the opportunity opened up by Mr. Brezhnev's recent call to start troop withdrawal negotiations, and Mr. Gromyko's subsequent discussion with Ambassador Beam. Such an effort would give us the chance to meet the objectives of this amendment while enhancing the stability and security of Europe. And that is what today's debate in the Senate is really about.

The issue is not whether Congress has the constitutional right and the sworn responsibility to review and reshape our force levels and our overseas deployment. We have that right—and we must meet that responsibility.

The issue is not whether our European partners should carry a partner's share of the economic and military burden of security. They have the strength to do much more—and it is time for them to begin matching their will to their ability.

And the issue is not whether the United States should withdraw troops, but when and how. Not our direction or our purpose, but timing and method are the heart of this debate.

How should we decide?

What are the advantages and risks that we would run if 105,000 American servicemen were unilaterally and quickly withdrawn from Europe?

First, there is the rough military balance of power in Central Europe between the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries. For 25 years our troops have helped keep that balance and have contributed to maintaining peace in Europe. A substantial American withdrawal might not upset that balance, and the calculus of deterrence—but it might. We should not make such a drastic change hastily.

Second, a substantial American withdrawal at this time could endanger deterrence by increasing NATO's dependence on tactical nuclear weapons. Most of a 150,000-man withdrawal would come from our land-based forces—not from the approximately 20,000 sailors and marines in the 6th Fleet. Consequently, the forces that were left behind

would have to be heavily reoriented toward a tactical nuclear capacity. But Soviet leaders might find a primarily nuclear force a less believable deterrent to military probes than the present mix of conventional forces. Here again, we cannot know for sure. We do know that the President of the United States should never be put in a position where his only choices when faced with limited conventional attack in Europe are to do nothing or to use nuclear weapons.

Third, the most desirable way to strengthen deterrence in Europe is by mutual cutbacks in the armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. If both sides agree to reduce their forces, they will reduce the threat that either side will gain a military advantage. Such an agreement would also reflect and enhance a more basic relaxation of political tensions. It would strengthen the chances for peace on a continent and in a world that has for too long lived with war. We cannot afford to bypass this kind of opportunity.

Mr. Brezhnev's recent remarks indicate a Soviet willingness to negotiate about mutual withdrawals. Yesterday's discussion between Ambassador Beam and Mr. Gromyko offer encouraging signs that such talks could be undertaken without delay.

Negotiations on balanced force reductions should have been and still should be high on our list of diplomatic priorities. As I said when I returned from my visit to Russia, this is one of a number of areas in which we can and must try to do business with Soviet leaders. We should vigorously explore the negotiating possibilities instead of taking unilateral action which could damage the prospects for their success.

Fourth, we should weigh the impact of force reductions in Europe on situations like the Middle East.

Fifth, U.S. force reductions in Europe could also have a bearing on current East-West negotiations, including the SALT talks. Progress on both sides in reducing conventional forces in Europe could improve the prospects for agreements in other areas.

Sixth, and I believe most importantly, one-sided U.S. troop reductions now would set back vital efforts to reduce East-West tensions and would particularly damage Chancellor Brandt's ostpolitik. The stabilization of East-West relations was the basic purpose behind the original decision by President Truman and the Congress to station American forces in Europe. Chancellor Brandt of West Germany is engaged in extremely delicate negotiations with Moscow and other East European nations to establish more normal relations. His policies, and particularly our joint efforts on the question of Berlin, are of great potential value, not only to Germany, but to all of us. They deserve more than the lukewarm support which the administration has given them. In my recent talk with Chancellor Brandt, he described the strong efforts he is making to maintain the balance between German diplomacy in the East and German commitments to NATO in the West. Unilateral American troop withdrawals at this time could weaken the NATO side of the equation and could make it far more difficult for Chancellor Brandt to keep the necessary balance.

We must also face the hard fact that the diplomacy of normalization is not without opposition in Germany itself. There, and elsewhere, powerful voices are opposed to any arrangements with the Russians and any relaxation of tensions in Europe. At the very least, the timing and character of the U.S. force reductions called for in this amendment could unsettle German politics.

For almost three decades, we have recognized that our troops in Europe serve a purpose beyond deterring a Soviet attack. Our NATO commitment helps to provide stability in German politics. Our troops help to cement German confidence in the West.

They represent the basis for continued German integration into Western Europe. These purposes would not be well served by U.S. troop withdrawals at a time when the Germans themselves are debating a relaxation of tensions with the East, and have taken important initiatives to do so.

Finally, Mr. President, there are the financial and economic questions. They cannot be dismissed as peripheral or trivial, but I think we should avoid placing too great stress on them, from either side of the issue.

In the current balance-of-payments situation, the cost of America's presence in Europe must be taken into account. While the precise figure is difficult to calculate, the best estimate is that our European troop commitments represent a payment outflow of about \$1.5 billion a year.

The immediate cause of our balance-of-payments problem is flows of short term capital—so-called "hot money"—and domestic inflation. Each of these problems must be solved, but neither will be solved by reducing our military presence in Europe.

This is not to say that we should avoid cutting the costs of our military support for NATO. We can and should insist that the Europeans—who want our troops in Europe—must pay more of the cost of keeping them there. We can and should insist that the administration cut the fat from our military forces in Europe, and elsewhere. Those must be urgent priorities.

We should not confuse a balance-of-payments savings overseas with a budgetary savings here. Redeployment of the forces based in Europe might contribute to the former—but it would do nothing about overall defense costs unless the forces were not only redeployed, but disbanded. Even if this amendment forced the withdrawal of 150,000 American soldiers from Europe, presumably they would be maintained in the United States, specifically earmarked for NATO.

We would still be paying approximately the same budget cost, or more, for exactly the same forces. The only difference is that we would get less for our money. We would lose the political and military advantages of the current deployment in Europe.

These, then, are the issues which should concern us today: the conventional force balance of power—the threshold for the potential use of tactical nuclear weapons—the possibility of negotiation on mutual force cutbacks, as called by Mr. Brezhnev—the effects of troop deployments on the Middle East and on SALT—and the impact of unilateral American withdrawals both on German efforts to settle festering issues to the East and on delicate problems in German internal politics.

So the essential question is not whether we should continue to do for the Europeans what they can do for themselves. We all agree on the answer to that.

The majority leader has courageously dramatized our answer—and he is again reminding the Europeans of how we think and what we expect. His reminders have been felt in Europe in the past and will be felt there now and in the future. European governments have responded in the last few years with larger steps toward joint force planning and more equitable defense spending. They have recently made arrangements with the United States to assume a larger share of NATO infrastructure costs of the next 5 years.

Little of this would have come to pass were it not for Senator MIKE MANSFIELD. Our European partners should understand that virtually all of us in the U.S. Senate are with him in expecting them to pick up a fair part of our mutual defense costs. And we are with him in our impatience. We may wait longer for the sake of Europe—but we cannot wait forever.

And just as our NATO partners should not misread what some of us are saying, so our

own executive branch should not misread us either. I am opposed to reducing our forces in Europe by 150,000 men at this time and in this way. But this does not mean that I oppose reducing excess military manpower, that is something which could and should be explored. There is plenty of fat in our Armed Forces, including our European forces.

I am not sure that the administration has done all it could to pressure our European allies to shoulder more of the cost of NATO forces. I am not sure that the administration has done all it could to press for a mutual balanced force reduction in Europe. That is why Senator MANSFIELD's efforts are so important. His proposals have motivated more action on these fronts than might otherwise have occurred.

Mr. President, we went to Europe in 1941 to fight a war. We have stayed there ever since to help avoid another war. We have succeeded. I hope and believe that we are nearing the time when peace can be maintained by diplomacy and trade, not primarily by arms and military might. There is evidence in SALT, in Mr. Brezhnev's recent statements, and in the Gromyko-Beam conversation that we have an opportunity now to begin to negotiate seriously about force reductions and the future of a stable peace in Europe.

We must seize our chance. For the time being, our troops in Europe are part of the negotiating equation. We must use them in the pursuit of a negotiated peace, as we have used them to deter war. They can serve no greater cause. It is the same cause the majority leader seeks to serve with his amendment. I disagree with his amendment, because I believe there is a better way.

ISRAEL'S SURVIVAL AND AMERICA'S SECURITY (Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Denver, Colo., June 25, 1971)

It has been some time since I was on the receiving end of a national campaign. And in the last two or three years. I have often wondered what it's like to watch the candidates from a distance. Can most voters see beyond the press releases and the jokes, the proposals and the television commercials, to the unique, individual flesh and blood human beings? Where does the plastic of image-making stop—and where does the hard-rock of character begin?

There are no easy answers to questions like that. Technology and history have sentenced candidates and citizens alike to a long and expensive ordeal, where people can often reach a politician's hand, but can seldom touch his soul. It's a frustrating process—this business of listening through the noise and listening for the man somewhere in the midst of the campaign. It's like buying a brightly colored grab bag—you can never be completely sure what's inside.

And the process is almost as frustrating from the other end. There, the task is to make people understand, to move them, to discover with them a new way to a better country. From airplane to airplane, from meeting to meeting, from speech to speech, the potential candidate keeps following the liturgy of politics and keeps repeating his litany of promises.

I don't know how the public endures it for so long. But I can explain how just one politician does because I have asked myself "why" again and again.

Part of the answer is the challenge—the chance to shape events and change the life of the nation. The other part is concern—the simple decency of caring what happens to real people and vital principles. Every American has a vision for America. The opportunity to make that vision a reality comes to few men. And because it may come to me, I want to talk with you tonight about my hopes and beliefs.

The conventional way to speak with you would be a laundry list of problems and plans. But that really says so little and re-

veals even less. In 1968, Richard Nixon put out a book proving that he had taken over a hundred specific positions on the issues. I was no more comfortable with him after publication than before.

Instead of something like that, I would like to tell you what I think about a single issue—an issue which I know is close to everyone here—the issue of Israel's survival and security. I have spoken about that issue time and again—and I have been disappointed by the occasional doubts about where I stand. I hope there will be no doubts left after tonight. That's why I want to tell you not only what I think, but what I feel.

I am talking about the feeling I had last January, when I visited a young country built and sustained by an abiding faith in humanity's oldest heritage.

I am talking about my feeling when I stood in Yad Veshem, the memorial to six million dead Jews who will always live in the memory of their martyrdom.

I am talking about my feeling in the bomb shelter of Kibbutz Geshet, where the children had painted wall pictures about peace that is their dream instead of the war that has been their fate.

And I am talking about my feeling in Kibbutz S'de Boker during my talk with David Ben Gurion—a feeling equaled only by my reaction to the bravery of Golda Meir, whose spirit is as young as the country she leads.

So when I left Israel only a few months ago, I felt something in my heart that I had known in my head for a long time. I felt Israel's urgent, moral claim on our support—not merely the support of our words, but the support of our deeds. And in the Middle East I also learned again a stark and simple truth—that the security of Israel is closely related to the security of the United States.

In 1971, this truth must be the foundation for American policy. It is no longer enough—and it never was enough—to rely on the diplomacy of mere reaction of Russian power politics in the Middle East. What may seem details of diplomacy to us may be matters of survival for Israel. Both our policy and our strength must remain constant—so Israel can become as certain of our support as she is of her own resolution.

We must back Israel's demand for defensible borders. From the beginning until 1967, the weakness of Israel's frontier was an enemy's best ally. The way to prevent a new and similar alliance now is an internationally recognized border adjustment. That would not be unusual aid it would not be unfair. As I pointed out to Premier Kosygin in Moscow, Israel needs the kind of border security Russia claimed to need after the Finnish War and World War II—the security of frontiers that are a shield against attack instead of an invitation to aggression.

And Israel deserves more than that. She deserves the right to determine her own fate—and every other country in the Middle East has a similar right. The great powers should help—but they cannot decide. A lasting peace will result only from negotiations by the parties directly involved. And the United States must do nothing to undermine Israel's bargaining position.

But there is something our country can and must do. Though we hope as much as Israel for a permanent peace, we must also assure Israel of enough power to deter renewed war. The right aim is to stop the arms race in the Middle East. But arms control on one side and an arms increase on the other will only tighten the tensions and encourage more bloodshed and violence.

That would threaten our own security—and that is another reason why we must secure the strength of Israel.

I have believed that from the beginning. I believed it in 1967 when I co-sponsored the Symington-Javits Resolution for a just settlement in the Middle East. I believed it in 1970 when I supported more planes for Israel. And I believed it when I went to Israel last

January and a week later when I told it to Premier Kosygin in Moscow.

In my short time in the Middle East, I found a new sense of understanding about that belief. I saw better than I ever could on paper or in State Department reports what Israel is really all about. And I remembered my father's explanation of America's meaning to him—to a man who finally found in Rumford, Maine, a decent refuge from the oppression of Eastern Europe.

The kind of life he built there and the kind of life Jews have built in Israel are things too precious to lose. They must command our energy and our attention now and in the years to come. We must wage the struggle together—in politics, in government, and in private life. And no matter where events and fortune take me in the next few months, I intend to remain part of that effort.

THE AMERICAN ROLE IN AFRICA'S FUTURE

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE at the African-American Dialogues, Lagos, Nigeria, March 8, 1971)

It has taken me much too long to make this trip to Africa.

I have looked forward to coming.

I am glad to be here.

I would like to see Africa achieve its potential.

I would like to know what America can do to help.

I want to hear what Africans have to say on that subject.

I suspect that, given the present mood of Africans, it might be better for an American—especially on his first visit—to listen rather than to speak.

I hope when I have finished, I will not be vulnerable to a criticism which Churchill once addressed to a parliamentary critic in the House of Commons, when he said:

"He can best be described as one of those orators who before they get up do not know what they are going to say; when they are speaking, do not know what they are saying; and when they have sat down, do not know what they have said."

With that reservation, there are some observations I would like to make, as one who has been long interested in Africa, and as an American who has had some responsibility for American policy toward Africa.

An American poet once wrote: "There is only one man in the world and his name is all men."

We are meeting here this week to help translate these words into economic and political facts:

We all remember the fresh beginning of African independence in the 1960's. It was a time when a new relationship between Africa and America seemed inevitable. It was a time when Americans who had won their independence from a colonial power nearly two hundred years earlier, responded sympathetically to the African struggle for independence and freedom and self-respect. It was a time when we thought we could see the end of colonialism.

We should not be surprised that colonialism has not ended easily, and we should not be surprised that independence has not made nation-building an easy task.

America won her independence through a revolution which did not produce a stable government until eleven years had passed. Seventy-one years after the inauguration of our first president the country was torn apart in a civil war. Our early growth was largely dependent on capital resources from Europe. Today, after two hundred years, we are still struggling with deep and divisive questions about freedom, equality, opportunity and justice.

The process of achieving nationhood—of establishing a country in which men and women can live with freedom from fear,

freedom from suspicion and mistrust, freedom from want and disease, and freedom to grow and achieve their natural potential—that process can be long and painful.

We who know this from our own national experience knew also that struggling nations need help to grow. We took some steps to help, but the promise was easier than the reality. Once independence was achieved, once the new constitutions were adopted and the new flags were raised, once the difficult task of building new nations really began, our support fell short of what it might have been. It is not that the United States could—or should—have tried to manage and solve the problems of Africans. That would have been unwise and impossible. But, looking back, we can see how much more we might have done to help.

America was diverted by her own troubles. We had gone to war in Indochina. Our attention was divided between that war and our internal problems. I am not here to tell you that this has changed. I cannot promise that there will be an upsurge in material support and assistance for African countries. We are still involved in a tragic war, and even if we end our military involvement in Indochina—as I believe we must—many Americans will be reluctant to assume any involvement elsewhere in the world.

The problems in our own country, in our cities and towns and small communities, are enormous. They demand and they deserve a far greater share of our attention and our total resources than we have given them in many years.

Nevertheless, we do have concerns and responsibilities in the rest of the world. We have them here in Africa. Out of our traumatic experience in Southeast Asia we are seeking wiser ways to play our proper role in the affairs of mankind. I believe we can do more on this continent than we have been doing. I believe we can do so together with those who seek understanding, respect and friendship. I think the American people have a desire to do so.

This is not because of any direct security interest we may have in Africa, or because we should wish to compete for favors with other great powers. It is simply because we cannot be faithful to fundamental American values, unless we show our concern for the human condition wherever men and women live.

We should, all of us, realize by now that the problems of mankind and the promise of mankind are two sides of the same coin.

What, then, should America do?

First, I believe America should raise, and not reduce, the level of development aid. That aid should respond both to the needs for individual country assistance and to arrangements for regional development. Our support for regional and multilateral efforts should be no excuse for cutting our overall aid commitment, and it should not be a substitute for supporting assistance to specific countries where it is needed.

America's resources for foreign assistance are not unlimited. I would suggest that one of the most productive uses of this conference would be to discuss how these resources might be allocated. For example, the so-called "brain drain" has been a serious and continuing problem for many nations, especially in the field of medicine. Our programs in the 1960's for training men and women in the United States have been partly responsible. I believe the time has come to reinforce the capacities of educational institutions in Africa so that her people may receive the medical training they need on their own continent. We should assist African countries to develop health care systems suited to their needs.

We should also consider the critical importance of long-term improvements in the quantity and quality of food supplies. The Institute for Tropical Agriculture here in Nigeria is an example of what can be done.

I believe we should undertake additional cooperative efforts to help meet the growing requirements for basic foods in tropical areas.

Second, I believe America should do more than express her sympathies for the need to stabilize commodity prices, to eliminate trade barriers, and to establish tariff preferences for goods from developing nations. We should use this conference to discuss how we can act on these matters together.

Third, I believe America should encourage private investment in the independent countries of Africa, wherever it can help, and particularly where it will tend to stimulate local investment. We must do so with the understanding that when local capital becomes available, it has a right to participate in a meaningful way.

Fourth, I believe America should be ready to help where she can to meet the challenges of population growth and distribution. In too many instances in the United States and elsewhere, we have seen the pressures of increased populations causing problems in education, housing and the environment, undoing the benefits of economic development. We should not presume to suggest population policies, but we can help support the population policies African nations decide to pursue. Above all, we in America must be without preconceptions as to what African countries need. We must listen to African definitions of what should be done in African nations. That is one of the basic reasons why I am here.

If peace and progress in Africa depended on friendly assistance, we could be satisfied with addressing ourselves to the practical problems of health, education, housing, food, employment and the conservation of natural resources. But aid alone cannot ensure peace or defend the dignity of man. We know from our experience in the United States that relations among men depend on more than economic development. They also depend on mutual respect and equality.

That is why we must address ourselves frankly and openly to the problems of freedom, justice, discrimination and racial oppression. I did not come here to tell Africans how to solve these problems. As an American, I cannot tell you that our country has yet solved its own problems of racial injustice and racial discrimination. Indeed, before I left for Lagos, a student wrote me in these words: "Senator, please don't be the usual politician who tells it like he wants it rather than how it really is."

More and more Americans are coming to recognize racial injustice for what it is. More and more Americans understand that no society can really be at peace so long as it sustains racial injustice. More and more Americans are committed to equal opportunity, in law and in fact.

But concern with the human condition cannot stop at our nation's borders. Every form of tyranny—wherever it occurs—is an outrage; and none is more evil than the oppression of a man because of the color of his skin. That is why I believe apartheid is wrong. That is why I believe white supremacy is wrong. That is why I believe colonial domination is wrong. These are not simply intellectual conclusions. They are convictions rooted in the experience and circumstances of my own life and background.

They are convictions which lead me to the conclusion that support of racial oppression in other countries by words or by silence, is against the best interests of the United States.

I know it is not easy to deal with these questions in terms of our relations with other countries. They are complex and they involve decisions of great difficulty, but they are questions which deeply affect the future development of this continent, and its capacity to achieve peace and justice for all its people, of all races.

How does one deal with questions of apartheid, white supremacy, and colonial interference with the rights of self-determination, particularly if you are a large and powerful nation such as the United States? The easy answer to some might appear to be massive intervention. But we have learned from our experience in Indochina that intervention, even by a powerful country, does not produce the results we may want.

My strong opposition to the military involvement in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos is a reflection of my conviction that we have seen too much direct interference in the affairs of other nations by the so-called great powers. There has been too much exertion of military power in international affairs, with nations attempting to bend other nations to their will.

Does this mean that we should stand aside, ignoring what is happening in South Africa, in Rhodesia, in Namibia, or in the Portuguese colonies? We cannot, if we are to do justice to our moral concerns. There should be two guidelines for our policies toward South Africa:

First, we must maintain our own arms embargo, and seek to persuade our allies to do likewise.

Second, we must recognize that a relations-as-usual, business-as-usual, communications-as-usual approach is inadequate. A neutral attitude, whatever its intent, may in fact contribute to support of apartheid. We need communication with South Africa, if we are to have a positive influence. But it must not be communication which gives a badge of respectability to oppressive regimes, or which is only one-way, or which is only with the dominant minority.

Adopting these guidelines does not give us an automatic answer to the question of what actions would be both realistic and right. The last decade has shown that Americans and others have not yet found that answer. The years since the Sharpeville massacre have been marked by much talk outside South Africa; the tragedy within is no less cruel than before.

We in America cannot ignore that tragedy. It is a matter of importance, and it is urgent. It is no longer enough to try to deal with this festering and explosive situation merely by incantation or by ignoring it.

We must seriously re-examine our policies and practices with respect to South Africa. The conscience of an America determined to solve a racial problem of her own must explore ways and means of stimulating and supporting genuine changes in South Africa's racial practices.

The objective of this re-examination must be to identify every present relationship and form of cooperation which may have the effect of aiding and abetting the present denial of equal rights to all South Africa's citizens. The United States cannot and should not try to solve the problem—which is the right and responsibility of Africans. But it must not—even inadvertently—make their problem worse.

Unless men can find the answer to this problem of relations among races—which spreads across the face of this planet—there can be no peace. It is the problem of all nations. If South Africa were on the road to justice for all its races, it would move us all down the road toward peace and understanding throughout this continent and the world.

The Rhodesian situation continues to be troublesome for all of us. We hope the United Kingdom can work out a settlement to prevent the creation of another South Africa in Rhodesia. But until and unless a settlement respecting the rights of black Rhodesians is achieved, we should be completely scrupulous in fulfilling the obligations we have assumed under the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations.

In the case of Namibia, I believe the right course for the United States is to support

peaceful efforts under the United Nations to stop this spread of apartheid and to make international responsibility for the area effective.

The question of the Portuguese colonies in Africa presents other problems for the United States. We have treaty commitments with Portugal, primarily through the North Atlantic Treaty organization. Those commitments are related to the general defense system developed between the United States and its Western European allies. They are not commitments which can be taken lightly by any responsible American leader.

They represent one side of the Portuguese colonial issue for the United States. The other side of the issue is represented by our concerns and interests in Africa. For too long some Americans have held that only our European commitments and only our military-strategic interests are important. According to that view of the world, at any time they intersect with other interest or concerns, narrowly defined military-strategic interests should prevail.

If the world is going to survive, and if American society is not to be ripped to shreds in dissension and disillusion, this way of viewing American interests in the world must be changed. We do have interests and responsibilities in Europe, but we also have interests and responsibilities in Africa. These interests must be given their full weight and importance in our policy choices.

Some of those interests relate to our increased economic investments in Africa. Some relate to the importance of avoiding the horrors of war and its impact on the world community. More important still are our interests in the principles of human freedom and national independence. We do have an obligation to set an example in human decency, generosity and concern for the rights of others.

How, then, do these general principles apply to our relations with Portugal and the issue of her African colonies? Some of us thought a new government in Lisbon might pursue new policies in Africa. But no real change is apparent. Instead, we have seen a continuation of the fighting to preserve colonial control. We have seen indications that planned movement of more Portuguese settlers to Africa will further complicate the problem. We have seen no break in her determination to withhold the right of self-determination from 13 million Africans.

I believe the United States has a duty to itself as a nation committed to the principle of self-determination to make our views known to the Portuguese government in no uncertain terms. I believe we have a duty, as a friend of African independence and peaceful development, and as an ally of Portugal to work as hard as we can to persuade Portugal to change her colonial policies.

We have an obligation to try to persuade Portugal to see the wisdom and necessity of bringing to a prompt end her military activities in Africa and to grant the right of self-determination to all people in her overseas territories.

If Portugal refuses to end her colonial policies in Africa, we may be confronted with a hard choice between our treaty relations with Portugal and our interests in the peaceful development of self-determined nations in Africa. I hope they change their policies, and we are not faced with that choice. But if we are, then we must not operate on the automatic assumption that these relations with Portugal are more important than our African interests and responsibilities.

I have spoken at some length of the negative actions the United States must take or consider in opposition to racial injustice and oppression in Africa. Such actions are important, but they are not all we can or should do to encourage the growth of freedom and equality in Southern Africa and throughout

the continent. Our commitments must include economic and technical assistance to help strengthen the promise of independent Africa.

Americans do not have all the answers in a troubled world. We know, however, that peace and the dignity of man cannot be maintained in isolation from other nations.

More than ten years ago, before he was President, John Kennedy said that "Every American is now involved in the world."

Our involvement with Africa provides us with an opportunity. We have an opportunity on this continent to prove that cold war politics need not be the basis for American foreign policy. We have an opportunity to prove that compassion and conviction and moral obligation can and should be the moving forces of that policy.

I do not believe we can expect change to be apparent overnight, but I believe relations between Africa and America can be strengthened in the 1970's. I believe they will be strengthened, provided we have the courage always to speak honestly and to continue our dialogue in friendship.

AN ALLIANCE FOR SURVIVAL

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, at the Conference on International Organization and the Human Environment, New York City, May 21, 1971)

Mr. Secretary-General, Mr. President of the General Assembly, Judge Jessup, ladies and gentlemen:

On various occasions, the Secretary General of the United Nations has spoken positively and prophetically of the need to see this entire globe as a habitat that must serve the needs of mankind. I know of few men in the world today who more fully exemplify Plato's ideal of statesman-philosopher than U Thant. It is a privilege to be his contemporary, and an honor to share this platform with him.

I am pleased, too, to have been able to meet Mr. Maurice Strong, Secretary-General to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment to be held in Stockholm. The fact that Mr. Strong was willing to give up his distinguished career in government in Canada in order to take on this assignment is a tribute to the persuasive powers of the Secretary-General—just as it is an authoritative assurance of the high quality of the preparatory work going into the Stockholm meeting.

Today, we meet in the forum of man to discuss the survival of man.

In other times, people have come to the same place for the same purpose.

But today's crisis is different from most of the United Nations has seen.

No ultimatum signaled its coming—and no bugles summoned its contestants. What is at stake is no one's security and everyone's life. Ally and adversary, we all share the pain and the danger of the environmental crisis.

A wall may keep freedom out and people in—but no wall could be high enough to keep the smog out of Potsdam or inside West Berlin.

Artillery and aircraft once turned the peaceful Ussuri River into a tense borderline—but bullets and bombs cannot deter the bacteria in the water that separates China from Russia.

Israelis and Arabs have fought over Sharm-el-Sheikh—but war and the threat of war will not avert a disastrous oil spill in the Gulf of Aqaba.

Americans cannot travel to North Korea—but Americans breathe the same air the jet stream carries here from there.

The simple truth is that no place on our planet lives alone—and no place can deal alone with the pollution of the planet. We are far from one world politically—but, by necessity if not by choice, we are one world

environmentally. And the crisis of the environment has made us common victims of a common adversity.

Together, we must create something better. Together, we must build an alliance for survival—an alliance beyond our separate ambitions to serve our shared interests—an alliance that includes all nations and excludes no nation. That is our only decent chance—and our only real choice.

People are the issue. States have sovereign rights—but so do people. People have a right to clean air and clean water. They have a right to the international resource we call the ocean—which gives us food and even the atmosphere itself.

So much hangs in the balance. We cannot rely on the political habits of the past to save our environment for the future. We may be tied to habit when we take up the issue of war and peace. We must free ourselves from it when we turn to the problem of pollution. And I believe that now is the time to try.

Our best hope for initial success is the Stockholm Conference next year. The composition of the conference should be equal to the * * * of the conference. It should be as universal in 1972 as the United Nations should become in 1971. The General Assembly should ask every government in the world to a meeting called to consider pollution everywhere in the world. And the most essential addition to the conference is the People's Republic of China.

China is too large and too populated to be left out. It has the world's greatest river system and one of the world's longest coastlines. It is a growing industrial power and a maturing consumer power. Its present and potential impact on our human and physical environment is comparable only to the number of its people. We simply cannot expect to create an environment that will work for man if our efforts ignore one-fifth of mankind.

And the General Assembly should not refuse China an invitation to Stockholm out of fear that China would reject it. That might happen—but it might not. A time of ping pong diplomacy holds out at least some hope for the success of environmental diplomacy. If China is willing to let its athletes compete with the rest of the world, China might also be willing to let its scientists help the whole world survive. It is worth finding out—and it is vital to find out.

If China will not participate in 1972, the United Nations should issue similar invitations in the years to come. I believe that, in the end, China must say yes to the invitations—and yes to a safe future for our fragile environment. An alliance for survival is in China's interest because it is in the human interest.

It may take time to convert that simple perception into international policy. But we cannot just sit back and wait. An alliance for survival incomplete at its inception would still be an infinite improvement over no alliance at all. And we must begin now. The crisis in the environment commands our immediate attention and our best efforts. In 1971, every concerned nation must become a partner for environmental protection. Every concerned nation must cooperate to create a multilateral attack on pollution.

If we can spend billions for our security from each other, then surely each of us can spend some of our wealth and some of our power on the common security of man.

Four specific steps deserve the highest priority.

First, we must more effectively coordinate current international policy toward the environment.

No one believes that present international arrangements can alone resolve the crisis. But we must make sure that we are doing as much as we can with what we already

have. Co-ordination should be centralized at a high level in the United Nations to direct priorities, to avoid wasteful duplication, and to assure comprehensive action. The exact design of a co-ordinating mechanism and the role of U.N. agencies, new or old, are matters for intensive study and prompt action. And the resulting structure must reach beyond the U.N.—to take advantage of the promising efforts of other multilateral and regional organizations.

Second, we must set international standards and norms for environmental behavior.

Some very serious offenses—like dumping certain toxic substances into the ocean—should be flatly prohibited. That is something the Stockholm conference should accomplish next year. In less troublesome areas, we may be able to rely on recommended uniform practices. But whether standards are mandatory or voluntary, we must speed up the process of setting them. We must assure that the best scientific opinions are taken into account as knowledge and circumstances change. And we must minimize the competitive disadvantages in world trade of acting responsibly toward the world environment.

Setting standards is, of course, a national as well as an international duty. For example, the United States can—and should—move against American firms for the environmental excesses of their foreign subsidiaries. No company should ever be permitted to export its pollution.

Third, we must establish an international system for environmental control.

We do not know enough about the trouble the world is in—and consequently we cannot do enough about it. The remedy is to identify, analyze, and disseminate relevant information about the global environment. We have seen a hopeful beginning in limited sectors—the prime examples are the world weather watch and the reports on threatened animal and plant species by the international union for the conservation of nature and natural resources.

But we cannot stop there—or even with an expanded version of monitoring physical data. Equally vital is the monitoring of national environmental policies. American law requires America's government agencies to submit detailed statements before they do anything that might impair the quality of the environment.

I believe those statements should be passed on to the United Nations. I believe other countries should adopt a similar policy. And I believe that the U.N. should apply the same standard to the conduct of its own agencies.

This system would let every government review and comment on what every other government was doing. I doubt that any country is yet prepared to grant a veto over all its decisions about the environment. But every country should be prepared to consult in good faith—as a first step toward an institution with the power to prevent the pollution of resources which belong to people everywhere.

We must earn a hard and fundamental truth: The atmosphere—which is essential to life—and the ocean—which is the source of life itself and of the renewal of life—are in jeopardy because of man himself. We can save them from man and for man only if they are brought under effective international jurisdiction.

We have a treaty to protect the empty blackness of outer space. At the very least, we should agree to full disclosure and due process about what happens here on earth—to the air we breathe and the water we drink and the land that sustains us.

When some scientists tell us that five hundred SSTs could destroy the ozone in our atmosphere and leave us exposed to deadly radiation, we cannot afford to let one nation decide for all mankind. Every interested

country's voice should be heard—and such voices should be heeded. The international community must determine the truth about its environmental dangers before the SST is allowed to fly.

Pending the development and release of such information, I would hope that all the nations now engaged in the manufacture of supersonic transports would consider suspending such manufacture and development.

And that principle must prevail across the sweep of the world environment.

I took the view in the Senate of the United States that no measure can be regarded as a national good if there is a serious danger that it would run counter to the human good.

If this view is to have any validity in any one place, it must have validity every place.

Our concerns are not confined, of course, to the world's atmosphere.

We read of mercury levels in swordfish. In the United States, the Government has acted to protect the health of its people by banning sales of swordfish.

What about other peoples? Other peoples throughout the world eat swordfish. If the United States is right in its analysis of contamination levels in swordfish, then are not other people entitled to the same protection?

It isn't just swordfish that ingest mercury. All seafood exposed to mercury are contaminated.

The entire chain of ocean life is affected.

Again, what I am asking is whether this is really a matter that can be responsibly left to the separate determination of individual nations.

Are we acting sensibly to protect the human habitat unless we set up effective world agencies that can act in the human interest?

Is there any rational approach to this problem unless a world agency sets world health standards and can apply them effectively in the human interest?

In the years just ahead, we will hear more and more about the harm one country has inflicted on the ecology of others. The construction of large dams may flood a nation upstream and dry up the irrigation system of a downstream neighbor. The disposal of wastes in rivers and estuaries can hit another country hard—and so can efforts at weather modification. In all these areas, men must find and face the facts together—and then men must decide together.

Fourth, the nations that have shared the financial benefits of environmental anarchy must now share the financial burden of environmental control.

We must beware of the voices that are urging the third world to settle for stunted development in the name of the environment. That advice is self-defeating—it will never be taken. And it is also wrong. We cannot sacrifice the human environment to the physical environment. We are against pollution—but we are not against people. We cannot begin an environmental crusade by telling primarily the poorest nations among us to ask what they can do for the world.

Before we who are lucky enough to live in a wealthy society start lecturing deprived societies, we should look to our own backyard. When I was a boy in Rumford, Maine, my friends and neighbors used to sniff the odor from the mill and say—"That's the smell of money." Why should we expect Asians and Africans to react differently?

What we should expect of them is what we expect of ourselves—a readiness to control the impact of industry and agriculture on the quality of life. But we cannot ask them to pay every cent of their own bill. They lack the profits we have already made from pollution. We must now use some of those profits to help them help the environment.

Economic aid should give the developing countries the chance to install anti-pollution devices at the outset of industrialization. We should be willing to pay more for less damage to the environment. We should also be willing to give international lending agencies the power to grant low interest development loans—loans that would prevent pollution now and would have to be repaid only in prosperity. If the advanced nations now believe that a product like DDT is a threat, they should provide the third world with any cost difference between it and a safer alternative.

It would be a crime to stop progress in the developing countries. And it would also be a crime to lose their unique opportunity for progress without pollution. Decent development and a decent environment are one and the same. That should be their goal—that should be our policy—and we should put our money where our advice is—and our interests are. After all, it is our environment as well as theirs.

All of this will require tough, tedious nuts and bolts work. But that is the only way to build an alliance for survival. That is the only way to succeed in the essential adventure of saving the earth God made—and the world man has remade.

But direct action to save the physical environment cannot be the sole aim of our alliance. There would be little consolation in saving every endangered species except people. And even in the best of all possible physical worlds, man could still disappear.

We could be engulfed by the weight of our own numbers—numbers too great for any miracle grain or any land use.

We could destroy ourselves in a quarrel over the vast gap between the majority that is poor and the minority that is well-off.

We could destroy ourselves in a quarrel that is in doubt or a negotiation that has broken down.

So ultimately, an alliance for survival must move beyond the physical environment. It must encompass the total environment. And it must provide support for effective U.N. peacekeeping, enough population planning, more development capital, and real arms control. An alliance for survival will finally fail if our countries continue to stagger under an arms spending burden of \$200 billion a year.

Let us begin to put the alliance together in the fight against pollution.

We can bring governments like China into the effort without pushing other differences into the foreground.

We can make ideological adversaries environmental allies.

We can make men and nations see their shared interest in defeating the shared danger.

And from there, with luck and commitment, we can turn to the other assorted agonies of the human condition. If we once learn to work together to reclaim our physical environment, perhaps we can then create the environment of tranquility and justice.

Your conference can point the way—to Stockholm in 1972 and to a more decent future in the twentieth century.

You can teach us to do the work of peace and avert the terror of war.

You can help us to realize the political renewal of the United Nations, which President Kennedy called "our last, best hope."

Then, some day, we will no longer have to come to the forum of man to struggle for the survival of man. We will instead debate and decide how to make the most progress for people.

That seems a distant dream—and it is. But I believe we can make it real in a universal United Nations committed to the total human environment.

Thank you for trying.

TOWARD A MORE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE to the Wisconsin State Democratic Convention, Madison, Wis., June 19, 1971)

I have come to your convention today to speak about another convention a year away.

But I have not come here to discuss who will be nominated in 1972 or what the platform will promise—though I have a very real interest in both questions. Instead, I want to talk with you now about how the Democratic Party will conduct democracy's most vital business at our next national convention.

Will our reality equal and decide permit Democrats on every side to make their voices heard and their views count?

Will we dispel the suspicions and the charges of unfairness—which can cripple our cause in the summer and kill our hopes in the fall campaign?

Because we want to win and because we want to be right, we Democrats know what our answers must say. We know that the only party worthy of leading America in 1973 will be a party that listens to Americans in 1972.

For more than half a century, Wisconsin has worked for a responsive political system—in this state and in our country. From Robert La Follette to Pat Lucey, Bill Proxmire, and Gaylord Nelson—from the passage of the direct primary in 1903 to your delegation's demand for convention reform in 1968—the men and women of Wisconsin have fought to give our party to the people. That goal is so easy to say so hard to reach. But I believe it is now within our grasp.

In the last two years, citizens and politicians like you have reshaped the rule of the Democratic Party. The O'Hara Commission has told us how to run national conventions that are in order—in fact as well as in theory. And the McGovern Commission has told us how to assure delegate credentials that are in order—in truth as well as in law. What it all adds up to is a peaceful revolution of popular participation in writing our next platform and naming the next President. Your efforts and the efforts of others have made it possible to make the Democratic Party more democratic than any party has even been.

Our challenge now is to seize that chance. It is a challenge for individuals and organizations in every state. And it is also a challenge for every potential presidential candidate.

The candidates have a special responsibility. Those to whom much may be given owe something in return. Those who stand at the center of the contest cannot justify a retreat to the sidelines, when the issue is the rights of people, even at the price of personal gain.

So what we face now is not just a battle each candidate must wage for himself, but a battle all candidates must win together for the Democratic Party.

I am convinced that we can succeed. There is already strong precedent for candidate cooperation on questions of party-wide concern. Last fall, we met in Washington to agree on common ground rules for our separate campaigns. Last week, I asked Democratic National Chairman Lawrence O'Brien to call another meeting to ban paid television spots prior to the convention. If we fracture our unity and drain our scarce wealth before the main event, we will not have the strength or the resources to defeat Richard Nixon. We must have enough left to do enough for victory in 1972.

And we must do more. The precedent of co-operation cannot be limited to the preservation of dollars. The nomination must be worth winning, not only financially, but also in principle. Our candidates must not be chosen by a few powerful politicians in pri-

vate backrooms. Our candidate must be chosen fairly and freely by all the people of our party.

So I am proposing today a joint attempt at the highest level to enforce the recent rules for reform. Larry O'Brien should bring the potential nominees together with Congressman Don Fraser, now the Chairman of the Commission on Party Structure. The outcome should be a genuine and common commitment to reject the support of delegates from states which have made inadequate efforts to comply with the Commission's requirements. In 1972, no candidate should seek an advantage from undemocratic delegations to the Democratic Convention. And every candidate should seek a more democratic party.

Together, the candidates can make change happen. But there is one barrier that they and other Democrats cannot remove. In New York and Indiana, in Wyoming and the Dakotas and elsewhere, Republican legislatures have blocked the bills which are necessary for reform. As a result, some state Democratic organizations are stuck with outmoded procedures and unresponsive systems—procedures and systems they may not want, but cannot undo.

Surely, we should expect more than this obstruction from what President Nixon likes to label the "party of the open door." But perhaps that is all we can get from a Republican Party so closed that it has not even discussed reform—a party with few young Americans, few blue collar workers, and even fewer blacks. Perhaps it was predictable that the party which purged one of its own Senators would try to prevent Democrats from taking a different and more responsive path.

But despite Republican resistance, you can see the signs of progress everywhere in the Democratic Party. The reaction of the South is proof that those who were the scapegoats of 1968 will not be the offenders of 1972. And across the country, eight states are fully in compliance with the McGovern requirements. Fourteen others are very near full compliance. Only four states still lag very far behind. We are on our way to a nominating process open to the public, advertised to the public, and controlled by the public.

And the potential nominees can make sure our party goes all the way. What we want and what we must have are delegates at the 1972 Convention who represent a constituency and reflect its viewpoint. Across the whole range of issues—from credentials to rules and the platform—the Democrats who select the delegates must know where they stand. A convention whose official call commands reform must not turn to covert candidacies or hidden policies the people have had no chance to review.

For longer than any of us have lived, the Democratic Party has worked for peaceful, progressive change. Now in 1971, we are renewing ourselves. In 1971, we are telling women and blacks and the young that they can secure a just place in our party. And if we convert our good words into good deeds, we will be more than ready for 1972. Then, next year, the self-appointed leaders who are today clamoring for a new party or the antipolitics of the streets will find themselves without followers or a cause to fight.

That is why potential candidates must speak up for reform—because it is necessary and because it is right. And no candidate can escape a larger obligation that goes beyond his own fate to the future of our party. No candidate should seek the chance to lead next year unless he is willing to lead the struggle for reform now.

The heart of the matter is the purpose of a political party. And any Democrat who looks to his heritage and his history knows what a party worthy of the name is really all about. It is not a neutral, selfish, self-perpetuating organization for the benefit of

politicians. It is a device to permit a free people to determine their lives and the life of society.

The Democratic Party is farmers outside Wausau and machinists in Milwaukee and professors in Madison. They understand what is happening to their own land and on their own campus. They see the everyday problems in their neighborhoods which add up to constant problems for the nation. And they have the right to decide how their party will respond.

Ultimately, of course, it is up to them to exercise that right. The 70% of Americans who think the Indochina war is wrong—the bread-winners in every city and every state who are angry about lost jobs and more welfare—the millions who are convinced that President Nixon has failed in civil rights and law enforcement—those Americans have both an obligation and an opportunity to change policy through politics.

The Democratic Party must finish the work of reform in the weeks and months ahead. But reform will mean nothing unless people use the resulting power to push and prod our party and our country in a new direction.

Seventeen years ago, when I announced for Governor of Maine, I told the voters something I deeply believe—that "the success of a political party is not an end in itself. It is merely a means of service."

That belief has always been the faith of the Wisconsin Democratic Party.

It is the tradition of the National Democratic Party.

It is the reason for reform in 1971—and the only way to victory in 1972.

JUNE 18, 1971.

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

Chairman LAWRENCE O'BRIEN,
Democratic National Committee,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I respectfully request that the potential Democratic Presidential nominees or their aides be brought together for the purpose of reviewing progress to date on state by state compliance with the recommendations of the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection.

The massive effort by the Democratic Party to induce greater public participation in the delegate selection process is an encouraging sign of hope for the future of American politics. This contrasts with the Republican National Committee's intention to run another closed convention.

However, before the great delegate search begins, all of the potential Democratic nominees should be informed of state by state progress on compliance. The candidates should agree to reject the support of delegates from states which have made inadequate efforts toward compliance.

Unnecessary challenge can be avoided if the Fraser Commission, the National Committee and the candidates band together to insure that the 1972 Democratic National Convention is the most open and democratic in American history.

Sincerely,

EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

THE HERITAGE OF MAINE

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE at the Narraguagus Regional High School Commencement, Harrington, Maine, June 11, 1971)

I am proud to share this moment with you because your graduation has a very special meaning for me.

My first statewide campaign began in the year most of you were born. As high school seniors in 1971, you have lived a larger part of your lives as my constituents than anyone else.

You are too young to recall my time as Governor or my first years in the Senate. You had more important things to do than noticing my career. You were learning to walk and to speak, to laugh and to love, to care about people and places.

Through all those years, you—like every other citizen of Maine—had a right to my concern and my commitment and my service. I have tried not to let you down—and I hope you think I have succeeded—if not always, at least often enough. Now, on your graduation day, I have come home again to fulfill another tradition of public men. I have come to Narraguagus High School to speak directly with each of you for the first time, Senator to constituent.

The only frank and honest way for me to start is by noting some apprehensions in Maine about my present course. It is no secret that I am thinking of running for President. And some of my friends and neighbors have made no secret of their fear that I am turning away from Maine—that somehow, sometime, my roots here have been weakened—that I care less now than I did before about the land which has given me life and opportunity.

None of my words could wholly relieve those apprehensions. And this is not the time or the place to talk about politics. But I would like to share with you tonight some of the beliefs I have learned during more than a half-century in Maine. They are what led me to public life in the first place. They are the reason for my conduct now—and the reason I may run for President next year. They are beliefs rooted in the traditions of our state. They are the same beliefs I hope you will take with you from this school and this graduation.

I hope Maine has taught you—as it once taught me—to care about our environment—about the earth God made and the earth man has remade.

To walk through the woods near Cherryfield, to fish in the Narraguagus, to pick blueberries a few yards from your back door, to see the clean, simple streets and homes of Milbridge is to understand how much it means to keep our world safe for a truly human existence. That is the challenge and the chance for all of us, each in our own lives. I found it in Rumford and you have found it here. It is the common heritage of Maine.

I hope Maine has also taught you—as it once taught me—to care about economic decency for people.

My high school graduation came in the midst of the Great Depression. In those years, I saw hunger and sorrow in my own town, next door and down the block. And you have seen some of the same things here, in the poorest county in the Northeastern part of America. Maine is fighting now as it always has to build something better. And none of us can ever abandon that fight.

And I hope Maine has taught you—as it once taught me—to care about community and mutual trust.

As a child, I felt the slights of an immigrant's son. But I also felt the respect my father earned as he made a place for himself and his family. I have always remembered a truth you have probably already discovered—that the quiet, reserved citizens of Maine know how to overcome prejudice and bring people together. The struggle is far from over, in this state or any other. And its ultimate outcome depends on us.

Finally, I hope Maine has taught you—as it once taught me—to care about other people and other places.

Only a few years after I returned from law school to Waterville, thousands of us left the state to defend freedom on the other side of the globe. Some of Maine's men died for foreigners they did not know and could not even talk with. But they knew how vital it was, in

Dietrich Bonhoeffer's phrase, to "live for others." They knew that neither a man nor a state could in good conscience forget the rest of the country or the rest of the world.

Their example must inspire our efforts. Each of us has a part to play. All of us must stretch ourselves to defend our beliefs. And none of us can settle for our own success alone, in this city or this state or this nation.

As we work to realize the principles we have learned in Maine, we will disagree about policies and politics, one from another. That is not important. What is important is to care and to act in the tradition of Maine. Whatever I do and whatever you do, that must remain our common compass.

It can direct so many of the decisions you and your classmates already face.

Will you move out of Maine—or will you remain or return later to help shape this beautiful state into a better place to live?

Will you then look only to yourselves and your town and our state—or will you look beyond our borders to apply what you have learned here to make a difference elsewhere?

Will you turn off and cop out—or will you use your new right to register and to vote—to make your voices heard and your views count?

None of you know where fate and the work of your own hands will take you in the decades ahead. Thirty-nine years ago, when I graduated from Stephens High School, I could not even dream of the opportunity Maine would bestow upon me and my family. But I was anxious to reach out and touch the promise of things to come.

That should be your resolution as you leave high school tonight—and it should be your resolution through all the years of your lives. You will find, as I have found, that you must choose again and again. There will always be new promises to reach for and new potentials to realize. There will always be challenges to the principles Maine has made a part of each of you. And there will always be another chance, here and elsewhere, to build a future equal to your heritage.

No citizen worthy of this state can decide to forget the spirit of this state. I believe you will remember. I believe you will care. And I believe you will give of yourselves for Maine and the nation and your fellow men.

Perhaps the most important truth I have learned in my years of public service is that you are important. This is your night—and it is not a night for long speeches. So I would like to stop now. And I would also like to thank each of you for sharing your special moment with me.

Everything I am and everything I hope to be is due to Maine. You and your parents and this state have given me the central belief of my life. It has guided me and I hope it will guide you. In Maine and in America and in the world, whatever we can do, and whatever we dream we can do, we must begin now.

TASK FORCE TO STUDY PREDATOR CONTROL PROGRAMS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in a speech to the National Wildlife Conservation Summit at Estes Park, Colo., on July 9, 1971, Secretary of the Interior Morton announced the formation of a task force to study predator control programs throughout the country.

I am indeed hopeful that the task force under the chairmanship of my good friend Dr. Stanley Cain of the University of Michigan will do its work well and come forward with strong recommendations to end the many abuses which now exemplify the predatory control activities throughout the Nation. Also, I hope that the Department of the Interior will live up to its responsibilities to halt predator control abuses while the study is in progress.

I was pleased to see Secretary Morton's commendatory comments concerning Mr. Nat Reed who recently joined the Department of the Interior as Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks. The Assistant Secretary is off to a good start and I am sure that with appropriate support from within the administration and from the Members of Congress he will be able to continue his good work.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of Secretary Morton's speech and the text of a Department of the Interior press release relating thereto at this point in the RECORD:

SECRETARY MORTON ANNOUNCES TASK FORCE TO STUDY PREDATOR CONTROL PROGRAMS BEFORE THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION CONSERVATION SUMMIT, ESTES PARK, COLO.

Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton today announced the formation of a blue ribbon Task Force which will study Predator Control programs throughout the country. The Task Force, sponsored jointly by Interior and the Council on Environmental Quality, will be composed entirely of wildlife management experts from various universities.

Members of the panel are: Dr. Stanley Cain, Chairman, University of Michigan; Dr. Fred Wagner of Utah State University; Dr. John Kadlec, University of Michigan; Dr. Richard Cooley of the University of California, Santa Cruz; Dr. Maurice Hornecker, University of Idaho; Dr. Durwood Allen of Purdue University and Dr. A. Starker Leopold of the University of California, Berkeley.

Speaking at the National Wildlife Federation Conservation Summit at Estes Park, Colorado, Secretary Morton also announced plans to step up Interior efforts to preserve non-game wildlife species. Morton said, "We in the Department are becoming increasingly aware of the alterations occurring in non-game populations as a result of man's impact on the natural landscape. America's wildlife management efforts have traditionally been directed towards species of sports value."

A further proposed program within Interior, said Morton, will be increased manpower for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife's river basin section which reviews all public works projects whose development could potentially endanger wildlife populations and habitat. The river basin section now reviews all dredge and fill applications, all public works projects, including those of the Corps of Engineers, Soil Conservation Service, Bureau of Reclamation, Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Power Commission.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ROGERS C. B. MORTON AT THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION CONSERVATION SUMMIT, ESTES PARK, COLO., JULY 9, 1971

In the past, I might have addressed this highly aware and deeply committed conservation summit gathering as the "conservation cognoscenti." Today, that venerable old giant of a word "conservation" has been temporarily eclipsed and "environmentally

erudite" might come closer to fitting this year's fashion in words.

But I think it best at this point that I leave alliteration to our able Vice President and turn to a very brief examination of why I believe I am here . . . here in the treasure chest of the Rockies addressing you at the end of an intensive period of study, exploration, and environmental soul-searching. You are definitely an environmentally sophisticated group so I needn't spend much time re-hashing the environmental crises which plague us, nor selling you the proposition that wise environmental practices must be founded upon morality. Years ago, Aldo Leopold said it all by enunciating that man is steward of the land—the environment—his is the responsibility of prudent management and cautious protection of that environment for future generations. Rather than moralize, however, I'd like to try to lay it on the line . . . to "let it all hang out" as they say . . . and talk environmental policy.

The conservation record of this organization indicates your interest, enthusiasm, and . . . I will say . . . your love for the animal kingdom. You have faced the bulldozer and the dredge. You have witnessed and decried the all-too-often rampant development of huge chunks of this previously unspoiled continent . . . a continent with so vast and majestic a storehouse of natural resources that the words of Pogo, the comic strips sage, come immediately to my mind. "We is faced with insurmountable opportunity." God help us if we manage to surmount it.

The immediate cadre of conservation crises is no longer waiting in the wings but is hammering it up on center stage. We see the tide rising in the Department of the Interior because we often use wildlife populations as our "environmental barometer" if you will.

The basic needs of wildlife are essentially the same as those of man. Most species of wildlife are products of a clean, fertile, and productive environment. They must have adequate food, clean water and protection from the elements if they are to survive. So must man. And . . . unspoiled tidal marshes rank in economic productivity above the best prairie croplands, Marsh-rimmed estuaries are vital to the more important commercial marine fishes and to crabs, shrimps, and shellfish. Continued destruction of tidal wetlands threatens a major source of human food and the livelihoods of many people.

The well-being of our fish and wildlife constituency is about as good an index as we can possibly monitor to determine just how we're doing to make sure we continue to share the crust and the waters of the earth with the rest of her creatures.

If we find more species have to go on the endangered list, it is apparent we're losing the battle; if migratory flocks are on the increase, we're moving ahead; if the life cycles of our flora and fauna approach the balance in which they can all thrive, we'll be doing our job. And then . . . we will reach a real threshold of environmental management.

While I'm talking about fish and wildlife, let me tell you about Nat Reed. Nat Reed has just joined the Department as Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks and he is one of the most aggressive, knowledgeable, and dedicated conservationists in America. That's why he's here. He didn't waste any time getting involved either. I know he didn't because I've already been deluged with both screams of protest and shouts of glee with reference to his activities.

Nat, with my approval and insistence, has fearfully begun to reconstitute the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and to bring this dedicated team of professionals back into fighting condition. The Bureau is really the heart and the guts of Interior when it comes

to protecting our fish and wildlife resources from the ravages of civilization.

I believe that Nat Reed, with a revitalized Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife will spearhead a renaissance of environmental thinking and action. Rest assured we'll excite the Bureau in the months to come to meet the tremendous challenge we face.

The Bureau's river basin section is principally responsible for reviewing all dredge and fill applications, all Public Works projects, including those of the Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, Bureau of Reclamation, all power plant sites and any other activities which impact fish and wildlife habitat. This includes all Atomic Energy Commission and Federal Power Commission licenses and permits.

Five weeks ago, I gave approval to immediately add an additional 150 permanent employees to the over-committed Bureau staff. Most of these additional people have been assigned to river basin studies. This, in itself, is an important first step because it is really in this arena that the effort to protect our wildlife resources will be won or lost.

Much of the destruction of our fish and wildlife resources in the past has occurred because we have not had professionals on the site to tell us what the consequences of a particular action might be. We intend by the end of 1972 to substantially increase the Bureau capability in this key area. This will greatly improve our ability to review and comment on all projects affecting the cherished wildlife resources that you and I are working to protect.

The predator control program managed by the Division of Wildlife Services has been under continuing fire for many months. As most of you know, in 1965, Secretary Udall established a review committee to examine this problem in depth. In fact, Tom Kimball was a member of that committee and made significant contributions to their final report, known as the Leopold Report.

Many of the recommendations contained in that report have since been implemented and we have seen a vast improvement in the operation of this program. As you know, however, there is room for further improvement.

Well before the Jackson Canyon eagle kill last month, I agreed to cooperate with the Council on Environmental Quality to initiate a complete review of predator control activities to identify problem areas and seek their resolution. This study team will be composed of seven non-governmental professionals recognized for their expertise in the wildlife field. Unless the New York Times or the Washington Post have had access to them, I shall announce them for the first time tonight.

The Chairman is Dr. Stanley Cain from the University of Michigan. Joining him for this important mission will be: Dr. Fred Wagner of Utah State University; Dr. John Kadlec from the University of Michigan; Dr. Richard Cooley of the University of California at Santa Cruz; Dr. Maurice Hornecker from the University of Idaho; Dr. Durwood Allen of Purdue University and Dr. A. Starker Leopold of the University of California, Berkeley.

Let me add that I absolutely guarantee that the findings of these experts will be given a full hearing and review by wool growers and cattlemen, as well as wildlife interests. The study already has received funding from Interior and the Council on Environmental Quality, and I personally pledge that performance will follow program so that our imperiled predators will not perish in a sea of platitudes.

The Task Force has been charged with the responsibility of examining all aspects of the issue, including poisoning carried on by the private sector and state and local gov-

ernment as well. They have been instructed to examine with care the economics of national insurance programs as a possible alternate to predator control and to recommend any changes which may be needed in our present administration of this program.

The problems of predator control and its impact upon wildlife species calls to mind another serious concern of the Department—the problem of providing for and protecting non-game species of wildlife. We in the Department are becoming increasingly aware of the alterations occurring in non-game populations as a result of man's impact on the natural landscape. America's wildlife management efforts have traditionally been directed towards species of sports value. A rather startling confirmation of this fact is found in the 1969 funding figures aimed at wildlife research, management, and habitat protection.

The total funding from all sources—federal, state, and private—was about \$142 million. Only \$6 million of that was clearly related to non-game species. Trends indicate that the non-consumptive enjoyment of wildlife species will soon exceed consumptive uses.

The Department intends, in the coming months, to examine this situation closely and determine where added emphasis can be given to protect these non-game species as they too are a viable part of our life support system.

I would like to share with you some news of another accelerated program which we have underway at the present time. I have ordered the National Park Service and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife to double their efforts to prepare wilderness proposals covering lands in the National Parks and the National Wildlife Refuge systems. Our society is going to need wilderness in the near future more than ever before. The Park Service, which came up with all of five recommendations in a period between the passage of the Wilderness Act in 1964 and the beginning of fiscal year 1971, completed 10 studies in FY 71, 9 of which have gone to the Congress. The Park Service expects to complete 20 additional studies in Fiscal Year 1972.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has already had 29 areas of refuge lands designated wilderness areas. Seven proposed refuge areas, totaling 340,000 acres are now before Congress, sent over by the President in April. Two other refuge areas are in the process of being submitted and the Bureau expects to complete the report on 9 additional areas by this fall, making a total for this year of 23 proposals covering almost five million acres.

Wilderness is not just for man. We share the earth with millions of life forms. Some endangered species like the condor and the timber wolf depend on wilderness for their continued existence. They were here before we were. Is their claim less than ours?

In the wilderness, in the estuary, on the prairie and the desert . . . we will win this battle. I stand in confidence before you tonight. In the past, nearly all systems in which human beings have been involved have managed to keep the results of idiosyncrasy and brilliance in balance, albeit a precarious one. The choice . . . the mandate for our time seems relatively clear. Maintaining the balance is the sustenance of life for ourselves and the promise of a future for our children.

The role of the Department of the Interior in maintaining that balance is a formidable one. I pledge to you that we will plan that role as deftly as possible, with vigor and intelligence, steadfastly and cautiously, and we will succeed.

NEW YOUTHFUL VOTERS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "The New Youthful Voters" appeared in the July 8, 1971, issue of the Columbia Record newspaper in Columbia, S.C.

This editorial raised some interesting questions, but, more important, answered some questions in reference to the impact of the extension of the vote in Federal elections to 18-year-olds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE NEW YOUTHFUL VOTERS

Ratification of the 26th amendment to grant the vote in all elections to 18-year-olds was the fourth change to enlarge the electorate since the United States Constitution was adopted in 1789.

The 15th amendment gave the vote to Negro citizens; the 19th to women; and the 23rd permitted balloting for President in the District of Columbia.

It is estimated that 11 million young Americans between 18 and 21 would be eligible to vote under the new age limit. An estimated 178,000 South Carolinians are in the new voting age bracket, 15,000 of them in Richland County. The state has 900,000 registered voters; the county, 60,000.

Officials estimate that about half of the young group will register, following the pattern set by their elders. So far, only about 15 per cent have put their names on the books, which is about average for other states.

If projections hold true, Richland County will have a registration of 67,500 persons, 7,500 of them 18 to 21 years old.

The question is what effect the newcomers will have on elections.

Samuel Lubell, nationwide pollster who has personally made samplings in Columbia, believes that young people generally follow the political thinking of their parents.

"Where breaks from parental loyalty occur," he wrote, "the most important reason is a changed sense of economic interest."

William Chapman also points out that young people are "much more likely than older people to swing sharply in their voting habits in a time of crisis, when there are clear alternatives."

During the Depression years of the 30s, new voters in their twenties led the swift, unexpected movement into the Democratic Party. Where registrations are by party, Democrats are running ahead by 2 to 1 among the 18-21-year-olds.

But will the new registrants exercise their right to vote? Richard M. Scammon and Ben J. Wattenberg say in their book, *The Real Majority*, that "few groups are as electorally weak as are young people."

They are a mobile generation in a political system that rewards permanent and prolonged residence. Politicians prefer safe and predictable constituencies, but the unknowns of the new voting group have them worried. Although the 18-21 registrants will comprise less than 10 per cent of the total, their generation gap could be decisive in close races.

The 1972 national elections provide the incentive for a rapid increase in teenage qualifications for voting. The impact of the 18-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

25973

21 voters will begin to reveal itself in state and local elections the remainder of this year and in early 1972, but the full effect will not be evident until November of next year.

In the meantime, office aspirants are haunted by the memories of youthful activity that upset the status quo in 1968.

AUTO EXCISE TAX REPEAL URGED

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, July 15, the entire 19-member Michigan congressional delegation joined in sponsoring legislation calling for the immediate repeal of the 7-percent Federal excise tax on passenger automobiles. At the same time a companion bill was introduced in the other body by Senators ROBERT P. GRIFFIN and PHILIP A. HART.

There are many reasons which argue strongly for this action—simple tax justice to rid the books of a long acknowledged discriminatory levy, the need to stimulate the economy, the need to discourage inflationary pressures by helping to hold down new car costs for the consumer, and many others. The Detroit News in an editorial appearing on July 16, 1971, has responded to this united action, H.R. 9816, with a persuasive argument in its favor which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

AUTO EXCISE TAX REPEAL URGED: TO SPUR RECOVERY

Senator Robert P. Griffin's bill to repeal the 7 percent excise tax on new automobiles no doubt was proposed to serve his own reelection campaign as well as to stimulate auto sales. But no matter. A strong case can be made for the action in which Griffin has the backing of Senator Hart and the entire Michigan House delegation.

In the first place, repeal can be advocated on the grounds it will stimulate the entire economy which is recovering at a slower rate than anticipated by the Nixon administration. One out of every six businesses in the United States is directly concerned with the manufacture, distribution, servicing and use of motor vehicles. So a spurt in sales by the auto manufacturing industry could trigger speedier recovery on a much broader scale.

But repeal also can be recommended on the basis of simple equity. The excise tax on new cars originally was imposed before World War II as a temporary measure but has been continued ever since. During the Korean war it was boosted to the 10 percent rate to cut sales and save scarce materials. So now the opposite move, complete elimination, can logically be advocated to boost sales and spur the economy. That move can be further supported on grounds that excise taxes placed on other manufactured goods in the past now have been repealed.

There is an additional argument for repeal. Government and consumer pressure has forced the auto industry to spend additional millions on safety and pollution control devices in recent years. These new costs have forced auto prices upward. Now the government could provide an offset against such costs by the removal of the auto excise tax.

Actually, Congress has been sympathetic to reduction and eventual removal of the auto excise tax but every time the tax has dropped—as in 1968 when it temporarily dipped to 2 percent—some new crisis in gov-

ernment financing has required the higher rate to be reimposed. Under the old law, in fact, the tax was supposed to have dipped to 5 percent as of Jan. 1, 1971, but Congress acted at the last moment to keep it at the 7 percent level. The law still provides for a gradual reduction and final elimination on Jan. 1, 1982.

So even though the tax brings in \$2 billion a year, the merits of repeal strongly outweigh the arguments for continuance. The UAW which on past occasions has supported an excise tax cut ought to get behind the move. The long-sought repeal is a proposal whose time finally may have come.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1971

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, violations of human rights of the Jews in Russia and the blacks in Rhodesia and South Africa are frequently brought to the attention of the American public by the communications media and to the members of the United Nations by Mrs. Rita E. Hauser, U.S. Representative on the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. Yet, it is a rare occasion for mention to be made of any of the many human rights violations, some of an atrocious and inhuman nature, inflicted upon the Christians of the captive nations.

Whenever collectivists want to "liberate" another African country from the humane and orderly rule of one of the established Christian nations of Europe, popular support gushes from the news media and the United Nations to amplify the rhetorical slogan of "the right of self determination." But what about the many peoples behind the Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain who have consistently been denied free elections under the tyrannical rule and domination of international communism? These people are ignored almost as nonexistent so far as the fourth estate and the United Nations are concerned.

Over my several years in Congress, I have introduced and reintroduced resolutions to make it the sense of the Congress that the matter of human rights violations be placed on the agenda of the United Nations.

I have written letters to our Ambassador at the United Nations with extensive documentation of numerous instances of human rights violations against the people of the enslaved countries asking that these matters be brought to world attention so that justice might be rendered to those mistreated as well as to those responsible for perpetrating the injustice. Like the plaintive appeals of the captive nations peoples, my efforts received little attention.

I did receive a reply recently to my last letter to the U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations. Ambassador Bush sent me a number of statements by Mrs. Rita E. Hauser, U.S. Representative to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. Her statements were replete with such cliches as the following:

My delegation is most grateful to the dis-

tinguished delegate of the Soviet Union for his reference to publish studies by outstanding American commissions and groups as to the state of racial and religious discrimination in my country.

The Allied forces liberating Europe uncovered unbelievable horrors in the German concentration camps. Significantly, the Nazi excesses were not solely a wartime phenomenon. They commenced years before the war, and should have been a warning to the neighbors of Nazi Germany as to what was in store for them.

Now the Commission devotes a major part of its attention to discussions of particular situations involving human rights violations. To meet the new emphasis the Commission has attempted to use modified or new devices. For example, in dealing with South African questions the Commission has adopted the technique of a special rapporteur to draw up detailed reports drawn from a wide variety of sources as to conditions in that area. In addition, the Commission has established special investigatory bodies of experts which have been given the mandate to travel to the actual scene of alleged violations, to hear witnesses and to gather information on the spot to the extent that they can gain access to the areas under scrutiny. This device has been used not only in southern Africa, but also last year with regard to alleged human rights violations in the Israeli occupied territories of the Middle East.

Obviously, the single most egregious denial of human rights on a broad scale results from the practice of apartheid in Southern Africa. This practice denies to a racial group, the majority, its most basic rights of participation in the life of the nation and relegates it to an existence deprived of any content of humanity, as understood by enlightened people.

The situation in Greece, a NATO friend and ally, presents a classic instance of political repression, including the dismemberment of the Constitutional Court in July when it ruled that various actions of the military government were unlawful.

We have, I believe, learned a significant lesson from the Nazi period. Gross abuses, if unchecked, spread beyond national boundaries in the sense that ultimately the situation poses a serious threat to peace.

Thus, just a few weeks ago, on the initiative of Israel, the United States, the United Kingdom and others, the Soviet Union's discrimination against its very large Jewish community was raised in the General Assembly. The Soviets denied the allegations but, more important, they strenuously invoked Article 2(7) and told the others this was none of their business. Syria and Iraq maintain the same attitude as to world interest in the treatment of their Jewish communities. And South Africa, of course, as well as Rhodesia and Portugal, invoke the same defense, but here the large numbers of Africans and Asian States in the United Nations have not been put off, and various ad hoc investigatory bodies have been established to document the repressive practices of these countries in Africa.

From the above statements, by the U.S. representative one can conclude that Mrs. Hauser seems to have a paranoia over human rights violations of selected subjugated peoples, is critical of political repression in anti-Communist Greece, and is more concerned about Nazis than a Communist threat or the plight of the suffering Christian people of the captive nations.

If the captive nations expect to ever again recapture their human rights they must look elsewhere, rather than to the United Nations.

For over two decades peoples coming

under the tyrannical subjugation of totalitarian dictators have looked to the United States, as the leader of the free nations, for relief.

In July 1959, Public Law 86-90 was passed, authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to designate the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week." Enslaved peoples were given hope by this statement in Public Law 86-90:

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties...

The dedication of America to the proposition that the nations of this world cannot coexist part slave and part free was expressed in another portion of Public Law 86-90:

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples...

The soft-on-communism pronouncements and actions of the present administration with regard to Communist leaders and nations must be most distressing and frustrating to the captive nations' people. At one time they at least had promises—something to hope for.

But all is not lost. Millions of people the world over will never surrender—never give up—the hope of freedom for captive peoples. And who can live without hope.

I insert at this point in my remarks the text of Public Law 86-90, the text of the President's Captive Nations Week Proclamation for 1971 and a "Captive Nations Week Manifesto 1971" of the American Friends of the Captive Nations and the Assembly of Captive European Nations:

PUBLIC LAW 86-90: PROVIDING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE THIRD WEEK OF JULY AS "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK"; ADOPTED BY THE 86TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN JULY 1959

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the President is authorized and requested to issue a Proclamation designating the third week of July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1971: PROCLAMATION 4065—JULY 9, 1971

(By the President of the United States of America; a proclamation)

From its beginnings as a nation, the United States has maintained a commitment to the principles of national independence and human liberty. In keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose of our people to encourage the constructive changes which lead to the growth of human freedom. We understand and sympathize with the efforts of oppressed peoples everywhere to realize this inalienable right.

By a joint resolution approved on July 17, 1959, the Eighty-Sixth Congress authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week.

Now, Therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1971 as Captive Nations Week. I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-sixth.

RICHARD NIXON.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:22 a.m., July 12, 1971]

(NOTE.—The proclamation was released at San Clemente, Calif.)

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO 1971

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year is designated as Captive Nations Week.

The observance of this year's Captive Nations Week comes just seven months after the start of a chain of momentous events in Poland. In December, 1970, Polish workers took to the streets of many of Poland's cities—in open protest against the Gomulka regime's edict that had placed an intolerable burden on their already low standard of living. The toll of these food riots, according to the regime's figures, was 45 dead and 1,165 wounded.

The upheavals led to Gomulka's downfall, and, when fresh work stoppages broke out in January and February of this year, the new regime of Edward Gierk rescinded the December price-increase directive. A shakeup in Poland's Communist Party, which had come in the wake of the December developments, indicates that the last word on the changes in Poland has yet to come.

The Polish events have again brought into sharp focus the inability of communism to satisfy the spiritual and material needs and demands of the people.

Communist regimes, backed by Soviet military power, have ruled over the countries of East and Central Europe for over two decades. The balance sheet of their tenure in power offers undeniable grounds for an indictment for tyranny, insensitivity and incompetence. In East and Central Europe, the Communists have systematically trampled upon human rights, have brooked no opposition and have established themselves as the sole font of wisdom and power.

Yet, political repression notwithstanding, the Communist regimes have been unable to "compensate" for their use of harsh tactics and methods by providing the people a decent standard of living. In divided Europe, the gap in the quality of life between its western and eastern parts has been widening with each passing year. The Communists have thus given the people of East and Central Europe the short end of the stick in both key sectors: in politics and personal life, the watchword is oppression and denial of inalienable rights; in the standard of living, the increase has been negligible—especially compared to the gains registered by other nations over the corresponding period.

The developments in Poland are but the latest in a series of dramatic proofs of popular discontent against Communist rule. Over the past 15 years, we have witnessed the Poznan riots and Polish October in 1956, the tragic but heroic Hungarian Revolution, also in 1956, and the "Czechoslovak Spring" in 1968. There have been other, less publicized demonstrations of true popular sentiment in all the captive countries.

The message is clear. The people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania oppose Communist tyranny. Their aspirations and objectives are the same as those of all freedom-loving people in the world; the right to chart their own future; national sovereignty and self-determination; respect for and observance of their fundamental human rights; and a chance to rejoin, as free and equal partners, the family of nations.

We believe that a lasting peace in Europe, and the world, can come only after the captive nations have regained their freedom and national independence. As long as there are men and nations in bondage, the quest for a genuine relaxation of tensions is bound to prove fruitless. A world half slave, half free remains a breeding ground for endless conflict. A community of free nations, on the other hand, is the best guarantee for the

advent of true international comity, closer cooperation, and a just peace.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during or after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania.

We further stress that the Communist regimes in East and Central Europe continue to flaunt the will of the people by denying them the right to free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, their support of the right to self-determination for all peoples help captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations.

2. To raise, at international meetings and conferences, the issue of the denial of fundamental human rights to the peoples of East and Central Europe.

3. To reject any and all attempts by the USSR and the other Communist regimes to secure even a tacit recognition of the *status quo* in East and Central Europe, since such recognition would deal a staggering blow to the hopes of the captive peoples of regaining their freedom and independence.

4. To voice their opposition, on all appropriate occasions, to the methods of force and threats and intimidation used by the Communist regimes in their effort to continue holding East and Central Europe in bondage.

We appeal to the people of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 18-24, their awareness of the importance of the fate of 100 million East and Central Europeans to mankind's long quest for world peace and justice.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,

Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

VASIL GERMENJI,

Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

LET US SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the President's announcement that he would visit China next year signifies what has been accurately described as the most important diplomatic move since World War II.

I have long said there is no real, deep-seated, basic reason why the people of the United States and China should be enemies. On the other hand, there are reasons dating back centuries why there should be enmity between Russia and China.

The following editorial appeared on the front page of the Indianapolis, Ind., Star for Sunday, July 18. Written by Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis News, Phoenix, Ariz., Gazette and Republic, I believe it clearly reflects what the vast majority of Americans think and feel over the President's move:

LET US SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

Americans in all walks of life long have been appealing for an end to United States participation in the Vietnamese conflict.

Now President Nixon by the most important diplomatic move since World War II has found a way to this goal and perhaps others.

His acceptance of Chinese Premier Chou En-lai's invitation to visit mainland China not only expedites negotiations for peace in Asia but will restore the United States to its traditional position of world leadership.

Diplomats everywhere have been busy since President Nixon's announcement of Thursday night, examining everything he said and much that he left unsaid. No one will more meticulously study his brief message than the Kremlin leaders. They realize fully what a U.S.-China accommodation could do to Soviet influence in Asia and, especially, in disputed Mongolia. It would give China recognition as a sovereign country free of domination by Russia.

There has been criticism already that a Nixon visit to Red China would indicate support of Communism. Much of this comes from the same people who earlier were appealing both within and outside Congress for looser relations with the Soviet Union, which we believe represents the greater menace to the United States and world peace.

A trip over the Pacific into China offers no guaranteed panacea for the solution of our problem in Asia, but it involves such greater possibilities that it is well worth the calculated risks involved.

Majority opinion supports with Mr. Nixon the thesis that there can be no stable and enduring peace in the world today without the participation of Red China. The President's visit could start the necessary processes to achieve this.

Mr. Nixon's venture could pay off handsomely for our country, but only if he goes to Peking with the complete backing of his government and his people. It is time to lay aside petty politics by all parties to supply this help he needs. Yacking by politically ambitious nitpickers should no longer be heard in this land.

Mr. Nixon's proposal was well conceived and expertly handled despite the anguished cries already heard from those both inside and outside of Congress who were denied participation in the secret diplomacy which made it possible.

There can be no better Godspeed for President Nixon on his flight to China than the united support of the American people.

Let's give it to him.

YAF PROTESTS PRESIDENT'S VISIT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement by the President that he is going on a visit to anoint the Communist Party of China with the mantle of legitimacy which they have so long sought, comes as a blow to all those who recognize the implication of such a move to our system of alliances.

As the President himself said in his State of the world message delivered less than 6 months ago:

Abrupt shifts in our policies—no matter how sound in concept—are unsettling, particularly for those who may have committed themselves to past practices at United States urging.

Needless to say, an abrupt shift in a long-standing policy which is absolutely unsound, a shift derived from distorted ideas of "polycentrism" in the Communist world and buttressed by a whimsical

notions that peace can be bought rather than earned, can be a great deal more than "unsettling." For our allies who might have been counting on a consistent commitment to freedom on the part of the United States, a consistency on which their very survival depends, this move is shattering.

What are the feelings of the small nations in the shadow of the Red Goliath as they see the spirit of Neville Chamberlain whisking through the corridors of the White House? The folly of appeasement past has been written across both Europe and Asia in the blood of millions. The hope for peace through conciliation with histories' bloodiest tyrants can be nothing but a soothing myth, a cloud of rhetoric hiding the advance of the massed battalions of the dictators.

The words of Winston Churchill after Munich hold today. To the spirit of appeasement he held up the spirit which preserves free men. Foreseeing the results of Munich Churchill said:

And do not suppose that this is the end. This is only the beginning of the reckoning. This is only the first sip, the first foretaste of a bitter cup which will be preferred to us year by year unless, by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigor, we arise again and take our stand for freedom as in the olden time.

The comment on the President's move all seems favorable. Those who would at other times, and with other Presidents, steadfastly have opposed the embrace of Mao Tse-tung seem to find hope in the confidence of the President, giving small thought to the content of the act. At least one group, however, recognizes that the Peking visit is a knife in the back to our anti-Communist allies—most specifically to the Republic of China. This group, comprised of student members of Young Americans for Freedom—the Nation's largest conservative youth organization—reacted quickly and decisively to the President's statement. Two hours after the announcement, 24 YAF members from all over the country had gathered at the Embassy of the Republic of China to maintain a round-the-clock vigil in support of the legitimate government of the Chinese people. They stayed there until Monday morning when they had to return to classes.

I visited with the members of this group at their vigil. These YAF'ers were fully and intelligently aware of the awful significance of the President's announcement.

Furthermore, and even more importantly, they were not afraid to stand up and disagree with our governmental policy—even when many of those leaders to whom they looked for guidance were precipitously caving in. The example of principled forthrightness exhibited by these young people should serve as an example for us all.

The news media, true to form, has largely ignored the efforts of this stalwart group. It is my hope that this statement of mine will serve to call some attention to the insight and determination of these young opponents of appeasement of the Communists. There are a great many young Americans who would prefer a generation of less than total peace to a generation of total slavery.

FASTER AID TO ACCIDENT AND HEART VICTIMS SOUGHT

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills designed to improve emergency medical services across the Nation and to arouse attention to the problems hindering progress in this field.

It is estimated by the Public Health Service's Division of Emergency Health Services, that about 60,000 of the persons killed each year in accidents, highway and industrial, and those dying from other medical emergencies, such as heart attacks, could be saved, if the Nation had a truly effective and top quality system of emergency medical services to transport patients to hospital emergency rooms and to provide, that, once there, they received the best and most rapid care available.

Of the 450,000 to 475,000 heart attack victims last year, 275,000 died en route to a hospital, but an estimated 35,000 of them could have been saved by prompt ambulance service with qualified paramedical personnel aboard using life-support systems, now technologically and commercially available, and recommended by the Department of Transportation and medical authorities.

Of the 55,000 traffic accident victims last year, 40,000 to 43,000 died en route to a hospital—and over half of them within the first critical hour after injury—but, with prompt and professional ambulance service, an estimated 12,000 could be saved.

The situation is even worse in our rural areas, for 70 percent of all the traffic accidents occur in rural areas and towns with populations less than 2,500.

We have all heard of traffic victims bleeding to death along our highways waiting for an ambulance that never comes, or comes too late; but what few realize is that it might be better if some so-called ambulances never come at all, for, in most States, a station wagon with an army cot in the back, driven by a garage mechanic, is called an ambulance.

Expert consultants returning from combat in South Vietnam have publicly asserted that, if seriously wounded, their chances for survival would be better in the zone of combat than on the average city street or highway here in this country. Probably no American city, except Baltimore and Jacksonville, Fla., can lay claim to maintenance of a model of first aid, coordination, communications, and transportation under an emergency medical service comparable to that of the armed services.

In an article in the Journal of American Medical Association in 1967, entitled, "Control of Accidents in Rural Areas," J. A. Waller found that mortality from motor vehicle accidents was higher in rural and mountainous counties in California than urban counties. He also found that chances for survival following injury of comparable severity were less than in urban areas. He blamed poorly equipped and inadequately staffed

ambulances; untrained attendants; insufficient surveillance for detection of accidents; the distance from the scene of the accident to the nearest hospital; and inadequate hospital emergency rooms for contributing to the higher rate of mortality.

Nor is the problem confined to rural areas. We in Washington were made aware of the problem here when Radio Station WWDC began a series of editorials based upon investigations of ambulance services.

General Manager William S. Sanders on April 8, 1969, said:

The Washington area, city and suburb alike, is in the midst of a snowballing ambulance crisis. Ambulances are making taxi runs, carrying sick people to hospitals, while emergency cases lie bleeding on the streets because there are not enough ambulances.

At the same time, hospital emergency rooms are glutted. Emergency cases wait in the hall because the crush of non-emergency cases keep overworked personnel tied up.

The present crisis in emergency medical services, in which we see public-spirited volunteers and other groups trying to provide service after the last funeral home in the area goes out of the business, can be traced to public apathy and inaction on all levels of government.

A few years ago, morticians operated about 50 percent of the estimated 25,000 so-called ambulances in this country, but today, they say, they are being forced out of the business by the Federal minimum wage law and the threat that someday new Federal regulations will be adopted.

Ambulance service is developing haphazardly in this country, but it is essential if we are to have professional emergency medical services that there be as much coordination as possible of existing resources so that we avoid the case of two or three ambulances racing to the same accident where there are no injuries, while no ambulance is available to rescue the victim of another crash. Services should also be linked with police and hospitals through two-way radio to insure that accidents are detected quickly, an ambulance dispatched, and the hospital emergency room notified of the nature of the injuries so its staff can lose no time in saving the life of the victim.

To fill the vacuum created by the passing of funeral directors from the ambulance service picture, other types of ambulance services have developed in various localities. These include volunteer corps, commercial operators, fire or police department services, and services connected with and administered by hospitals.

One or more deficiencies appear in each of these services. Vehicles are often unsatisfactory; personnel are often poorly trained; life-support equipment is lacking; and central dispatching is rare.

LEGISLATION AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES

It was with the recognition of the need to improve emergency medical services, that the Highway Safety Act of 1966 was approved by the Congress with provisions of aid to States in implementing such programs. All States were to meet regulations later set by the Secretary of Transportation in providing an emergency medical services program estab-

lishing licensing of ambulances and personnel, and other criteria, to insure top quality service.

One of my bills, to amend that act, would write into the law that a State must have this program within a year after passage of the bill. By actually writing this provision into the law, it is hoped it will be a much stronger incentive for States to assume a greater role in this area, rather than the current regulations of the Department. The Department of Transportation has provided fine leadership in this area, but only so much can be done without State and community cooperation. It is in the best interest of the Department that it be given a stronger tool to encourage State participation, because the Department has leaned over backward, due to political pressures from the States, to avoid using the threat of cutoff of funds to a State which lacks an acceptable emergency medical program.

In March the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration released a survey of how States are complying with standards established by the Department of Transportation in accordance with the Highway Safety Act of 1966. The survey showed that no State is currently fully implementing the requirements of the standards in the area of emergency medical services.

Secretary John A. Volpe stated, "Ideally, all States should be fully implementing the highway safety standards," and it was warned that failure to implement an approved program could result in the loss of Federal funds available for grants to the States and local communities, as well as the loss of 10 percent of the State's Federal-aid highway construction funds.

The following shows how the States rated in compliance with the emergency medical services standards. "B" means the State's program, when implemented, will conform substantially to the requirements; "C" means the State's program, when implemented, will demonstrate acceptable progress:

Alabama, B.	Montana, B.
Alaska, B.	Nebraska, B.
Arizona, C.	Nevada, C.
Arkansas, C.	New Hampshire, B.
California, C.	New Jersey, B.
Colorado, C.	New Mexico, B.
Connecticut, C.	New York, B.
Delaware, B.	North Carolina, C.
Florida, C.	North Dakota, B.
Georgia, B.	Ohio, B.
Hawaii, C.	Oklahoma, C.
Idaho, C.	Oregon, B.
Illinois, C.	Pennsylvania, B.
Indiana, C.	Rhode Island, B.
Iowa, C.	South Carolina, B.
Kansas, B.	South Dakota, C.
Kentucky, C.	Tennessee, C.
Louisiana, B.	Texas, C.
Maine, B.	Utah, B.
Maryland, B.	Vermont, B.
Massachusetts, C.	Virginia, B.
Michigan, B.	Washington, B.
Minnesota, B.	West Virginia, B.
Mississippi, C.	Wisconsin, C.
Missouri, B.	Wyoming, B.

It is hoped that the Transportation Department does indeed enforce this provision. By approving this legislation we in the Congress will say that it must

be done and will give the Department a stronger tool to use.

It may be argued, that if this legislation were passed, the ambulance crisis would be worsened, because we would take off the highways those so-called ambulances which are performing the majority of services across the Nation.

I answer, first, that would be for the best; and, second the situation is already so critical that the Transportation Department must take action to get the States involved in such programs. Each year of delay only worsens the crisis.

The second part of my amendment of the Highway Safety Act would encourage States to move as rapidly as possible, by giving special aid to programs in those areas where there is determined by the Secretary of Transportation to exist an acute problem in providing emergency medical services.

It also recognizes the fact that rural and less populated regions have been neglected under the current apportionment formula in which States receive Federal aid based on their population and road mileage. Seventy percent of all traffic accident fatalities occur in such areas and the chance of survival is less in those areas than in urban areas. One can die more quickly along a highway in our large Western States, hundreds of miles from the nearest hospital or ambulance, than he can on the interstates in our urban States in the Northeast, but fewer dollars have been used in the Western States or other rural States to solve these problems.

The following table from the Transportation Department shows how much has been spent by the Federal Government for ambulance programs:

State	Fiscal 1971	Total
Alabama	\$56,964	\$239,510
Alaska	46,815	138,713
Arizona	28,242	329,509
Arkansas	82,013	344,491
California	550,000	775,480
Colorado	58,002	253,895
Connecticut	18,950	34,763
Delaware	-659	144,114
Florida	4,712	1,363,116
Georgia	-9,630	468,487
Hawaii	10,000	22,227
Idaho	28,230	87,265
Illinois	-72,343	374,347
Indiana	169,087	523,080
Iowa	38,500	234,000
Kansas	219,329	555,424
Kentucky	133,690	260,862
Louisiana		81,530
Maine	74,150	142,330
Maryland	91,304	365,928
Massachusetts	313,207	506,204
Michigan	105,353	312,440
Minnesota	97,712	665,030
Mississippi	8,684	304,612
Missouri	122,801	659,657
Montana	20,225	121,363
Nebraska	243,540	672,519
Nevada	22,825	98,735
New Hampshire	16,556	96,171
New Jersey	306,020	650,807
New Mexico	34,737	103,363
New York	285,750	1,056,983
North Carolina	223,585	653,807
Ohio	380,000	705,100
Oklahoma	-33	128,106
Oregon	-1,012	347,391
Pennsylvania	-114,069	1,281,199
Rhode Island	7,750	20,000
South Carolina	119,432	460,444
Tennessee	9,138	163,852
Texas	62,000	1,197,640
Utah	2,550	97,170
Vermont	41,863	186,799
Virginia	176,395	607,589
Washington	91,687	177,609

State	Fiscal 1971	Total
West Virginia	\$45,479	\$138,471
Wisconsin	182,181	831,890
Wyoming	49,287	137,809
District of Columbia	74,213	136,963
Total	4,464,769	20,372,014

Note: All figures are as of Mar. 31, 1971.

AMBULANCE ASSISTANCE TO HOSPITALS

My second bill would amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to provide \$50 million over the next 2 fiscal years to assist hospitals in providing emergency medical services.

The relationship of the ambulance service to the hospital can be the key to the success of an ambulance service. Although many hospitals discontinued ambulance services during the last 25 years, there is currently an interest on the part of many to reverse the trend. Logically, the hospital emergency room is the focus of community emergency health services. There is a vital need for closely coordinated efforts between ambulance services and hospital emergency departments.

While the emergency departments of hospitals have improved in the past decade, the quality of medical care for the acutely ill or injured in these departments is at times less than adequate. While the equipment of these departments is usually good, a knowledgeable and skillful medical staff is frequently lacking. Particularly, in hospitals across the country, an unreasonable delay frequently occurs between the arrival of the patient at the emergency department and his examination and treatment by a physician.

Recognizing the need to improve hospital emergency rooms, the Congress passed an amendment to the Public Health Service Act making \$20 million available in grants to hospitals for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, but there have been no appropriations for this vitally needed program.

In a peripheral manner, the amendment also made grants available to hospitals to provide emergency medical transportation.

My bill would set up a new section of aid for emergency medical services, as well as require States to develop and fully implement an acceptable emergency medical care program before such assistance is available.

To have a truly efficient emergency medical care system there must be a working harmony and coordination between the police, which detect an accident, the ambulance service, which transports the patient, and the hospital, which treats the patient. In my opinion, an ambulance service, operated by a hospital, offers the best alternative in achieving a coordinated service.

For other services would stop at the door of the emergency room, but a hospital-run service would enable the flow of information needed to save the life of the patient. With a professional ambulance attendant, the patient's needs could be diagnosed while en route to the hospital or he could relay valuable information to the physician on duty in

the emergency room, thus reducing the time lapse between arrival at the hospital and treatment.

Furthermore, there must be an upgrading of the hospital emergency room, and therefore, we in the Congress should exert all efforts to fund such programs as are now provided by the Public Service Act.

It is hoped that if my amendment becomes law, communities faced with an ambulance crisis would encourage the hospital to provide ambulance service, and that, in turn, the hospital would bring pressure upon the State legislature to enact such legislation as would enable the hospital to gain such funds.

Finally, we have not even begun to apply our available technology. The manned space program has developed medical monitoring equipment, computers can be used in an ambulance dispatch center to give the exact location of all ambulances, and helicopters can rescue persons in remote areas and save valuable time. All of these should be explored, and, hopefully, put into use when we have developed the structure and the programs needed to finance their use.

AN OREGON CELEBRATION

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, All American City Cottage Grove, in Oregon's Fourth Congressional District, each July celebrates its proud history with 4 exciting and thoroughly enjoyable days of parades, races, rodeos, and other special events.

Bohemia Mining Days, the name given to this festival time, recalls the 1858 discovery of gold and mining which flourished until World War I when lumber became the mainstay of the economy.

Today's New York Times carried an interesting account of this year's observance which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

A SMALL OREGON TOWN CELEBRATES BIG DAYS; FESTIVAL IS TYPICAL OF HUNDREDS MORE ACROSS NATION

(By Steven V. Roberts)

COTTAGE GROVE, OREG., July 1.—The long, family style tables were set up in the service shed of the Oregon Pacific and Eastern Railway, and the colorful banners of the local Shriners hid the greasy machinery pushed against the wall. In a makeshift kitchen, a crew of Shriners cooked round, fluffy hot cakes, easy-over eggs, and slabs of country ham.

Yesterday morning a young girl sat at one of the tables, wedged between her boy friend and a retired grocer, and said: "This is it, this is the big thing that happens to the town every year. The rest of the year we sit around and watch people grow."

As she talked, the girl downed the remains of her Buckaroo Breakfast," one of the features of Bohemia Mining Days, an annual event in this town of 6,000 in the lumber country of southern Oregon. For four days every July, Cottage Grove is a whirl of fiddlers' contests and hound dog races, rodeos and parades, carnival rides and penny-toss games.

Bohemia Mining Days is similar to hundreds of festivals put on by small towns across the country every summer, a few special days to relieve the routine of life. Often they celebrate the town's ancestry, as do the "Czech days" in the Midwest, or a local industry, such as the Priest River Loggers Celebration in Idaho.

GOLD DISCOVERED IN 1858

Bohemia Mining Days recalls the history of this region after gold was discovered in 1858. One early prospector, who came from Bohemia in Central Europe, gave the district its name, and mining flourished here until World War I. After that, lumbering gradually took over as the major industry, but in recent years a local group has tried to restore the old mines as a tourist attraction. Thus Mining Days, as do many festivals, also gives a promotional boost to the local economy.

As part of the festivities, people dress up in Western garb. Mel Gans, the retired grocer at the buckaroo breakfast, looked a little uneasy in his cowboy hat, bright orange shirt and levis, but he was clearly enjoying himself.

"I'm a Shriner," said Mr. Gans who is 68 years old, "and we were down here till midnight last night fixing this place up. We had a whole bunch of guys here and we had good fellowship."

In fact, the whole parade had an air of ritual about it, everyone knew exactly what to expect. "Hey, Mom," yelled one youngster, "the parade is coming from that direction this year." Mom's weary reply came. "It always comes from that direction."

COLOR GUARD APPEARS

Right on cue, half an hour later, the American Legion color guard, flags propped conveniently on their ample stomachs appeared down Main Street. Behind them rode Sharon Gibson, Miss Cottage Grove, in an open truck. Sharon, who is 17, won third place in the state high jump contest last year, plays the kettle drums and piano and is a counselor at a Girl Scout day camp. She hopes to be an elementary school teacher, but might try being a model or airline stewardess for a while, "to make myself more well-rounded."

In a town such as Cottage Grove, a parade is a show people put on for their friends. As the Cottage Grove Riding Club pranced into view, a group of girls started shouting, "Hi, Kitty, Hi, Brenda. I see Linda in front. Let's go out so we can yell on her."

Various marchers tossed candy to the crowd, setting off a stampede of children. Squads of girls in pink and purple uniforms twirled batons and tried to uncoil their awkward adolescent legs into a strut. One group, Paula and her Pipsqueaks, had 11 youngsters in descending order of height. The mother of the tiniest Pipsqueak was momentarily upset when she could not find her daughter. Then she noticed the girl had hitched a ride on a passing pony.

As dusk fell, the fiddlers were fiddling at the high school, and the bronc riders were falling at the rodeo grounds. But the center attention was Bohemia City, the fairgrounds where the carnival rides and booths had been set up.

Just the names gave a sense of the network of associations that binds together any town: Trinity Lutheran Church Pie Palace, the Sorpotimist Banana Shack with "Ice-cold chocolate-covered bananas," as the feature, the Girl Scout Bakery.

The most popular feature was the beer garden run by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. Partly it was the heat and partly it was the idea. As one local man put it, "People will go in there and drink beer who would never go into a tavern in their whole lives."

THE TEEN-AGERS ARRIVE

One of the unusual local organizations is the Lemati gang, named after a local In-

dian tribe, a band of young men who dress up in frontier style and stage periodic shootouts for the amusement of the crowd. It is a chance they admit, to act out their fantasies in real life.

"We do this mainly for the kids," said Larry Kareff, a foreman in the city public works department, "but all of us are kids at heart, too."

Teen-aged boys roared up in their brightly painted refugees from the junkyard. Family cars, borrowed for the evening, disgorged groups of giggling girls. The mating dance of watching and be watched was on.

All is not peaceful in Cottage Grove. One booth was run by the "people center," a new organization set up to deal with drug abuse and other problems of local youths.

But drugs are still a minor problem here. In Cottage Grove this weekend, fathers were valiantly trying the break balloons and win teddy bears, courting couples were riding on Ferris wheels and stealing a few squeezes, and the women of the Trinity Lutheran Church, wearing starched white aprons and little caps, served up blackberry pie and talked about their grandchildren.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S FUTURE VISIT TO CHINA AND ITS EFFECT ON THE U.S. NUCLEAR POLICY IN ASIA

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I strongly applaud President's Nixon's decision to accept Premier Chou En-lai's invitation to visit China. For sometime, I have been in favor of new U.S. initiatives to develop communications with this most important nation of 800 million people. While past developments in the area of trade and cultural exchanges have been significant, President Nixon's visit will establish direct and open Government-to-Government communications between the United States and China on a permanent basis. It will be a major step in furthering the "era of negotiations," of which the President has so often spoken.

Much potential good may come out of the President's visit. It may, for one thing, facilitate China's acceptance of a separate and independent Government on Formosa when Peking is admitted to the United Nations. A cooperative attitude on the part of Washington and Peking on this issue is necessary, for if admittance of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations produces division and hostility among the members, the world body will be further weakened. Moreover, China's membership in the United Nations should facilitate more Government-to-Government contact between Washington and Peking through the U.N. forum. President Nixon's visit may improve prospects for such a dialog.

Second, the President's trip may serve to bring China into important international negotiations which are currently going on, particularly in the field of disarmament. It is interesting to note the newspaper speculation that Dr. Kissinger discussed disarmament with Premier Chou En-lai. China's possession of

nuclear weapons makes its participation in disarmament negotiations crucial to their success in halting the arms race.

The President's visit may help to bring China out of its isolation and into a healthy relationship with the rest of Asia. As the President told us in his recent foreign policy report to the Congress, China has legitimate interests in Asia. In addition, China's future attitude is bound to affect the chances for a permanent peace in Vietnam. We can hope that the President's initiatives toward a new relationship with China will result in progress toward peace in Indochina.

Because of the great potential associated with the President's visit, I am even more disturbed by reports associated with Secretary of Defense Laird's visit to Japan. The Secretary seems to have, in a series of ambiguous statements, clumsily confused the Japanese, frightening them and much of the rest of the Far East. The thrust of Secretary Laird's remarks seems to have been that Japan should assume the role of military dominance in the Far East, from which the United States is presently withdrawing and should, perhaps, develop a nuclear capability in doing so.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Secretary Laird is doing a great disservice to the entire world in attempting to invest upon the Japanese the role of Far-East anti-Communist policeman, which he sees slipping from Pentagon hands. Any student of modern Japan understands the future of that great nation does not depend upon military power. Nothing but evil could result from reversing Japan's commitment to a foreign policy of anti-militarism initiated by Emperor Hirohito and General Douglas MacArthur at the end of the Second World War. We should be trying now to limit the number of nuclear powers and control the number of nuclear weapons in the world, rather than encouraging their proliferation. Specifically, we should discourage rather than encourage a nuclear arms race between Japan and China.

Secretary Laird also has indicated that the nuclear weapons stockpiled on Okinawa may be transferred to Taiwan or the Philippines, or to South Korea. I believe that any such policy is foolhardy at best. Our recent policy of nuclear encirclement of mainland China has produced in the Chinese a mixture of fear and hostility toward the United States. If, Mr. Kissinger's recent visit to the People's Republic of China, and the President's impending visit, are to have any meaning at all, the United States must take definite steps now to demonstrate that it is terminating this policy of nuclear intimidation. In addition, I object strenuously to the stockpiling of nuclear weapons in small allied nations in the Far East, regardless of how loyal and how stable they may appear now to be. A radical reaction of rapidly changing events in the Far East could easily create instabilities in these nations that would result in American nuclear arsenals falling into the hands of forces hostile to this nation, or individuals tempted to use them to start a nuclear war.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has followed the policy for many years that it

will neither confirm nor deny the presence of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world. Inasmuch as we have the capability to deliver nuclear weapons within minutes to any spot on the earth from mainland United States, or from our Polaris submarines, I suggest that we announce now that no nuclear weapons are or will be stockpiled anywhere west of the Marianas Islands, and none except on United States controlled territories, or on U.S. ships at sea.

This posture, Mr. Speaker, if taken now by this country, will put some meaning into, and give some credence to the President's statement that he desires to make a "journey of peace," and will give some credence to the hope that the United States is, as a nation, adopting more responsible and mature policies with respect to Asia.

Mr. Speaker, to provide my colleagues with additional information on this very important matter, I include with my remarks an article by Selig S. Harrison printed in the Washington Post of July 14, 1971, headlined "Laird Confuses Japan on A-Arms Issue"; excerpts from an article by Crosby S. Noyes in the Washington Star of July 13, 1971, on the same subject, and an article by Morton H. Halperin in the Washington Post of July 18, 1971, headlined "Why Not Tell Where the Weapons Are?"

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 1971]

LAIRD CONFUSES JAPAN ON A-ARMS ISSUE
(By Selig S. Harrison)

TOKYO, July 13.—Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird's studied ambiguity on the issue of nuclear weapons for Japan during his recent visit here has left behind a trail of confusion, uneasiness and agitated debate concerning his possible motives.

When a Japanese reporter asked how the United States would react if Japan developed tactical nuclear weapons, Laird suggested at his farewell news conference that Japanese defense planners should give "higher priority" to upgrading conventional military capabilities, adding that "President Nixon and our government will continue to provide the nuclear umbrella."

The secretary coupled this response with an assurance that he sees "no role for Japan as far as the nuclear deterrent is concerned during the periods of the 1970s and beyond." But he spoke of the issue casually as one of "priorities" three times in the course of his reply, and the inference drawn by most Japanese observers was that he does not necessarily rule out the future desirability or inevitability of nuclear arms after the conventional buildup now programmed here has been completed in 1980.

What Laird said with cautious indirection in the open forum of a press conference confirmed the worst Japanese fears generated by more direct statements coming out of an earlier background briefing given by U.S. defense planners authorized to discuss the secretary's thinking.

The principal spokesman at this briefing pointed to a series of developments which might lead Japan to deploy defensive nuclear weapons in the early 1980s—possibly "ABMs (antiballistic missiles) on ships," he said, since a country with Japan's population density would be doomed if enemy missiles ever came close to the big population centers.

The most critical development pushing Japan toward the nuclear option, it was suggested, would be a U.S.-Soviet agreement in the strategic arms limitation talks resulting in a reduced U.S. nuclear posture in the Pacific.

Peking is not taking part in the negotiations and would still be free to develop its missile strength unchecked.

This would pose a growing threat to Japan at a time when the intercontinental ballistic missile threat to the United States from Peking would still be "decades" away, and when the United States would feel less directly endangered than ever before by Moscow.

Even if the strategic arms talks did not have a direct impact on the U.S. nuclear presence in the Pacific, the spokesman reasoned, Washington might be increasingly unwilling to bear the costs of maintaining the nuclear deterrent alone. No longer would Japan be an indirect beneficiary of an anti-Soviet strategic posture that the United States maintained basically for its own sake.

CHANGED SETTING

In this changed strategic setting, Tokyo could choose to acknowledge its new position as the immediate beneficiary of the deterrent and actively help the United States to maintain it. Or Japan might begin to worry about U.S. reliability and decide instead to develop its own defensive nuclear weapons as a supplement to the U.S. strategic umbrella.

The point of it all was not so much that the United States should directly encourage Japan to go nuclear, but rather that the Japanese should begin to pay a greater price for U.S. nuclear protection. By implying that the U.S. nuclear shield can no longer be taken for granted and that the United States is not afraid to see Japan go nuclear, Laird apparently hoped to change the bidding in the overall bargaining relationship between the two countries.

Laird astonished the Japanese press and delighted hawkish elements in the military here with an uncompromising refusal to permit a public verification procedure demonstrating the removal of nuclear weapons from Okinawa.

He seemed impatient on finding that the "nuclear allergy" is still dominant here 25 years after Hiroshima but did not let this deter him from asking for free access by nuclear-armed and nuclear-powered U.S. ships, submarines and aircraft as a logical corollary to receiving U.S. nuclear protection.

MOTHER PORT

It is understood that Laird also asked for semipermanent arrangements permitting the 7th Fleet to make Japan a "mother port" as a way for Tokyo to help support the nuclear deterrent and the U.S. naval presence in a more general sense. At present, U.S. vessels, including aircraft carriers with nuclear-capable aircraft, operate out of the huge San Diego, Calif., naval station as home base, using Yokosuka and Sasebo in Japan only for port calls and repairs.

One of the most interesting items on Laird's agenda here was a proposal for the reversal of an earlier decision to return Yokosuka and, more importantly, for the establishment of a major residential complex for the wives and children of naval personnel on Okinawa. This would be a political hot potato for the Japanese government but was urged by Laird as a way to save substantial sums on steaming costs back and forth between San Diego and the western Pacific.

The timing of the controversial nuclear briefing on the day before the scheduled opening of the strategic arms talks has led to a widespread suspicion that the real motive behind the exercise may have been a desire to influence the Helsinki talks by projecting the specter of a nuclear Japan.

Whether or not this is justified, it is clear that the settlement currently proposed by the Soviet Union in Europe could eventually have an impact on the U.S. nuclear posture in the Pacific and thus on Japanese nuclear plans.

BAN SOUGHT

Moscow wants tactical nuclear weapons in western Europe capable of reaching Soviet territory to be banned, along with intercontinental missiles, as one of the preconditions of a strategic arms agreement.

Should the United States ever agree to this, some Japanese and U.S. officials argue, Moscow and Peking could point to this as a precedent for demanding a pullback of U.S. nuclear weapons in the Pacific for a comparable distance from their shores.

This could lead to pressures for the withdrawal of nuclear bombs for use by carrier-based aircraft from storage vessels in the western Pacific, and it could make it all but impossible, politically speaking, for nuclear-armed ships, submarines or aircraft to call at Japanese ports.

In assessing the weight of accident and design in the Laird visit, it is instructive to recall the secretary's long preoccupation with the role of nuclear weapons in the hands of U.S. allies as an essential element in the U.S. strategy. Laird's 1962 book, "America's Strategy Gap," advocated "defensive nuclear weapons with proper controls" for NATO partners, citing approvingly a statement that "military establishments which do not have nuclear weapons are little more than oversized gendarmes."

REFERENCE NOTED

Japanese readers have been quick to note the reference to "proper controls," implying a two-key arrangement, as well as another passage made in the NATO context with a striking applicability to the current Japan-U.S. dialogue initiated by Laird. "The nuclear deterrent in the hands of the allied powers would be a great help to us," Laird wrote, "since it would provide us with a bargaining vehicle for insisting, in turn, that they meet their conventional force requirements."

The alarmed antinuclear forces foresee the Laird visit as renewed proof of collusion between Japanese and American hawks and as a partial vindication of the Chinese propaganda line warning of the revival of Japanese militarism.

"Smoke does not arise when there is no fire whatsoever," said the newspaper Asahi in a comment on the State Department disclaimer issued following the briefing here.

Yomiuri recalled the Defense Agency white paper last October arguing that "small-scale, tactical, purely defense nuclear weapons" would be legally permissible under the U.S.-imposed "no war" constitution.

"These press reports are trial balloons intended for American and Japanese public opinion," Yomiuri observed.

[From the Washington Star, July 13, 1971]

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE BY CROSBY S. NOYES

If the reports from Tokyo are even reasonably accurate, it is clear that Defense Secretary . . . Laird is in sore need of a few lessons in elementary diplomacy.

At a time when the new government of Premier Eisaku Sato is making strenuous public efforts to improve its relations with the U.S., the defense secretary seems to have been prodding the Japanese on their most sensitive political nerve. The results are likely to be quite different from those he intended.

The Japanese are not notably receptive to the idea that they should resume their role as the tigers of the Pacific—particularly the implication that we would welcome them into the nuclear club. A revival of Japanese militarism is no more popular with the Japanese public than it is with Japan's neighbors in Asia.

There were immediate and anguished denials from the State Department and the California White House that there has been a change in American policy so far as Japanese rearmament is concerned. Specifically, it

was denied that any "responsible body of opinion" in the United States or Japan "advocates the possession of nuclear weapons by Japan."

Nevertheless, the reports made it clear enough that somebody, responsible or otherwise, has been suggesting that the Japanese, because of restrictions on American armaments resulting from the SALT talks with Russia, might have to develop a defensive nuclear capability early in the next decade. According to these reports, Laird believes that the Japanese cannot count on the protection of the American nuclear umbrella indefinitely.

It is one thing if Laird has been saying this sort of thing to top officials of the Sato government. It is quite another to spill the whole line to the American press in such a way as to cause the maximum sensation in Japan and other Asian countries. . . .

By pressing on Sato a whole gamut of highly unpopular and politically loaded military propositions, Laird is placing . . . [Sato's] policy of economic rapprochement in jeopardy and putting powerful weapons in the hands of Sato's Socialist opposition. . . .

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1971]

WHY NOT TELL WHERE THE WEAPONS ARE?

(By Morton H. Halperin)

(NOTE.—Halperin is a former Defense Department official who is prohibited by existing security regulations from confirming or denying the presence of nuclear weapons overseas.)

Are there nuclear weapons on Okinawa?

Ask an American reporter and he will say "almost certainly."

Ask any Japanese newspaperman or opposition Diet member and he will give you a flat "yes."

Ask an Okinawan and he is likely to point out to you the specially guarded and distinct "special weapons" facilities that dot the island.

Ask an American official and he will assert that it is the policy of the United States to neither confirm nor deny the presence of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world.

If you press for the reasons for this policy you will be told that the security of the United States would be jeopardized if such information were given out. If you are still not satisfied you will learn that the reasoning that leads to this decision is itself deemed to be classified—at least no American official will discuss it on the record.

As many have long understood and as now most Americans know because of the controversy surrounding the Pentagon papers, information remains classified only until some official decides that it is in the nation's interest or his own to have it revealed. Thus there is one very large exception to this "neither confirm nor deny" rule. The United States has more than 7,000 nuclear weapons in Europe. This information was first reported in a press backgrounder held while then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara was in Europe, and was later confirmed on the record. McNamara, tired of being accused of denuclearizing Europe while in fact presiding over a vast increase in the number of American nuclear weapons stationed on the European continent, finally overruled his security advisers and put out the truth. No one was able to show any harm to the United States—either direct and immediate or otherwise.

Why, then, does the United States persist in this policy? Certainly not, as is sometimes claimed, to keep the Russians or the Chinese guessing. Nuclear weapons are stored in specially designed and guarded facilities easily identifiable not only by satellites but also by more conventional human agents on the ground. Moreover, confirming that there were nuclear weapons in place A would not tell a potential enemy whether there were also nu-

clear weapons in place B; nor could he even be sure that they were in place A. Even a denial that nuclear weapons were stored in a particular country could not be accepted on its face.

The "neither confirm nor deny" policy is not then directed primarily at potential enemies. Rather it is aimed at the publics in allied countries. Many governments are prepared to let the United States store nuclear weapons on their soil or to have ships with nuclear weapons call at their ports provided their people do not find out about it. If American officials would answer the question for one country, there would be tremendous pressure on many allied governments to get an answer and to publish it. Now they can, and some do, say that the United States will not even tell them.

Thus, in order to enable the American government to consort with foreign governments to fool their own people, the American public is denied information of significant importance to American security and to a number of foreign policy questions. The determination of the U.S. government to deny this information has been carried quite far despite determined efforts of an authorized congressional committee. Witnesses testifying in closed session before the Subcommittee on Commitments of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee systematically refused to discuss the question of the location overseas of nuclear weapons. The Subcommittee Chairman, Sen. Stuart Symington, called attention to the problem in the committee report, but he could do no more, given the Executive branch refusal to cooperate.

Symington pointed to the obvious danger that nuclear weapons stored overseas might be overrun and captured by enemy forces. They might also be used without authorization by friendly or even American forces in a grave local situation. Moreover, their presence close to the Soviet or Chinese border—which Symington indicated was the case—might look very provocative to Moscow or Peking.

These considerations must be balanced against the deterrent and war-fighting value of storing nuclear weapons in overseas locations. The deterrent effects seem small if the United States does not tell potential adversaries that the weapons are there, and the effects will be uncertain regardless of what it says. The war-fighting advantage is limited even if one ignores the very great inhibitions on their use. However, the essential point is that the Congress and the public can reach no sensible judgment on these questions since they are not told where the weapons are.

The foreign policy implications for the "neither confirm nor deny" policy can be illustrated by returning to the question of nuclear weapons on Okinawa. One of the key issues in the reversion negotiations was whether reversion would occur with the United States maintaining the right to store nuclear weapons on Okinawa. The United States clearly gave up that right, but suspicious Japanese are asking that their government inspect the withdrawal of whatever is in those special storage areas. This the United States refuses to do because the result of that inspection would be to confirm or deny the presence of nuclear weapons. Thus, needlessly, a suspicion remains to cloud American-Japanese relations.

A controversy has also raged in the American government as to where to move various facilities from Okinawa. Recent press reports suggest that some American officials are urging that the United States store nuclear weapons on Taiwan. Such a move would have profound repercussions on Sino-American relations. It would substantially increase the value to the United States of its bases on Taiwan and make any early withdrawal much less likely. Building up American bases on Taiwan would also increase the leverage which the Nationalists have on American

decision, and it would set back the effort to improve relations with the People's Republic of China.

It is intolerable to have such momentous decisions made without the knowledge and consent of the American people so that citizens in allied nations can be confused. The remedy is clear: the United States should remove nuclear weapons from all countries which are not prepared to have their presence revealed. The President should then provide the Congress and the people with a list of all overseas areas in which nuclear weapons are stored and an explanation of why they are stored there. We could then have a long overdue public debate about whether the United States should store nuclear weapons beyond its borders.

PROF. D. F. FLEMING: THE COLD WAR AND AFTER

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Committee on Foreign Affairs began an examination of the origins and effects of the cold war.

During the hearings, the committee was privileged to hear from Prof. D. F. Fleming, of Vanderbilt University, one of the most eminent authorities on East-West relations during this period of history and the author of "The Cold War and Its Origins."

At present, Professor Fleming serves as professor emeritus of political science at Vanderbilt University. He has also served as adviser of the Atomic Energy Section of the U.S. Department of State, with the School of International Studies at New Delhi, as a radio commentator for the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, for which he also served as director, and as foreign editor of the Nashville Tennessean.

Professor Fleming's testimony entitled "The Cold War and After" is a brief but penetrating survey of Soviet-American relations over the past two decades. I place it in the RECORD at this point and commend it to the attention and consideration of our colleagues:

THE COLD WAR AND AFTER

(Testimony of D. F. Fleming before Subcommittee on Europe, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, June 7, 1971)

Our Cold War with the Soviet Union during the past twenty-five years has been due to two factors, both closely related. Our leaders after World War II were unwilling to accept a Communist state as a great world power and unable to recognize Russia's overwhelming need for firm security in Eastern Europe.

The anti-Communist aversion is basic. The Communist abolition of private profits is the supreme heresy, the unforgivable sin. Its proclamation in Russia in November 1918 led to a desperate civil war, during which all the governing, well-to-do classes were driven into exile, into labor battalions, or killed.

THE WESTERN DEMOCRACIES

The West European democracies did all that their war weary peoples would permit to help the Russian Whites to defeat the Reds. From 1918 to 1920 they first did their utmost for the government of Admiral Kol-

chak in Siberia. The British gave him 79 shiploads of supplies and arms for 100,000 men, but his defeat led to one of the most ghastly mass retreats of all time.

In South Russia, about 500,000 Allied troops tried to aid the attempt of General Denikin to take Moscow. Equipment for 250,000 men was sent, along with all kinds of advisors and instructors, but the result was another terrible retreat in which a quarter of a million people died of typhus and exposure. Then Poland made a major effort to carve out a great empire in Russia, but was defeated and saved only by military aid from the West.

These failures did not prevent the Allies from giving White General Yudenitch's forces equipment, including American gasoline, for a drive up the Baltic coast to Leningrad. The result was another tragic retreat. Simultaneously, too, the Allies were intervening in North Russia, at first to protect large dumps of supplies there from being captured by the Germans, then to fight the Reds. The first motive had also been a factor at Vladivostok in the East, where we had 7,000 troops, along with British, French and Japanese forces. Though our men only guarded property, the other invading forces were anti-Red, a part of the effort to scotch Bolshevism at its birth by invasions from all four sides of the Russian realm.

When it was all over, Russia was devastated throughout her vast expanses. "Millions of poor civilians had died of abuse, exposure and famine, which was soon to claim millions more." Everything was in a far worse state than at the end of Russia's immense effort in World War I, bad as that was. Hatred and degradation filled the land and the upper classes were finished.¹

Worse still, from our standpoint, the great foreign interventions had enabled the Reds to create a big military machine and to form the first totalitarian regime. Without the compulsions of the Western interventions the Soviet regime would probably have evolved more mildly. Furthermore, neither the Soviet leaders or peoples can easily forget the frightful experiences of the time. To them it was a long ordeal of fire and blood, famine and death. To us it was a distant incident, vaguely understood and soon forgotten.

RUSSIA'S ORDEAL IN WORLD WAR I

Just before the Western Interventions, the Russians had suffered the agonies of World War I, as we never did. The Tsarist bureaucracy had mobilized 15,000,000 men, mainly illiterate peasants, for whom there was neither adequate transportation, barracks or arms. Yet these hordes of men pouring into East Prussia had helped the Western Allies to succeed in the first battle of the Marne in France in 1914, and by over-running the Austrians repeatedly they had contributed to the final Allied victory. However, by the summer of 1917 this largest of armies had become "an enormous, exhausted, badly clothed, badly fed, embittered mob of people, united by thirst for peace and general disillusionment."² These memories, too, are deep in the Russian soul.

Yet after seeing Communism develop out of World War I, the United States Senate defeated the heroic efforts of Woodrow Wilson to create a strong League of Nations to keep the peace and we retired into political isolation unrestrained money-making, until World War II engulfed us again and brought Communism to China.³

RUSSIA IN WORLD WAR II

Once more we suffered, but not as the Russians did. Again they mobilized 10,000,000 men, but this time well equipped for battle. They held the Nazi armies, the mightiest ever assembled, deep in Russia, and after nearly three years drove them back behind Berlin and Vienna, both of which the Russians occupied. It was a tremendous victory, but

gained at abysmal costs: 15 cities, 1,700 towns and 70,000 villages largely destroyed; 88,000,000 people subjected to invasion, and 25,000,000 deprived of shelter; 6,000,000 buildings destroyed; 70,000,000 head of livestock carried away; 40,000 hospitals, 84,000 schools, 44,000 theaters and 43,000 libraries, looted and destroyed—along with industrial enterprises, highways, bridges, postal and telegraph stations.

Also, while all this was happening the Anglo-Americans, due to British insistence, delayed until June 1944 the opening of a second front in Europe that would ease the pressure on Russia. To the Russians this was an eternity of more than two years; to us it was justified time to prepare efficiently. In the same period, too, we urgently desired Russia's entry into the war against Japan. Generals MacArthur and Wedemeyer were strongly for it, as were the American people, and it was our main objective at the Yalta Conference, in early 1945, where Stalin agreed to be ready to fight Japan in Manchuria three months after Victory in Europe Day. Events in Europe soon fixed this date as August 8, 1945. At that time the Russians were ready in the Far East, but on August 6 we hastily dropped the first A-bomb on Hiroshima, to save lives it was alleged, as 80,000 people died and an equal number were maimed for life. On August 9 our other A-bomb was used on Nagasaki, with comparable results, and Japan sued for peace the next day, leaving Russian faces red as we announced that the war was over.⁴

These two wartime threads of military-diplomatic history help to explain Russia's determination to hold East Europe and to do everything possible to delay a German revival.

THE RUSSIANS IN EAST EUROPE

Can any American begin to imagine the human suffering involved in Russia's tremendous World War II ordeal? Yet this was the third long trauma from foreign invasion in the lifetime of most Russians. Is it any wonder that Stalin made it clear to Eden in December 1941 that because of these three immense invasions through Eastern Europe "in thirty-five years" he did not intend to let that region fall into hostile hands again?⁵

Would any Soviet leader in his senses have resolved differently? Nevertheless, when East Europe was occupied by the Russians in 1945, in pursuit of the Germans, most Westerners thought that they should go back home and let the East Europeans have their usual anti-Soviet governments, especially in Poland. Only a minority understood that the Soviets could trust only Communist governments to secure the region, with Moscow's aid and under its control.

Even Roosevelt may have thought that he could eventually persuade Stalin to let the Poles manage their own affairs, but both FDR and Secretary of State Hull did have a clear understanding of the immense losses and achievements of the Russians in World War II, and of the urgency of remaining friends with them and organizing the world for peace with their cooperation. At the Moscow Conference in October 1943, Hull found that both Stalin and Molotov assented warmly to his statement that the closest relations and agreement between their two countries were of vast importance.⁶

FDR'S PREMONITIONS

After the Teheran Conference, a month later, Roosevelt also felt that its biggest achievement had been to make clear to Stalin that the U.S. and Britain were not teamed up against Russia. That would be the one thing that would "upset the applecart" after the war; and on his last Christmas Day, in 1944, he talked reflectively of British ability to get other countries to combine in some sort of bloc against the Soviet Union and said soberly: "It's what we've got to expect." Again on March 3, 1945 he said that at Yalta many points had been disputed between

Footnotes at end of article.

Stalin and Churchill, but Stalin, said Roosevelt, "agreed to every single suggestion I made" and he added emphatically: "I am convinced that we are going to get along." On April 12, just before his death, FDR sent a cable to Churchill about recent disputes with Russia concerning the problems of ending the war, saying that "We must be firm, however, and our course thus far is correct."

SUDDEN REVERSAL

A year later, on March 5, 1946, Harry S. Truman sat on a college platform at Fulton, Missouri, to applaud a speech by Winston Churchill, which he had already approved. It portrayed in the most portentous terms the terrible Russian danger which had arisen, the "police governments" of Eastern Europe. To cope with Russia and Communism Churchill pleaded for an alliance of the English-speaking peoples, with joint use of their naval and air bases all over the world. "At this sad and breathless moment" he saw "an iron curtain" from Stettin to Trieste. Nobody knew what Soviet Russia and its international Communist organization intended to do in the future, "or what are the limits of any of their expansion and proselytizing tendencies." Beware, he warned. Time might be short. "The Dark Ages may return, the Stone Age."⁵

All that Roosevelt had so clearly foreseen and feared had come to pass. Eleven days after his death Truman had given Molotov a tongue lashing in the White House, about Poland, using Missouri mule-driver's language, against the advice of his three leading advisers—Stimson, Marshall and Leahy.⁶

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF COLD WAR

Given our aversion to Soviet and Communist control of East Europe, it was natural that NATO should be organized to protect West Europe, to be followed by the Warsaw Pact alliance. The division of Germany and Berlin's anomalous status was also inherent in the situation.

It was soon assumed that both the terribly wounded Russians and Communism were out to take over the world, but it was not inevitable that President Truman should deliver his famous Doctrine, on March 12, 1947, in which he practically forbade all future revolutions, lest they turn Communist, and allied himself and us with all reactionary regimes around the globe. This was blindness on a gigantic scale. For us "to declare that revolution was finished was to kill the American dream. It was to shut us out of the future at a time when a billion and a half people, nurtured in our revolutionary tradition, were determined to move upward into a better life."⁷

Yet upon this doctrinal base we erected alliance structures encircling the globe and built an immense military machine to see to it, after China became Communist in 1949, that no other spot on earth did. South Korea was saved in 1950, at a most of 2,000,000 dead, but saving South Vietnam has proved to be beyond our power. There we have struggled for some fifteen years, using finally our full air power—save only atomic bombs—to blast and burn and poison everything that may be underneath. Several hundreds of thousands of helpless people have been killed and some three million others driven from their homes into penury in the cities. We have used every kind of weapon on the ground and some 50,000 of our troops have died, yet the little yellow men in the jungles have defeated our mammoth military machine, and our own people have become outraged by the huge squandering of our resources until they are forcing the end of the sad struggle that has won us condemnation all over the planet and entailed the neglect of our own dangerous social problems until internal disintegration threatens. This is the penalty for wasting some two hundred billions in Vietnam and for spending a total that approaches a trillion dollars on the

Cold war, plus all the time, attention and effort involved.

Could anyone possibly conjure up a more tragic and absurd end to the Cold War than our adventure in Southeast Asia?

PROGRESS IN RUSSIA AND CHINA

While we have run the Cold War deeply into the ground in Vietnamese jungles, Red China, which we thought we were containing, has emerged as a vast nation, the world's largest, all of whose people are fed, decently clothed and housed.

In the same decades, too, the Soviet Union has developed military power virtually equal to our own, and it has given its great union of peoples good education, excellent health care and full employment.

CAN WE RECOVER?

The successes of the two mammoth Communist states, which we have been endeavoring to "contain," now compel us to engage in long and devoted efforts to have our own falling society; to cope with the immense misery in our huge urban ghettos; to stop the hopeless piling up of our people into the heavens in a few places; to reform our overloaded courts and shocking penal systems; to build hospitals and health care for all; to renovate our sadly neglected schools, including many colleges; to provide better care for our old people; to build really adequate modern mass transportation systems, partly to save us from asphyxiation by the omnipresent automobile; and to save our natural environment from other kinds of pollution.

It may be too late for us to cope with all of these accumulated deficits, and others, but if we are to compete with the two Communist giants we must prove to the world and to ourselves that we too can abolish poverty and provide acceptable lives for all. To do less is to condemn our way of life to a troubled end. It has wonderful advantages, but it must also distribute the essentials for living to everyone.

Fortunately, our Government is now disposed to welcome China into the family of nations and to negotiate a more bearable level of nuclear stalemate with the Soviet Union. These negotiations, said the *Sunday Times* of London, will be "the most momentous in diplomatic history." So they will be. A reconciliation with China and the Soviet Union, or even a *modus vivendi*, should give us time to put our own house in order and to demonstrate to the other peoples that our nation does have a future, that it can survive the Cold War.

In this great endeavor we can succeed, if we have learned that power is a thing of the spirit, that it resides in the minds and hearts of men, not in the means of destruction.

FOOTNOTES

¹ D. F. Fleming, *The Cold War and Its Origins, 1917-1960*, pp. 16-35, especially pp. 30-35.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 11.

³ My books about this period are: *The United States and the League of Nations, 1918-1920*, and *The United States and World Organization, 1920-1933*.

⁴ Fleming, *The Cold War and Its Origins, 1917-1960*, pp. 171, 193-98. Truman greeted the news from Hiroshima as "the greatest thing in history." He had "no qualms" about his use of the A-bomb. (p. 304.)

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

⁶ *The Cold War and Its Origins, 1917-1960*, p. 160.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 162, 213, 215.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 348-49.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 268. Some three months earlier on January 10, 1945, Republican Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg had made a name for himself in a long Senate speech demanding "justice" for Poland, in which he had proposed a treaty with Russia promising to protect her from future invasions if she would let Poland alone (p. 275.)

¹⁰ Fleming, p. 447.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, during the last year I have been privileged to serve as a member of a 24-member task force on early childhood organized by the Education Commission of the States.

After many months of meetings, hearings, and deliberations, the task force issued a report on alternatives for program implementation in the States. This report was intended to serve as a guide to State-level policymakers who are involved in initiating or expanding programs for young children.

Perhaps even more significant than the report itself is the fact that the Education Commission of the States perceived the interest and the need on the part of States in the area of child development. All too often, people point to the relatively small percentage of States which have mandatory kindergarten attendance and conclude that the States have little interest in early childhood programs.

Yet this belies the true situation. Not only have the States shown an active concern over educational programs aimed at their preschool children, but they have also extended this concern to the children's health, nutrition, and overall development into healthy individuals.

If the States are to see their concern for early childhood development translated into meaningful programs for their youngsters, they will have to take an active role in pulling together the many sources of Federal, State, local, and private funding and in-kind resources and organizing these into an effective system for meeting their needs. Legislation now pending before both the House and the Senate can do much to facilitate the States' ability to expand and improve early childhood services. I hope that as the committees take action in the days ahead, they will overlook neither the important role the States are already playing nor their potential for even greater involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point several excerpts from the Education Commission of the States report:

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT: ALTERNATIVES FOR PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION IN THE STATES

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ALTERNATIVES

The states should provide support for developmental programs for children younger than six, the standard first grade entry age. The major thrust of such programs should be (a) strengthening the role of the family as the first and most fundamental influence on child development; (b) the early detection of serious health and education handicaps; and (c) the provision of remedial health and education programs for all preschool children who need special services.

A statewide, publicly supported early education effort should be based on the following minimum objectives:

1. To develop ways to reach the families of

younger children and to strengthen their capacity for parenting.

2. To involve parents in the formal education of their children directly and through the decision-making process.

3. To provide for health, safety and psychological needs of young children.

4. To start the educational process that will contribute to the development of individuals who will be able to solve a variety of problems and are willing to try to solve them.

5. To lay a foundation for improvements that should take place in the early years of schooling to make it more responsive to the needs of children.

An analysis of federal priorities and programs indicates that it will be up to the states to carry the major burden of early childhood programs and to coordinate their efforts with the many ongoing federally supported programs. Indications are that in the near future, federal legislation will require a coordinated state planning mechanism. Coordination of the more than 300 federal programs for young children, administered by 18 agencies, is urgently needed.

Organizational structure at the State level

How early childhood programs are administered at the state level will substantially affect the impact and nature of the state effort. The primary need is for a mechanism to coordinate overlapping federal and state programs.

Whatever agency is assigned or created to assume general responsibility for the administration of state early childhood programs, it should have at least the following functions:

(a) To supervise all state and federal funds for early childhood programs;

(b) To analyze, make recommendations about and coordinate all state and federally funded programs for the development of early childhood personnel;

(c) To develop a master plan for early childhood programs, staff and funding across the state;

(d) To analyze and develop recommendations for state certification efforts related to early childhood personnel;

(e) To develop a system of early diagnosis of children's needs and of parental training and involvement in their children's education;

(f) To make recommendations regarding state standards for private, particularly franchised, early childhood programs;

(g) To serve as an advocate and promoter of programs to meet the needs of all young children in the state and to stimulate the development of postsecondary and inservice training programs for early childhood personnel.

Alternative structures to be considered include:

1. Assignment of general responsibility for early childhood programs to an existing agency already administering programs, such as the state department of education, health or social services. A division of early childhood education should be established within the department and be headed by a professional with sufficient rank and responsibility to be of influence.

2. The establishment of an office of child development as an independent state agency, headed by a commissioner of child development appointed by the governor, to administer all state programs for children younger than six. A special advisory board of heads of public and private agencies concerned with early childhood would be created.

3. The establishment of a state child care coordinating council in the governor's office. Members would represent parents, public agencies and private groups with an interest in children's services. The council would be responsible for state-wide planning, coordination and evaluation.

Alternative State program approaches

The recommendations and alternatives suggested for state action are based upon four assumptions: (1) the state has a responsibility to the total population; (2) the states must develop some equitable basis for the allocation of funds; (3) a state program should take into consideration the possible participation by other agencies in the funding of programs; (4) a state will probably have to phase in the program over a number of years.

The alternatives include:

1. States should consider a comprehensive approach including children younger than three and their parents because, after the initial expense, such a program could be operated at low cost; the ability to make early diagnoses would strengthen all other programs; and some day care services will be required for the age group in any case. Such a program would be developed through demonstration/parent education centers with diagnostic services and day care programs.

2. States should consider programs for three-, four- and five-year-old children which provide training for them and their parents in their homes.

(a) Several programs could be developed which provide limited training for parents to work with their own children, such as a parent/child toy lending library.

(b) Parent-oriented television programming, building on Sesame Street or a similar series, could be used to assist parents to work with their children and maximize existing children's television programs.

(c) Either of the two above approaches could be rendered more effective at relatively little additional cost by adding a home visit by a qualified professional teacher or aide who would work with both parents and children in the home situation.

(d) Special television programs for children, like Sesame Street, could offer important early educational opportunities, although they should not be expected to fill children's needs without supplementary efforts.

3. A combined approach, which provides a classroom experience for children in addition to a home visit program and uses television as an instructional aid, offers the benefits of parent involvement in education at home but also social growth by giving children practice in sharing and working together in a group.

4. States should consider alternative programs for three-, four- and five-year-olds in a classroom situation.

(a) The state might provide aid to children to attend existing private preschool and/or kindergarten programs if no public programs exist.

(b) The state might encourage the expansion of day care programs and provide support for an educational component in them, including special staff training and provisions for parental involvement.

(c) An effective state program could be developed by expanding the existing Head Start effort to more five-, four- and three-year-olds. Special steps should be taken to avoid administrative duplication. It might not be necessary to provide supportive health, dental and nutritional services to all youngsters.

(d) Television programs, like Sesame Street, could be used to supplement educational efforts. One possibility is to build classroom efforts around T.V., bringing children and teachers together to view the program and then expand on it.

(e) It is not recommended that states establish formal classroom preschool programs for all three- and four-year-olds because there is no evidence that all children need a structured group experience if they are receiving some kind of systematic training and

because there are viable, less expensive alternatives.

(f) Where states have already initiated kindergarten programs for five-year-olds, these programs should be retained but revitalized through such efforts as substantial state support; flexible certification laws; minimum instructional standards; special programs for parent involvement; and single sessions.

(g) The states should develop methods to regulate the standards of private kindergartens, particularly those being established in the rapidly expanding franchising effort, but flexibility should be key.

Priorities and methods for implementation

It is assumed that even if a state chooses low cost parent/child programs, limitations of resources and staff will necessitate the establishment of initial priorities. The following alternative priorities are suggested.

1. If a state is able to predict a lack of trained personnel for kindergarten and pre-kindergarten programs, it might adopt as its first priority the development of postsecondary and inservice programs for professional and other positions.

2. A state might focus first on the development of an early diagnosis system—and personnel to administer it—which would determine the need for various alternative programs.

3. The state could consider establishing a limited number of model demonstration centers, but the federal government has developed a number of such centers which should fulfill the need for experimental programs.

4. Another approach would be to serve first the children with the greatest need, particularly those from low-income homes, of ethnic and minority groups and the handicapped.

5. The beginnings of a state program might be developed by state subsidization of an educational component at existing day care and industrially established centers for four- and five-year-olds.

Training and certifying quality personnel

Teachers and administrators for early childhood education must evidence qualifications and training different from their counterparts working with older children. Certification procedures and teacher training programs should reflect this fact. For the effective implementation of the program alternatives outlined in this report, a new type of professional early childhood educator will be required.

To meet personnel needs for early childhood education programs, states should take some or all of the following steps:

1. Establish credentials in early childhood education or at least provide for a strong specialization in early childhood education within the preparation of an elementary certificate.

2. Establish the same salary schedules, fringe benefits and tenure rights for early childhood teachers as for all other teachers.

3. Encourage the development of postsecondary and inservice programs for professional and other positions, through a variety of actions.

4. Develop programs particularly suited to training teaching aides, parents, siblings and other young people to assist with the wide range of program alternatives.

5. Organize and train volunteers as teachers' assistants.

Providing adequate physical facilities

If a state determines that its needs for additional facilities for early childhood programs will be substantial, it might examine carefully and consider revision of existing legislation and regulations related to classroom space. The success of Head Start programs in non-school space suggests that—with full recognition of the complica-

tions involved—the time has come for code revision.

In all state efforts to develop facilities and regulate their standards, there must be basic recognition of the need for flexibility in creative design and adequate provision for state aid for construction where funds are needed.

Methods of providing State financial support

The states must develop sound principles of financing for their early childhood programs, including provisions so that (1) early childhood education is treated as an integral part of the state's overall education program, (2) it will benefit from a steady flow of state funds, and that (3) funds can be provided on an equalization basis to insure that particularly needy districts benefit.

Cost estimates are included for the alternative program approaches outlined.

Within this framework states should consider some or all of the following techniques:

1. Inclusion of early childhood programs in the state foundation formula, if the foundation program has proven to be an effective method of distributing state aid.
2. Establishment of a special early childhood education fund within the state's education budget, if there is not an effective foundation program and no immediate plans for establishing one.
3. Establishment of a special state fund to include all expenditure for early childhood programs (including education, health, nutrition, day care, etc.).
4. Provision for construction funds for early childhood facilities.
5. Provision to ensure maximum use of federal matching funds and adoption of the principle by the state agency administering early childhood programs that priority will be given to plans using matching funds or joint federal or other public or private funding.
6. Development of a program of incentive grants to state colleges, universities, junior and community colleges for offering graduate, undergraduate and associate degree specializations in early childhood education.
7. Adoption of the principle that salaries for early childhood teachers should be equal to those of elementary school teachers and provision made so that whatever state support is provided for elementary teachers salaries is also provided to early childhood teachers.
8. Provision of parent education as an integral part of the state early childhood and/or adult education programs.

Implementation

Included among the steps a state should devise to insure consideration and assist in implementation of the alternatives outlined in this report are (1) public examination of the issue at a prominent level of government; (2) collection of essential data; and (3) identification of an interagency committee to oversee the implementation process. A governor's conference on early childhood education might be the first step.

The key decision will be the structure to be adopted for administration of early childhood programs. Alternative program and funding approaches will be largely determined by this decision. The Education Commission of the States stands ready to assist the states in development of model legislation, identifying consultants to assist with legislative and administrative matters and program development and to conduct continued research on best practices across the country.

THE NEED FOR STATE-SUPPORTED EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

In the coming decade, the states will be subject to increasing and widespread pressure to provide special educational services to very young children and their parents. There has already been a large increase in

the number of three- and four-year-olds enrolled in nursery schools and kindergartens. According to the U.S. Census Bureau one in ten children of these ages was enrolled in some kind of formal preschool program in 1965; in 1970 the figure was one in five. About two-thirds of the increased enrollment is accounted for by federal child care programs begun since 1965.

The success of these federally funded programs, which aim primarily to enhance the early development of disadvantaged youngsters, has led other families to demand the same "head start" for their children. Although private schools are expanding and national business organizations are beginning to franchise nursery schools, tuition fees range from \$500 to \$1,000. But, perhaps three-fifths of the population has incomes high enough to prevent their children from attending Head Start and yet cannot afford private programs. They are disenfranchised with the concentrated expenditure of their tax dollars on the disadvantaged, and they are demanding public preschools and kindergartens for their children.

Additional immediate pressure will come from families who want day care for their children while the mothers work. An estimated eight out of ten working mothers of preschool-age children are not now eligible for the majority of federal or state-supported programs. There are more than 11.6 million mothers with jobs today; more than four million of them have children under six. But only 640,000 licensed day care spaces are available, and more than one-third of these are privately run. By 1980, the Labor Department predicts, 5.3 million mothers will be working.

And there is significant agreement that custodial care is not enough, that the first five or six years are of crucial importance to an individual's development. These are the years of most rapid intellectual growth. These are the years when the ways of thinking and behaving which will guide the mental development of the individual through the rest of his life are being formed. Most educational problems start before a child enters first grade. To deal with the cause rather than the effect, efforts should start well before the child is six.

The question is not whether the states should become involved. To a large extent they already are. Eight states (three by 1973) and Guam mandate kindergarten programs and at least 37 have adopted legislation permitting them. Thirty-eight states, American Samoa and Puerto Rico make some form of state aid available for kindergartens, and at least six provide some funding for preschool programs. But much of the recent impetus has come from the federal government—whose purpose has been to provide educational training for the children of the poor and day care services to welfare mothers who might then be able to go to school or be trained to get a job. And often state involvement has followed—in an uncoordinated array of day care programs or health provisions or locally initiated classroom efforts approved but not funded by the state. In many cases, state interest in early childhood training has simply been a recognition of an established situation.

But the situation is getting out of hand. Direction is needed. If the states are to determine their own priorities and program emphases, they must assume the leadership now. There needs to be a clear notion of what people can expect to accomplish in early childhood education programs. Early childhood education is not a panacea for the social ills of our society; but it certainly is a prerequisite to solving many of these problems.

Early education as an investment

To the extent that an educational program for young children contributes to their success as students and citizens, it will sig-

nificantly reduce subsequent remedial, counseling and even penal and welfare costs. There are no definitive statistics on how much a state might save in the long term by investing in early childhood education. And there is not yet enough experience to analyze precisely the relationship of early training to prevention of later problems.

But it is clear that a relationship exists. Failure in the initial years of formal education can be closely tied to the high percentage of drop-outs in the public schools. It costs approximately twice as much to retain a child in a mentally retarded or remedial classroom as in a regular classroom. Once in a special class, he usually remains there at least eight years. And yet, for example, over half the Spanish-surnamed and Negro children in mentally retarded classrooms in California have the ability to be in regular classrooms and have been misclassified because they lacked early training in English and the basic skills demanded by the public schools. It costs per year, on a national average, \$4,070 to detain a juvenile, \$1,898 to keep an individual in a state penitentiary, and about \$1,000 for an individual on welfare.

In fact, early childhood programs can be considered integrally related to overall state economic development. A 1967-68 financial study prepared by Moody's Investors Associates and Campus Facilities Associates for the State of South Carolina linked implementation of a state kindergarten program to the state's total manpower resources and the overall drive for economic growth. In addition to long-range development, the report estimated that the effect of preschool and kindergarten programs would be to reduce the number of first grade repeaters and result in a savings of at least \$2.5 million a year. Resultant support from the legislature and the governor led to the initiation of a kindergarten program in 1970.

Over a long period of time, there will be cost benefits in terms of reduced expenditures for special and remedial education, delinquency and crime, and an increase in the general productivity of society. But it would be a mistake to expect an immediate measurable payoff; education and other social services generally do not work that way. It would be a disservice to sell a developmental program for young children solely on the basis of some immediate cost-benefit analysis. Expectations are bound to be disappointed because the real values have been overlooked, and the short-term payoff will not be as spectacular as hoped.

The immediate tangible pay-off of early childhood programs should be:

1. Improving the inadequate day care situations to which many children in this country are now exposed.
2. Detecting and preventing future problems for the 10 to 15 percent of children who might be physically or mentally handicapped or have learning disabilities.
3. Providing help to any parent wanting to become a more effective parent.

State support for early childhood programs

A state can realize substantial political, social, educational and economic benefits if it provides early developmental programs for children younger than six—the standard first grade entry age. The major thrust of such programs should be (a) strengthening the role of the family as the first and most fundamental influence on child development; (b) the early detection of serious health and education handicaps; and (c) the provision of remedial health and education programs for all preschool children who need special services.

Recognizing the magnitude of the task, the wide variations in children's needs and the already existing demands on state resources, the task force has focused on the development of alternative approaches and organizational structures which might be implemented at different levels by states with different needs. As a minimum, states should

provide some form of development program for three-, and four- and five-year-olds and should—as much as possible—involve their parents in the process. There are many public and private efforts across the country which indicate the benefits to the national welfare of concern for the health of expectant mothers, of provision of an adequate diet for newborn and very young children and of education for prospective and new parents. Therefore this report looks at programs for mothers' prenatal and postnatal care and parent education as one very important alternative for state support.

OBJECTIVES OF A PUBLIC EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM

In order to realize a state's general goals in developing comprehensive preprimary programs—enriching educational experiences, meeting increasing demand and reducing later remedial and other costs—the immediate program objectives must be considered and defined.

For a statewide, publicly supported effort, we recommend a set of minimum objectives which recognize the social, educational and health needs of all children:

1. To develop ways to reach the families of young children and to strengthen their capacity for parenting.
2. To involve parents in the formal education of their children directly and through the decision-making process.
3. To provide for the health, safety and psychological needs of young children.
4. To start the educational process that will contribute to the development of individuals who will be able to solve a variety of problems and are willing to try to solve them.
5. To lay a foundation for improvements that should take place in the early years of schooling to make it more responsive to the needs of children.

These objectives are discussed below:

1. *To develop ways to reach the families of young children and to strengthen their capacity for parenting.* There is important evidence that in the earliest years children are more influenced by family than by peers or any persons outside the family. Parents are in fact primarily—and in most cases exclusively—responsible for early childhood development. Some families are now getting their children off to a good start. Some are not. The overriding aim of states should be to strengthen the family as the primary group responsible for the development and education of young children and to meet the special needs of parents.

At least from a conventional point of view, the family is strengthened when one parent (usually the father) can earn an adequate living and another parent (usually the mother) can remain in the home to provide for the welfare and development of the children. Some women need an outside stimulus to maintain a healthy mental state. That choice should be available without sacrificing the welfare of their children. The family is strengthened when it is more self-sufficient and does not have to depend upon outside agencies for service that can be provided internally and when the education the children receive outside the home respects the language, culture and life style of the home.

The priorities that follow are:

To assist the family in providing a healthy stimulating environment for the children in the home. Many parents need help to understand the process of child growth and development, how children learn and how parents can assist in the process. This is important to foster both the child's development and the parents' self-confidence.

To supplement the efforts of the home by providing limited educational opportunities outside the home ranging from special services covering an hour or two a week to three or four hours of classroom activities a day.

To provide adequate day care services for

those families needing it. When it is necessary to provide complete day care service, it should be conducted by someone who knows, understands and respects the cultural background of the child. Many parents have no alternative but to leave their child alone, with a babysitter or in a day care program that just manages to provide minimal custodial services. A working mother's income is often the difference between being impoverished and not being. In 1968 in the male-headed families in which the wife worked, without the woman's salary eight percent of the families would have had less than \$3,000 a year and 40 percent would have had between \$3,000 and \$7,000 a year. These women do not qualify for most of the existing federally subsidized programs because they are working. And yet as much as a third or more of their income may go for inadequate services for their children.

2. *To involve parents in the formal education of their children directly and through the decision-making process.* When children are young, it is easier to involve their parents in the activities and program development of the schools. There seems to be a natural tendency for parents of a preschool-age youngster to hold high aspirations for him—regardless of what may have happened to his older brothers and sisters. An early involvement of parents can help to head off later conflicts between home and the schools—particularly when racial or ethnic groups are concerned.

As many parents as possible should be encouraged to participate in the program for their children by being paid assistants or volunteers in the classroom, attending parent meetings or through an outreach program in which teachers or parent coordinators go to the homes of the parents who cannot come to the school.

Representative groups of parents should be involved in the decision-making process by serving on advisory councils similar to the Head Start Parent Advisory Groups. If such groups are formed, their function should be clear, and their recommendations should carry real weight in the decision-making process. This becomes extremely important particularly when minority groups or low-income parents are involved. The success of efforts such as Head Start and Follow Through to reverse the disastrous educational results of the majority of children from low income and minority groups depends to a great extent on involving the parents to help them understand what the educators are trying to accomplish and to help the educators become more responsive to the children and the parents. Unless this kind of bridging between the schools and the parents can be accomplished, there is little hope for the success of these educational programs. The schools simply cannot accomplish the task alone. And, of course, it is implied that the parents would be helping to redefine the tasks that the schools are attempting to accomplish.

3. *To provide for the health, safety and psychological needs of young children.* Regardless of where education takes place—in the child's home, in a day care home or in a classroom—a major objective must be the physical and mental welfare of the children. There are significant problems of providing adequate physical facilities, of determining standards and licensing to insure that children are in a safe environment that protects them from physical harm and nurtures their physical development.

In addition to these concerns, the psychological needs of the children must be taken into account. A quality program (a) should provide the psychological services which some young children with serious problems need to become mentally healthy individuals and which are not now available; (b) should protect children from psychological damage resulting from the overexpectations of parents or teachers; and (c) should promote the

development of a healthy self-concept which research indicates is essential for later success in school.

In considering the physical and psychological health of young children, it becomes particularly clear that concern for human development cannot be imposed at an arbitrary age level. It has been estimated that if the needs of expectant mothers were adequately met, the number of mentally retarded children could be reduced by as much as 50 percent. Unless an adequate diet is provided for newborn and very young children, their physical and mental development can be stunted. And for long-range health and development, prospective parents and the parents of very young children should be offered parent education programs. This training in human growth and development should start when prospective parents are still in school, although for most individuals the motivation to learn will be greater when they become expectant parents. Certainly at that time and extending over the next several years, there would be great benefits if education for parents, explaining in detail how children grow and develop, were available to all. This is of prime importance because the parents' understanding in large part determines the health, safety and psychological well being of the children.

4. *To start the educational process that will contribute to the development of individuals who will be able to solve a variety of problems and are willing to try to solve them.* There are mixed opinions on how to start very young children on an educational process that will contribute to their full development. Some educators and psychologists believe that objectives should be stated in very explicit terms (such as the child can count to ten, name nine colors, etc.) and the program should be systematically designed to accomplish them. Others stress language development, concept formation and problem-solving, but are not as concerned about the specific content. They devote considerable attention to helping children either maintain or develop a healthy self-concept as it relates to learning and school.

Clearly no single set of objectives would satisfy the leading educators and psychologists who are involved in developing model programs. But in many instances these differences are matters of approach and stress.

Experts recognize the importance of early intellectual development, but only as a part of early childhood education. Most authorities agree that it is important also to help young children develop social skills and a healthy self-concept. In addition they recognize the importance of individualizing the program to respond to the ability and needs of individual children.

Human beings and particularly young children vary greatly in their rate of growth and development as well as in their potential to learn. Children from different backgrounds have learned different things that are vital to them but are not necessarily the things the school values in a child. A child from a middle-class family comes the closest to having the prerequisites the school usually expects. A child from the ghetto may have learned how to care for himself all day on a city street or how to look after younger brothers and sisters. The rural child may have developed capabilities appropriate to his environment. Or a child may come to school with a well-developed language, but it is Navaho or Spanish or different from the English used in school. We cannot expect these children to achieve the same objectives as those set for a child who comes to school speaking the language of the school and tutored previously in some of the things the school expects.

5. *To lay a foundation for changes that should take place in the early years of school to make it more responsive to the needs of the children.* One of the objectives of educa-

tion before the age of six should be to foster changes in the public schools. Rather than starting at the top—in colleges and universities—and working down in order to effect change, early childhood education offers the opportunity to start with the young child and work up. To suggest that the schools should change is not an attack on the schools, their teachers or administrators. It is a recognition that any social institution should be constantly engaged in the process of self-renewal—changing its form and content to adjust to changing social needs and demands.

If a developmental program before the age of six is to have long-term positive effects, it should be carried on into the school years. One of the implications, of course, is that the educational and related objectives of the school will need to be more broadly defined to correspond with the general objectives outlined above. This will probably be a long-term objective. It would be a mistake to plan any preschool program without taking into account the current structure, curriculum and procedures in the early grades of the elementary school and the effects that the developmental program before age six will have on that program.

In short, an immediate objective is to help young children succeed in the schools as they presently operate. A long-range objective is to project the kind of changes that would be desirable to make the early years of education more productive for more children.

If early childhood educational programs are going to help children be more successful in schools as they are, the programs must anticipate some of the schools' expectations. An obvious example is the development of language. Probably the best approach to language development for a Spanish-speaking child would be to continue to develop his language (Spanish) and use it in the classroom, but if English is the basic instructional language in kindergarten or the first grade, one of the objectives of the prekindergarten programs would have to be to help him understand and speak English. This should remain an objective only as long as it takes to change the approach in the early years of school.

As a long-range objective, and early childhood educational and developmental program should lay the foundation for the following kinds of changes in the public schools:

A restatement of the basic purpose of public education. Instead of blending divergent groups into a single homogeneous mass, the aim should be to develop different cultures and life styles, enhancing their values and uniqueness and, in the process, enhancing the whole society. Schools probably will not be successful with many children from minority groups until they do reflect these differences. Minority groups have always resisted the effects of the majority group to assimilate them. A diversity of views and approaches probably will enrich our society.

The public schools need to learn to respond to different children and their parents on an individual basis. The soundest process of education starts with the known and proceeds to teach the unknown. The process should start with the child's language, his culture and his background and build on that base.

The public schools need a broader definition of objectives. Intellectual objectives need to be expanded to include more emphasis on problem-solving, and general objectives need to be expanded beyond intellectual development to include the physical and mental health of children.

PRIORITIES AND METHODS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Whether a state determines to provide classroom instruction for all five-year-olds and support alternative programs for younger children or to offer a variety and com-

bination of out-of-classroom programs for all pre-first graders, the problem of how to phase in program activities must be faced. It is assumed that even if a state chooses low cost parent/child programs, limitations of resources and staff will necessitate the establishment of initial priorities.

Concerted efforts should be made, as recommended elsewhere in this report, to secure the passage of federal legislation which would enable the states to coordinate federal programs in the state, to study the needs and resources of the entire state and to enable the state to establish comprehensive priorities. The states must continue to stress such a comprehensive approach. The intent should not be to delay action on program implementation but to underline the need for more coordination of effort.

1. *Initial training of personnel.* If a state is committed to the concept of early childhood education but is able to predict a lack of trained personnel for kindergarten and prekindergarten programs, it might adopt as its first priority the development of postsecondary and inservice programs for professional and other positions. Among the actions to be undertaken might be:

A program of incentive grants to state colleges and universities to encourage them to include specialized graduate programs in their schools of education and undergraduate B.A. programs in early childhood education;

A program of incentive grants to state junior and community colleges to provide courses in early childhood education;

The development of programs for retraining—through formal efforts in two-year and four-year institutions and through inservice programs—credentialed elementary school teachers wanting kindergarten positions;

The establishment of a limited number of model demonstration centers to provide inservice training for professional and paraprofessional personnel prior to the expansion of the state program.

It should be emphasized that this alternative of focusing first on staff development should not be undertaken without concurrent planning for the initiation of the state's early childhood program so that positions will be open as staff are prepared to fill them and so that funding commitments are made to the development of a full-scale program.

2. *Early diagnosis.* A state might focus first on the development of an early diagnosis system—and personnel to administer it—which would determine need for various alternative programs. To insure effectiveness of the alternative approaches suggested—to a greater or lesser degree—early diagnosis of a child's educational needs is basic. In many instances, the home situation with minimal professional guidance can prepare a child to enter a formal learning situation with adequate expectations of success. Of course, there will always be exceptions—because of particular family situations, physical or psychological handicaps, etc. If the special needs of such children are diagnosed early—at the latest by age three—and they can be directed to special programs, they can be guaranteed a reasonable chance of success. And the state can be saved substantial future costs.

Ideally, a comprehensive diagnosis system would not only identify those youngsters needing substantial help, but also those who need only minimal or no further preprimary assistance. By reducing the need to provide programs across the board for all children, such diagnosis would limit the "essential" state involvement.

Legislation to be proposed in New York for an Office of Child Development includes important provisions for development of professional personnel who would conduct early diagnosis programs. A bill has been introduced in the California Legislature to provide funds for such early diagnosis. The pur-

poses of the proposed Educational Development Assessment Act are to reduce the incidence of students assigned to special education programs, cut down school failure due to undiagnosed, correctable learning disabilities and increase school personnel's knowledge of children's needs so that they can design more satisfactory programs. The bill would provide state funds for up to 90 percent of the cost of such a program, but not to exceed \$45 per student to be assessed.

3. *Model demonstration centers.* The state could consider establishing a limited number of model demonstration centers. But the time has passed when the major requirement is to provide models. The federal government, through the Planned Variation program in Head Start and the Follow Through program, provides a number of model demonstration centers across the country that can be studied by individuals interested in state programs.

The same arrangement has not been provided for day care, but the Office of Child Development and the Office of Economic Opportunity funded a major effort during the summer of 1970 to pull together all the information on experimental and demonstration programs that could be used as parts of an effective day care program. This effort will result in the publication of three or four books covering: day care for infants; day care for three-, four- and five-year-old children; after-school day care for older children, and training of day care personnel. In addition, the Office of Economic Opportunity is planning to fund a number of demonstration centers across the United States. These federal efforts should fill the need for model demonstration centers.

4. *Meeting the needs of the disadvantaged first.* Another approach to establishing a program would be to serve first the children with the greatest need. This priority would focus initial efforts on children from low-income homes, children of ethnic and minority groups, and handicapped children. Such an approach has the advantage of providing a systematic way of introducing and expanding a program of step-by-step as funding, trained personnel, and facilities become available. It is also based upon a sound premise of starting where the need is greatest.

But there are these limitations. The states would then be duplicating or supplementing federal programs; the result might be to encourage the federal government to either maintain the current effort or reduce it. If the notion of shared responsibility is acceptable, however, it would follow that the federal government should be encouraged to expand its efforts rather than to reduce them. In any case, there should be funding articulation and coordination between state and federal sources.

There is a problem of making administrative decisions as to who has the greatest need. The income-level approach, used by the federal government, is probably the easiest, yet it is difficult to administer because of the vast variations in what income means even within a state.

Income as a method of determining who will receive services also presents other problems. A family may initially qualify for services and later improve its economic position so that it no longer qualifies. In such a case, a minor advance in the family income could be undesirable because of a loss in services for their children. Income level, moreover, does not necessarily correspond to need. It is probably true that the highest percentage of children with the greatest need are from low-income homes, but many children from other homes are in equal need of services.

There is also a political consideration. The working man who is just above the poverty level is probably willing to support such a program if he sees that, before long, he too will benefit; but it appears that someone else's children are going to keep getting a

"head start" and his children are not, he is likely to oppose the program strongly.

5. *Support for an educational component for older children at day care centers.* The beginnings of a state program might be developed by first subsidizing an educational component at existing public, private and industrially established day care centers for four- or five-year-old children. Such an effort would reach the children of working mothers, a high proportion of whom it can be assumed would benefit greatly from a formalized educational program; would provide the basis for future expansion to all children; and would offer an opportunity for inservice staff training without the need to solve facilities problems at the start.

Additional factors favoring day care as the place to start are the great need for it, the substantial political support behind it, and the federal funds available to contribute to its support. The state would provide some assistance to existing centers to provide an educational component, encourage industry by offering some assistance, and supplement the efforts of the federal government to establish new centers.

One of the basic considerations should be to assist day care homes to obtain a license and upgrade the quality of the service to children. Most of the children who are currently receiving day care services are in homes, and this will probably be true for some time to come. Indeed, good home day care offers many advantages to the children in care. But day care mothers need recognition, training, technical assistance and encouragement.

LEAD POISONING IN MASSACHUSETTS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on June 30, 1971, passed resolutions strongly urging funding of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act of 1971. These resolutions, filed by Speaker David B. Bartley of Holyoke, Mass., are direct response to the dire need to begin a massive Federal assault on a devastatingcrippler and killer—childhood lead poisoning.

There is currently pending in the Massachusetts Legislature legislation to set up a coordinated statewide program within the Massachusetts Department of Public Health for detecting and screening those children suffering from lead poisoning. But, like every State and municipality, funds are essential to implement urgently needed local health programs. Thus, the urgent necessity for appropriating the full funding—\$25 million—for the grant programs to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which are authorized by the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695.

At this point, I am including the full text of the resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO APPROPRIATE FORTHWITH THE FULL FUNDING AUTHORIZED BY THE LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING PREVENTION ACT OF 1971

Whereas, It is estimated that 400,000 children suffer lead-based paint poisoning annually; and

Whereas, It is estimated that over 200 children will die and another 4,000 children will suffer moderate to severe brain damage this year due to said poisoning; and

Whereas, Said tragedy is solely a product of man and has been ascertained to be preventable; and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States has enacted the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act of 1971 and that said act would provide for programs of detection, prevention, treatment and education; and

Whereas, Meaningful implementation of said act is of crucial importance to the citizens of the commonwealth; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby strongly urges that the Congress of the United States appropriate forthwith all funds necessary to implement the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act of 1971; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to Senators Allen J. Ellender and Warren G. Magnuson, to Representatives George H. Mahon and Daniel J. Flood, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

OUR WASTED ASSET—SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most valuable assets in this Nation is the talent and experience of our senior citizens. Recently, Richard E. Cox, one of the publishers and editors of the Blade-Times of Brunswick, Md., wrote an editorial for the Blade-Times indicating his concern over the waste of this important asset. I share Mr. Cox's thoughts with my colleagues:

OUR WASTED ASSET

How do we as individuals treat our senior citizens? Do we listen to them patiently as we think of other things, or do we give their words the attention and respect that they deserve?

In the Indian tribes of this land before there was a United States, the people had the utmost respect for their senior citizens. Words of wisdom came from their lips and all ages gathered around to hear the advice and experiences of the "senior citizen".

Are we as smart?

We don't think so. If anything, our troubles in this country spring from the national habit of not listening to advice and the "I'd rather do it myself" type of thinking.

This is about as smart as the little boy lost in the woods who when found, wouldn't listen to advice about the right trails, but instead chose to wander about on his own, going deeper into the forest and farther and farther away from home.

Of course this story is silly, but it's not too far away from the way we live when we choose not to believe the advice we get, preferring to find out for ourselves.

Education is not necessarily wisdom. Education is a learning and training process about things, places and methods. Wisdom is something else altogether. It comes from a common-sense approach to life which recognizes problems for what they are and handles them in the same way.

Many Senior Citizens have this wisdom tucked into their minds—wisdom gained from getting burned themselves. Why can't we take this wisdom and learn from it?

Everyone says that our greatest national asset is our youth—our children. We agree that this is a great national asset. However, we contend that our number one asset is the wisdom in the minds of our senior citizens. And we are wasting it.

With the many problems which beset our country, our states, our towns and our homes, wouldn't it be smart to call on this national asset at times for advice?

The problem is simple.

People who do not have wisdom themselves, have trouble recognizing it.

GRINNELL, IOWA, THE "ALL AMERICA TYPE"

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Grinnell Herald Register is especially interesting to me, because it does relate to a typical Iowa city—the kind of place which gives strength to the Nation:

FIVE GRINNELLIANS APPEAR IN OIL FILM: 129 MILLION SEE GRINNELL TV "PEOPLE" COMMERCIAL

More than 129 million Americans have already viewed a television commercial called "People"—and scheduled future showings indicate that millions more will see it.

This is important to Grinnellians, since five localities appear in the TV commercial sponsored by "The Oil Companies of America".

The four who appeared in the commercial "People" are: Mrs. Raymond Harris, Mrs. Sharp Lannom IV, Dr. William Evans and Cyril Arthur, Mike Hotchkin, pharmacist at Grinnell General, was the only Grinnellian appearing in another commercial entitled "More Oil".

Screening time of the commercial is only 60 seconds. Just what goes into making a one-minute commercial? And just as important, why the commercial?

"CAN'T RUN SHORT"

The "why" seems easier to answer. In fact, the commercial notes the answer quite succinctly—"A country that runs on oil can't afford to run short."

Since our current society is one that reaches for catch words and catch phrases to tell the story, the answer, put another way, is "The Energy Gap"—and how to keep the nation from falling into it as it gets wider.

They tell us that each and every person—man, woman, and child—uses an average of three gallons of oil per day. This coupled with daily consumption of electricity and the utilization of energy from coal and natural gas, is the fountainhead of the problem.

Demands for energy have doubled in the past 20 years, and will double again in 15 years. And where does this energy come from? Where will the load fall? The present breakdown of sources is: oil, 43 per cent; natural gas, 32 per cent; coal, 21 per cent; hydroelectric power, 4 per cent; and nuclear power, less than 1 per cent.

"ENERGY GAP"

The rapidly rising demand and the dwindling "immediately available" supplies create "The Energy Gap".

It's the contention of the American Petroleum Institute that the problems of the energy gap belong to the entire nation, and that the government should be concerned in

fostering a coordinated solution to the problem.

One of the principal factors permitting the people of the United States to enjoy the highest standard of living in the world is "cheap energy". The problem seems to be moving into the area of "sufficiently available" energy to meet the immediate needs of tomorrow, and the longer range needs of the tomorrows after that.

This is the point they are making—and this is the point which should be made in conjunction with it—the problem belongs to all of us, and accordingly, the government, should participate in the solutions thereto. Meanwhile, back at the commercial:

WHY GRINNELL?

One of the first questions asked about the commercial is: "Why was Grinnell selected?"

It started with the producers who wanted "... an all-American type of small city. . . ." A number of Iowa's small cities were recommended by the Iowa Development Commission, and producers of the show visited those cities.

After visiting some 10 different cities, Grinnell was chosen because "... it looked and responded as an all-American type of small city, and seemed to have all the qualifications that the producer sought. . . ."

AND THE "ACTORS"

"How were the people selected?" seems to be high among the questions that people ask about the commercial. Apparently this is a complex process that includes a series of conversations, probing, general contacts and just plain looking around.

For instance, that day when Mrs. Raymond Harris was having lunch with her husband in the Longhorn, possibly the remotest thought in her mind was a television commercial. Yet, during her lunch, she was approached by the show producer Norry Nelson, who explained why the group was in Grinnell. After an interview, she agreed to be on the commercial.

THE HELICOPTER

A goodly number of Grinnellians were aware of the helicopter circling and circling and circling Grinnell for several days. First it was plotting the aerial shots—and then, when sun conditions were right, shooting the aerials.

Although the helicopter was rented from a flying service in Des Moines, the pilot was flown in from Hollywood. A stunt pilot who can fly any kind of plane, he was brought in just for filming the commercial—and as an extra, getting the crew to and from Des Moines.

KALEIDOSCOPE PRODUCTIONS

Makers of the commercial were Kaleidoscope Productions of Hollywood. A major film producer in the area of commercials, industrial pictures, training films, etc., they number among their clients a number of major companies including United Airlines, Alcoa, Procter and Gamble and others.

SOME 5,500 TO GET 90

It came as quite a surprise to learn that, in order to get 90 feet of film needed for the commercial, some 5,500 feet of film was shot.

Apparently this is somewhere near par for the course. Specific scenes are shot again and again until both director and producer are sure that they tell the story.

Another factor that enters into shooting so much film is that, once the crew and equipment leave the site of the commercial, return costs to get a "different" shot would run up dramatically. So, every effort is made to have "everything in the film can" before the crews leave.

CONSIDERABLE TIME

Grinnellians who became "actors" in the commercial found that they had to spend plenty of time on the commercial.

During a recent luncheon session of the

cast, hosted by Bob Schulz of the Iowa Petroleum Council, they chatted about the time they were involved in the shooting. It was as follows:

Dr. Evans—about 2½ hours; Mrs. Harris—about four hours; Mrs. Lannom—almost seven hours, (although a lot of this time was in "scene preparation"); Mike Hotchkiss—about two hours; and Cyril Arthur—2½ hours.

All those who appeared on the commercial are paid—and continue to receive money, based on how many times the commercial appears.

APPEARANCES

The commercial has been screened on all three major networks thus far. Programs on which it has been shown include: "Today," "Meet the Press," "Face the Nation," "NBC Baseball Game of the Week," "Harlem Globetrotters Special," "Don Knotts," "Gunsmoke," and other network specials like "Penguin City" and "Lure of the Tall Ships."

Viewing audience thus far has been estimated at 129 million.

Future screenings include the following programs: "Marcus Welby," "Cannon," "Mission: Impossible," "Gunsmoke," "Wide World of Sports," some NFL football games, "NCAA Football Highlights," more NBC baseball games and the "Today" show.

As of now, the exact number of showings has not been determined.

SURVEY

An "Independent" survey on reactions to the "People" commercial was conducted by the ad agency. This apparently follows a standard practice to determine whether or not a commercial is getting the proper message across.

Conducted in Louisville, Ky., Philadelphia, Pa., and San Diego, Calif., this "in-depth" survey sought to involve a cross-section of male and female viewers in all age and income brackets.

Some verbatim comments from the survey are interesting enough to reprint:

"It was about a town in middle America . . . a town in Iowa. There was a man cutting materials . . . and a lady using a sewing machine . . . and a doctor injecting serum from a bottle. A lot of things in the commercial grabbed your attention. It was a nice pleasant town in Iowa . . . many people depend on oil . . . oil is important and useful . . . the grandmother telling us that sewing machines use oil materials and doctors do too"

"A lady comes into her kitchen and turns on the gas indicating the necessity of gas in the home . . . it's a necessity . . . important in running the country . . . gas and oil are a necessity."

"There was a street scene . . . and a lady in Iowa sewing . . . and prescriptions were a by-product of oil. I thought it was an excellent presentation. The message showed the oil industries contributing many by-products"

OIL IS HEARTBEAT

"Oil is the heartbeat of America. It shows this cutter and he didn't realize his cutting machine uses oil . . . and it shows a woman sewing and a woman in the kitchen . . . and a doctor."

". . . dependent on oil for the electrical power in industries, autos, planes, down to that little lady at the sewing machine Even women in the kitchens and doctors. They have come up with a commercial that is factual and everyone should be watching it."

"I thought it was part of the show. It was sort of a documentary. Didn't look like a commercial at first."

"It was a nice homey American type scene. It showed the next door type of people doing the things people do every day. A grandmother was sewing, a man was cutting a pattern . . . most people do not realize that 74 percent of the country's power comes from oil. A country has to have oil to run the many things in industry and the home."

One of the principal impacts of the commercial was the use of "real people" to get the message across.

Launched April 26 by the American Petroleum Institute, the television commercials are part of an overall program that will run on all three TV networks, in some 160 newspapers across the country, and in various trade publications.

All the effort, all the time, all the money was expended to get one critical message across: "A country that runs on oil can't afford to run short."

AGNEW CATCHES PLANE BUT MISSES BOAT

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Vice President's recent pronouncements from Madrid on the subject of black American leadership.

Vice President AGNEW has recently completed a tour of Africa which included Ethiopia, Kenya, and the Congo. This trip provided a unique opportunity for the Nixon-Agnew administration to show itself above the conflicts that embroil and sometimes embitter us at home. Black Africans have watched the progress of their brothers in America over the years. Young African children have studied the patient struggle of black Americans from emancipation to the present day. They have followed the fight for equality in education, housing, and jobs. They have been aware of the NAACP's gains in the courts in the area of enforcement of existing laws. They waited, with us, the many years before passage of a civil rights law by the Congress of the United States. And, with the rest of the world, they heralded the coming of nine, then 13, black legislators to the House of Representatives, culminating in the formation of the Congressional Black Caucus.

If he were a statesman, a quality his office should evoke from him, Mr. AGNEW would have spoken in positive terms. He would have called upon the Africans' knowledge of American history and added to it. He would have spoken of the gains black Americans have made over the years, and pointed to the 1,860 black elected officials as tangible evidence of those gains. He would have demonstrated to the Africans he met that, in America too, black political maturity is becoming a reality.

But he did nothing of the sort, Mr. Speaker. Instead, and again, black Americans have been slapped in the face by the Nixon-Agnew combine. Not a single gain was cited, and his remarks, instead of being those of a statesman, were those of a backroom politician intent upon hacking up his political adversaries. He referred to black leaders as "those in the United States who have arrogated unto themselves the position of black leaders, those who spend their time in querulous complaint and constant recriminations against the rest of society." With typical shortsightedness he did not recognize that the same system that produced the

so-called querulous and complaining black leaders produced him. No, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing of the statesman in Mr. AGNEW.

And yet, his "querulous complaint and recrimination" against black American leadership did not surprise me. He was frustrated. He had just left nations where the heads of state, the vice heads of state, all cabinet officers, all diplomats, and every other prominent official was black.

Considering the absence of black Americans in the Nixon-Agnew Cabinet, how could he have explained to them that they found no black man capable of running a government?

THE PROBLEMS WITH TELEVISION NEWS

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House, a very timely and well written speech, on the problems with television news, which, I am sure, will be very interesting and informative to all of my colleagues.

The speech was written by Miss Susan Schiffer, of WTEV in New Bedford, Mass. who is an intelligent, well-versed correspondent:

TELEVISION NEWS: TO SIGNALIZE OR SYNTHESIZE EVENTS?

Until a few years ago most Americans assumed that they were experts on three things: Politics, baseball, and the weather. Recently, a fourth has been added, television. And especially since Chicago, T.V. news has become the national whippingboy, after the war in Viet Nam, that is.

Within a generation, the United States has evolved a "Post-Literate" culture—in other words, we are dominated by the electronic media. Most of us are affected far more dramatically by what we see and hear than by what we read.

Used responsibly, the broadcast media can be enormously constructive; but used without proper care and restraint; it can inflame tensions and polarize a community.

The standard criticism of T.V. is the way it handles the day-to-day flow of news by presenting a series of headline stories tending to highlight the unusual and extraordinary. The most lurid and saleable stories of all seem to be about disorders in our cities. For instance, this past summer on July 2nd, in Lancaster, Pa., the UPI wire reported to the rest of the nation that 10 blocks of downtown Lancaster had been burned to the ground. There are neither 10 blocks of downtown Lancaster nor had they burned to the ground. In fact, of the five firebombs thrown, three landed in the street, one in a parking lot, and only one in a clothes store. Yet, television and newspaper reporters converged on Lancaster from all over the state. Once there, they chose to cover the disorder in two basic ways: One, highly dramatically, perhaps gaining the reporter a raise, but causing more damage and personal injury; two, analytically, informing the citizens, perhaps losing the reporter a by-line, but helping to recreate solidarity. This incident is just one example.

There is an urgent need for a high degree of social awareness and responsibility on the

part of America's journalists. Since 1948, the growth of, and dependence on, television is one of the most astounding phenomena that man has experienced. As cabinets have grown smaller and screens larger, second and third sets have entered most homes and ninety-seven per cent of our nation's homes have television. Over one third of these sets are color.

The average American now spends between five and six hours a day in front of his television sets—or—12 to 15 years of his life. No other communications medium has ever approached T.V. as a leisure-time attraction.

This new social habit has placed awesome responsibility on the shoulders of broadcasters. What we see and hear on the tely directly influences not only our buying habits but our political preferences and the day-to-day decisions that affect our lives as well.

When the television news began fifteen years ago, announcers merely read bulletins from a wire service teletype, punctuated by a few file photographs and maps. Today's news has required the investment of large sums for reporters, equipment, and facilities all over the globe. Hour for hour, news is the most expensive element in a television network's budget. It is estimated that in 1968 alone, the three networks spent over \$150 million on news programming. In the past, a good deal of this investment was not recovered, but advertisers are now beginning to spend a great deal more on news.

Television news' evolution has been accompanied by several dramatic trends. One is that T.V. is now the primary source of news for most people according to the latest Elmo Roper and Associates survey, of some 2,000 people 21 years of age and older, 67% use T.V. as their primary news source.

Another Roper finding of interest is the increasing percentage of people who find television to be the most believable of the media. For instance, in 1959, only 29% said that they would believe a news story on T.V. if it conflicted with reports from radio, newspapers, or magazines. By 1968 the figures were 50% for T.V.

One last statistic of interest is that when the majority of the interviewers were asked which media they would least like to do without, 49% chose television.

Thus, television news, through the use of the camera, has been able to enhance a story far more than words alone. Americans can now live more of their lives at a distance, yet this has created a paradox because of the separation of participation and experience. A two and one-half minute report on a riot in India, which the average American viewer would not have known about much less experienced in the past, now provides a sense of participation without the fuller understanding which comes with experience.

Television cameras have opened up new vistas, but are people ready yet for them? Viewers have become omnipotent spectators, believing they understand because their eyes have "seen it." Yet, an inverse relationship exists between the viewer's conviction about the validity of his own experience and his ability or willingness to learn from television. The more he believes he "sees for himself" the less he gains. Thus, if video coverage of events is to contribute toward an informed public, there must be more clarification on the factual and symbolic context of events.

Cameras also recreate the temptation to show something on the screen simply because there is the footage, whether editorially it is a good judgment or not.

Television can also not only prepare the person for what the event will be like, but can change the event as well. Some people certainly like to act for the camera. Thus, while a newspaper reporter, equipped only with his pencil and note pad, can report on a mass meeting or demonstration without becoming part of the action himself, television cameras, on the other hand, which are

highly visible, can attract attention—either exhibitionistic or hostile—from the demonstrators.

Thus, the television newsman or woman must be constantly aware of the danger of affecting the course of an event by the very presence of the camera and of the possibility of helping turn what could otherwise have been a non-event into an event.

Although prejudice can save a great deal of time in preparation, the television reporter must be aware of the need for responsibility, and one of the biggest handicaps we face is the shortage of time in standard news shows. A half hour newscast usually only contains seventeen minutes of news—or—the same number of words which appear in only two columns of the front page of the *New York Times*. While a production piece (which normally means a voice over silent film and an interview) can last several minutes, a "talking head" or standard interview is usually supposed to be kept under one and a half minutes. Thus, the reporter or editor often must choose only a segment of what the interviewer's statement contained. When the choice is between a diffuse idea and a sensational phrase, the headline often wins out. (One efficient way for an interviewee to avoid being cut off, which Nixon uses very well, is to end each sentence with one's voice going up.)

Reporters also face conflicts between our conception of doing our job and such considerations as respect for privacy or our editors' view of what best serves the public interest. Just how far does a reporter with a camera and a microphone have a right to probe? Where does honest reporting stop and snooping or voyeurism take over? Is it sometimes in the public interest to withhold information?

It has always been said that questions of this kind can be resolved by the simple application of good taste and common sense. Yet, common sense is often in short supply, and one man's meat can be another's poison.

The times and customs are continually changing. In 1925, the *Wall Street Journal* was able to editorialize:

"A newspaper is a private enterprise, owing nothing to the public."

No mass media would take that position today.

But in the last few years, the American public, partly inflamed by the coverage of the disorders in our cities and Chicago, have begun to question television's responsibility. The climactic events have emphasized television's tendency to limit itself to that aspect of news which it can show a picture of—which is only a fragment of the total story.

For example, the Kerner Commission states that during the Newark disorders, a television crew asked young blacks to throw bricks through windows over and over to get a better picture. In Chicago, reporters missed a marvelous opportunity, before a mass audience, to conduct an investigation in depth about what those demonstrations and youth really meant. The networks covered the violence: But not what is means to all of us for now and the future. Perhaps more than anything else, both 1968 political conventions showed how important entertainment standards are to networks. The goal of Commercial T.V. is a maximum audience, "lured by high drama of a fight to the finish between the rival gladiators, no holds barred, the loser to the lions. Exciting television, however, can be ruinous politics."¹

What are the frontiers ahead for television news? We know that continuing advances in electronic technology will soon make instantaneous communication with just about any part of the world a daily occurrence. Miniaturization will take the wrist watch radio and television out of the realm of Dick

¹ Prof. Penn Kimball, Columbia University Forum.

Tracy fantasy. Video and sound equipment will become much smaller and more portable. Television sets will come equipped with automatic devices for recording, storage, and playback, so that we will not be bound to the exigencies of the clock in meeting our demands for information.

Thus, the scope of man's capacity to communicate will be greatly enlarged. The question is, how shall we use this tremendous capacity?

The ability to receive messages from the ends of the Earth does not amount to much if the information is faulty or the information accurate but its interpretation—flamed by a parochial point of view—may still be invalid, and in the nuclear age, dangerous. More than ever, we will need skilled gatherers and interpreters of information.

It is impossible to merely transmit and not influence an event. What is communicated is nearly always the result of "negotiation" among conflicting interest, the product of a filtering and refractive process.

But the various television stations and news services must encourage their reporters to probe the areas of discontent; to dig beneath the surface before and after the crisis, to examine proposed solutions to problems, to stay with a story, following up, interpreting, distinguishing between the authentic and the phony black leaders, to time news stories to avoid increasing prejudice, and to use the words black and white only when such designations are necessary.

We must remember that "technologically, a responsible news organization has the job of holding a mirror to evolving history: its obligation is to assure that the mirror is as distortion-free as possible. It aspires to total objectivity, but, knowing the unattainability of that goal, tries to deliver at least a full measure on all the events of observers."

As in the case of any other institution, there should be constant criticism of the news. One way of going this would be the establishment of an American broadcasting council on fairness and accuracy in reporting. Such a non-governmental "grievance committee" could be set up by WE T.V. news men and women ourselves to hear complaints about fair journalistic practice and to pronounce censure.

Or, perhaps there should be occasional conferences sponsored by the FCC to evaluate T.V. news performance and to serve as a funnel for viewer satisfaction.

Television should and must criticize the establishment and thus expect criticism in return. We need your criticism, support, and ideas.

James Thurber has pleaded, "let us not look back in anger, nor forward with fear, but around with awareness."

Television can and must make people aware—but it will take your involvement as well. Even if you only plan to spend a few years watching television, why not make an effort to make it an awakening experience?

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 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?"

* Neil Hickey, "Crack in the Electronic Mirror," Pamphlet, TV Guide—1969.

* James Thurber, *Credos and Curios*.

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

EMPRISE MUST BOW OUT OR DOG RACES WILL STOP, STATE COMMISSION RULES

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, the courage of those members of the Arkansas Racing Commission will almost certainly go unrecognized. The people of Arkansas and the Nation should be comforted by knowing that there are State officials that cannot be bought, intimidated, or conned. Hopefully this action will alert all affected States:

EMPRISE MUST BOW OUT OR DOG RACES WILL STOP, STATE COMMISSION RULES

(By John Bennett)

LITTLE ROCK, July 15.—The Arkansas Racing Commission revoked the franchise Thursday of Southland Racing Corp. of West Memphis, but suspended revocation to allow the principal stockholder to divest itself of all but 10 per cent of the track's stock.

Unless Emprise Corp. of Buffalo, N.Y., the principal stockholder, gives up the stock by Jan. 14, 1972, the Southland franchise will be revoked, the order says.

Emprise owns 46 per cent of the Southland stock and has been the subject of state investigations since it gained control in 1968.

The commission, by a 3-to-2 vote, found that Emprise has "an undesirable personal background" and its principal stock ownership "is detrimental to the public interest of the people of Arkansas."

Attorneys for Southland and Emprise said they will appeal the order.

"It is arbitrary, capricious and without justification of fact," said C. B. Nance Jr. of West Memphis, representing Southland.

Three Republican appointees voted for revocation and two Democrats, including the chairman, voted only for public censure of Emprise.

The revocation order was offered by Dr. Richard Springer of Hot Springs. Voting with him were Guy Newcomb of Osceola and Dr. J. D. Bilberry of McGehee. Chairman J. W. Benafield of Lonoke and H. M. Orsburn of Dardanelle cast negative votes.

The order said the Emprise stock could be transferred "by sale or otherwise" to any person unrelated by blood or marriage to a stockholder, director or officer of Emprise.

Language of the order apparently means Arkansas Sportservice, Inc., concessionaire at the track and a subsidiary of Emprise, could not accept shares since its corporate officers are basically the same as those of Emprise.

Any transfer of the stock will not become effective until approved by the commission. Mr. Benafield said all transfers "will be closely investigated" before they are approved.

The order stated that total revocation this summer would likely mean the end of greyhound racing in Arkansas since the voters statewide must approve a new franchise.

"By virtue of the current conduct (of Emprise) . . . voter approval in the foreseeable future is unlikely, and, consequently, the state will lose revenues, the innocent minority stockholders will lose their invest-

ments, trainers and breeders will lose a significant source of income and Eastern Arkansas will lose a significant industry.

"Consequently, in an effort to protect the public interest, Emprise should be afforded a reasonable opportunity to divest itself of stock qualifying it as a principal stockholder," said the order.

If, during the suspension period, Southland "shows by competent evidence" that Emprise has divested the stock, then the order will be stricken and never be admitted as evidence in any future hearings against Emprise, the order said.

Mr. Gill said it is "conceivable" a probable federal court test of the order would delay beyond next Jan. 14 any transfer of Emprise stock.

Mr. Benafield said it is "possible" that a newly constituted commission could later rescind the order. He voted in favor of an order prepared by Mr. Orsburn that was highly critical of Emprise but that concluded neither Southland nor Emprise had committed acts justifying revocation.

Show-cause hearings to evoke the franchise began in April. They were based on allegations that track officials and Emprise had concealed financial information from the state and that Emprise had engaged in business transactions with persons considered to be of "bad character."

One key factor was a Los Angeles federal indictment naming Emprise and six men for illegally concealing an interest in a Las Vegas gambling casino.

Mr. Nance told the commission Thursday that the indictment has been quashed.

The Orsburn order, defeated 3 to 2, said that if Emprise should be convicted under the indictment, then the commission should reconvene in a new hearing.

The order approved Thursday said there "certainly" have been business associations between Emprise and "persons with criminal convictions . . . which have exceeded one-half million dollars in value."

The 14-page opinion recited the long controversy between Emprise and the state and the "bickering" within Southland that culminated in the resignation of Richard C. Upton, Southland president, in February, 1970.

State investigations followed the resignation, but determined no basis for revocation. The latest hearings began this spring when the track applied for racing dates.

The order listed nine reasons for revocation, including the violation of three commission rules.

"A racing franchise is a privilege and not a right, and the state's power in regulating a privilege is so broad that it may extend to the point of total prohibition of the privileges," the order stated.

It found that Southland refused to comply with rules by not submitting requested financial information earlier this year.

"The state must regulate not only the corporate shell which holds the franchise but also the groups which control the corporation," the order said. "That is the explicit intent of the statutes and our rules."

"Therefore, any corporation must forfeit its franchise when the group controlling the corporation does not submit to regulation by the state."

The state said the argument that Southland could not obtain requested financial information from Emprise "is not an excuse for omitting the information, but instead, a compelling reason for revoking the franchise."

"The very purpose of the statutes and our rules is to look through the corporate veil to hold the real parties in interest accountable for compliance with the law, and regulation by the state."

West Memphis City Atty. R. E. "Skip" Wallin said Thursday the ruling "just tickles me. The race track will still be open, nobody

will lose their jobs, but the syndicate will be sent away."

West Memphis Mayor Tilden Rodgers was cautious in his appraisal. "That means they're not going to close it down for good," he said upon learning details of the revocation.

Lou Durteen, manager of the track, said, "I was not there (in Little Rock), I haven't talked to anybody and I just can't tell you what's going to happen. I've been here all day and all I know is what I've read over the press wires."

Mr. Upton, son of Charles J. Upton Sr. whose family owns 17 per cent of the stock, second largest to Emprise, said "I imagine they will repeal" the order, when contacted at his West Memphis home Thursday. He would make no other comment.

MR. FRED HADDAD—THE MAN AND
"THE SYSTEM"

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, during recent years we have all been besieged with complaints from those who dislike what they call "the System." Their complaints are never clearly defined. For lack of a clear definition, most Americans conclude that these complaints come from persons who lack the desire or the energy required to advance themselves within the boundaries of our established way of life.

From time to time an occasion arises which reminds us quite clearly that in the United States there actually is no "System" at all. There is a way of life secured by certain guaranteed liberties and with emphasis placed on freedom of opportunity. Whatever a man chooses to do with his life, he is free to do within the limits of law and custom. In short, "the System" does not exist of itself. It is personalized by individual people, no two of whom act in exactly the same way.

I have been reminded of this fact by an announcement just published in the press which states that one of my constituents, Mr. Fred Haddad of Charleston, W. Va., will give \$500,000 in personal gifts to an assortment of educational, religious, cultural, civic, and charitable organizations. This action by Mr. Haddad is the end product of the operations of that imaginary "System" which is daily criticized by the unproductive element found in every society. Just how Mr. Haddad reached a position which permitted him to make a personal gift of \$500,000 to these organizations is a story well worth telling.

He is the son of an immigrant from Lebanon who came to the West Virginia coalfields in 1909. His father, Mr. Nathan Haddad, applied his boundless energy to the development of a mercantile business over a span of some 40 years. He was eminently successful in all respects and acquired a richly deserved reputation as a public benefactor. It is the familiar story of the immigrant who came to these shores with a determination to succeed, and with an equal deter-

mination to distribute the benefits of his success among his neighbors.

From such a father one would expect a man like Fred Haddad, and the people of West Virginia were not to be disappointed. From a training period in his father's enterprise he moved into the retail business and in 1959 set up the first of a chain of major retail stores which now total 18 outlets in West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. His organization is still expanding, and the community acceptance earned by his establishments grows firmer each day. He has not advanced at the expense of the people with whom he deals, or the society in which he operates.

Now he is a man of considerable means but without lavish tastes. But he has inherited the public service instinct. It is part of his home training. Inevitably it comes to him that he has an obligation to show some practical concern for the affairs and interests of those who live in his community. And so we have the announcement of a \$500,000 gift.

I bring this story to the attention of my colleagues, not because I feel it is necessary to bestow public recognition or praise on Fred Haddad. This has already been done and it has been well earned. His own actions have established his stature, but I believe the point of the story is simply this: Fred Haddad, and the thousands of Americans like him, are themselves "the System." They are not an organization. They are individuals possessed with the proper amounts of ingenuity, energy, and willingness to enter into the competition for survival in the marketplace. Generally speaking, they have little interest in wealth for its own sake. They enjoy success and they like to win the daily battles which the marketplace forces them to fight, but they know that "the System" which permits full exercise of the right to enterprise is also "the System" which provides the greatest challenge to the constructive attributes of mankind, and also offers to each participant the greatest possibility for personal satisfaction through success.

In every State there are hundreds of counterparts of Fred Haddad. They are the living reminders of the principles which have operated to make this country the most powerful nation on earth. We would be well advised to remember men such as these as we consider each day legislation affecting the lives of both this and future generations.

USE OF RECYCLED PAPER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Stationery Supply Service made recycled paper available to the Members and the committees so we could give substance to our entreaties about conserving natural resources. It is my understanding that the switch to recycled paper has been rather successful thus far

and that a number of my colleagues have joined me in public commitments to use recycled paper.

But our purchases are the smallest fraction of paper used by the House. The Government Printing Office uses far more paper for bills, committee reports, and other public documents.

A case in point is H.R. 1, the bill reported from the Ways and Means Committee in May. This bill weighs in at two pounds and three ounces and since 22,000 copies of the bill were printed the total weight of this printing was 48,125 pounds. Using the standard that 1 ton of recycled paper could save 20 trees it turns out that had this bill been printed on recycled paper we could have saved 480 trees which would have been a noble and desirable accomplishment.

So, Mr. Speaker, to encourage the use of recycled paper I am today introducing a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that we should use recycled paper to the maximum extent feasible for all documents and publications of the Congress. This is a straightforward resolution and one which would make clear to the American people the depth and sincerity of the congressional desire to promote conservation of our natural resources.

If H.R. 1 cost 480 trees imagine how many forests we destroy with our public documents every year. Let us put an end to this waste.

ADDITIONAL MEDICAL BENEFITS
FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the House has served a worthy and humanitarian cause by acting favorably on H.R. 1409, authorizing additional health care for military dependents in mental hospitals.

The Armed Services Committee is to be highly commended for amending the bill to additionally provide that the costs of medical care are not increased for dependents of men who die in combat. In the last two Congresses, I have sponsored legislation to correct this inequity.

The bill provides that dependents of personnel killed by enemy action will continue to be eligible for the same medical benefits as dependents of active duty personnel for 1 year after the death of the serviceman.

Presently the dependents of deceased service personnel are provided medical care on the same basis as retired service personnel, paying one-quarter of in-hospital medical charges. Active duty personnel pay only the first \$25 of medical costs in civilian hospitals.

The inequity of this situation was demonstrated in the case of one of my constituents who was pregnant at the time her husband was killed in Vietnam. She was advised that under the present law she would have to be charged at a much higher rate for hospitalization when the baby was born.

Certainly there is something wrong with a law that subjects service families to higher hospital bills because a serviceman gave his life for his country. We have acted to correct this defect in the present law by approving the legislation before us today.

TAKE A GIANT STEP

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I, along with several of my colleagues, had the pleasure and privilege to attend the first graduation of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf held on the Gallaudet College campus. MSSD, funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is a regional high school which provides independent educational programs for deaf youths from the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.

The 12 graduating students can only be admired and commended for their persistence and courage in successfully pursuing academic study despite the serious obstacle posed by their deafness.

Some highlights of the ceremony included addresses by two of the graduates, Warren Coryell, of Philadelphia, Pa., and Carl Schroeder, of Hyattsville, Md., and a performance in the language of signs and music of the class song, "The Impossible Dream," by another of the graduates and my constituent, Susan Wallace of Lanham, Md.

Miss Nanette Fabray, noted singer, actress, and comedienne, and herself afflicted with a hearing deficiency, delivered an excellent commencement message—one which was warm, witty, optimistic, and inspiring. I insert her fine remarks into the RECORD at this point and commend it to my colleagues' attention:

TAKE A GIANT STEP

(Commencement Address by Nanette Fabray MacDougall)

(Personal greetings to those present.)

This is a beautiful day. A very, very happy day. Not only for you graduates, and your families and friends, but for me as well. I have tried many times before to come here and see you on my trips to Washington, but something always seemed to happen at the last minute. Another committee, another speech, another place to go.

But here we are at last. Together. And as your own friend Sandy Graham said in a poem I like very much: "Love is close to each other." I like that, and I feel very close to you, indeed. So it's a beautiful day.

For many weeks now, ever since I found out that I could be with you today, I have wondered what I could say to you that could equal what you have accomplished here. Nothing I can say would do justice to the work you have done, and the real triumph you represent to us all.

What can I say? Usually, at graduation ceremonies, the speaker will remember his own graduation day, the excitement of it, the joy of learning, things like that.

All I remember is the party afterwards.

Some speakers point with pride to their own school records, and pat themselves firmly

on the back for their high grades, and their determination to learn.

I seemed to flunk almost everything. Math, English composition, social studies—and there was a rumor that I wouldn't pass gym. I was even turned down for the glee club.

In all my school days, I never had a single request for a look at tomorrow's homework. Everybody knew better than to copy me. That was Hollywood High School. A few years ago I was invited back there to accept an award as a Distinguished Alumni, and walking down the hall I met one of my old teachers.

"What!" he said when he saw me, "Haven't you graduated yet?"

I'm not sure he was joking, either.

I guess the thing that hurt me most about my graduation from high school was that everybody else seemed to know exactly what they were going to do in life. They all had plans. Some of them were consumed with passion for learning, some were consumed with passion for success, some were consumed with passion for truth. Me—I was consumed with passion.

So you see, I really have no right to be here. Giving you what will be your final lesson in this school. But you can't get away, at least not until you get your diplomas. So you'll have to put up with me.

Not long ago, my little boy and I were watching a baby in the park, a cute little girl who was just beginning to walk. She'd push herself up with her hands, rock back and forth a little, then take two or three steps and down she'd go. Then she'd get up again, and do it all over. Each time she would laugh with excitement. And my son and I would laugh with her. Finally he said something I'll never forget. He said: "Walking is a big step."

In a way that is what I have come here today to tell you. Life itself is one big step after another. Sometimes you fall down. But you must laugh as that little girl did, and get up again, and go on, learning a little more about life every day of your lives, a step at a time.

Most of what I have learned—and I am still learning—happened after I graduated from high school. The reason I was such a poor student was because I was slowly becoming deaf, without knowing it. Later, when I discovered what was happening to me, when I was told that I would be totally deaf within a few years more, I thought life was over for me.

It wasn't. Here I am. With you. Like you. And like you I had to learn to live with a hearing problem. I had to learn what was really important to me. It wasn't my career, or the theatre, or being a star that really mattered to me. It was love. Love of life, of my family, love of people, love of you. Just being alive was enough for me. But I had to learn that, as you have learned, one step at a time.

The world outside these walls is not a perfect world. It never has been. Perhaps it never will be. But we will go on together, you and I and all of us, traveling on this huge space ship, rushing through the heavens all around us, toward an unknown destiny. And each of us, all our lives, small though we may be, is important in the scheme of things. Because if we are gentle with each other, patient, if we try to understand each other, one step at a time, we can change all the things that torment us, we can change the world.

We live in a time of great change. Many of us here today will not live long enough to see all those changes come to pass. You will. You are a very important part of the change that is taking place in the education of the deaf. You may not realize just how important you are. This school, your school, is an ornament to our country, a symbol of tomorrow for all those who cannot hear. It

was thought of, dreamed about, talked about, many years before you were born.

It took time, and much patience, and the work of many dedicated people, to bring us all here together today. You are the first of many, and I know all your names:

Christine Beverage, David Bugbee, Bob Casey, Warren Coryell, Christa D'Auria, Sharon Dent, Gregory Heller, Andy Parker, Ronald Paschal, Carl Schroeder, Dennise Scott, Susan Wallace.

In years to come I will not be able to say all the names of all the students who will graduate from here. But you will always be a part of this school's history. It starts with you. Walking is a big step. This is a giant step for you, and for all of us. You'll fall down, many times as all of us have. But you will get up again, I know. And like that little girl, I hope you'll laugh when you do.

You have my love, my admiration, and my very deepest congratulations. If I may, I would like very much to sing for you—I think it's a good song for this day, and if you remember the words, do them with me.

(Miss Fabray then sang and performed in the language of signs "Over the Rainbow.")

ARMANDO O. RODRIQUEZ COMMENTS ON C.R.L.A.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year, I twice spoke on the topic of California rural legal assistance. In particular, I told of State OEO Director Lewis K. Uhler's activities relative to hindering the progress of poor in attaining competent legal assistance. In response to those comments, I received an excellent letter from an interested follower of this controversial subject.

Armando O. Rodriguez, a Fresno attorney, is well qualified and capable of commenting on legal services for the poor because of his extensive background in this field. His testimony adds to the growing volume of evidence which clearly points to Mr. Uhler's professional incompetence and deliberate campaign against California's poor. The letter follows:

FRESNO, CALIF.,

June 25, 1971.

Mr. JEROME R. WALDIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. WALDIE: I have read your comments re CRLA and Mr. Uhler's activities as published in the Congressional Record for May 11, 1971 and May 24, 1971. I find your position and statements quite compatible with my own.

I have had the pleasure of serving both as a staff member of CRLA in their first operational office in Madera, and thereafter, as a member of the Board of Trustees. Before that time, I was also employed as a staff attorney for Alameda Legal Aid Society, which obtained the first "War on Poverty" Grant for Legal Services west of the Mississippi. I have also served as Legal Counsel, Board Member, and staff-member to other OEO programs.

I concur with your two-fold recommendations as to the choices available to Mr. Carlucci.

1. The immediate restoration of CRLA funds;
2. The withholding of funds from the State OEO office pending an examination of their procedure and use of funds.

In this sense, I specially commend you for your position of according Mr. Uhler the opportunity to refute the charges of mismanagement and improper diversion of OEO funds. The use of State OEO funds for investigative tactics with a view of intimidating and hindering programs instead of for assisting OEO programs through providing technical assistance, should not be condoned under any circumstances. I wish more members of the California delegation would become aware of these events and speak out.

I pledge my support to help continue those OEO programs worthy of retention. I also hope that we can provide the necessary technical assistance to those programs capable of doing a meaningful job, but for any number of reasons have faltered. Everyone in Washington must be aware that there cannot be a "perfect" program. Let us look to remedy the defects in worthwhile programs so that some lasting effect may remain from the "War on Poverty."

Very truly yours,

ARMANDO O. RODRIGUEZ,
Attorney at Law.

HOW TO GET SHOT IN ONE EASY LESSON!

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, breaking into people's homes or apartments by law-enforcement officials who do not first identify themselves is a dangerous business. It should not be sanctioned except under conditions of extreme public need relating to the contents of the premises to be searched and then only upon a showing of probability of the presence of contraband approaching a degree of proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

It should be understood that when law enforcement agents break into peoples' homes without warning they do so at the peril of being shot. Not so, of course, if they adequately identify themselves first. But, when they fail to do this and do not even dress or look like police officers or Government agents a situation can develop where America can seem more like Nazi Germany than a free nation.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of the readers of the RECORD, the following editorial from the Manchester Union Leader under date of July 8, 1971. I am requesting a complete report of this incident from the Secretary of the Treasury together with a statement of present Treasury policy with regard to such matters.

In my opinion juries cannot and probably will not convict persons who shoot people who break in on them in their homes in this fashion.

TREASURY GESTAPO AT WORK

(By William Loeb)

The other night Kenyon F. Ballew, a life member of the National Rifle Association and a Boy Scout leader and gun collector, and his wife, Sara Louise, were washing up and getting ready to go to bed. Mrs. Ballew, clad in panties, was in the apartment living room and her husband was in the bathroom washing.

Suddenly, there was a loud banging at the door and the words, "Open up. Open up."

The door was broken open and a bearded man wearing a yellow sweatshirt and carrying a handgun came in followed by a man in a striped shirt.

Mrs. Ballew screamed and Mr. Ballew emerged dripping wet from the bathroom and picked up a .44. He fired simultaneously with the raiders.

After the shots were exchanged, Mrs. Ballew saw her husband on the floor. He was bleeding from the head. Mrs. Ballew started to scream, "Get the police! Murder!" And one of the raiding party said, "We ARE the police!"

It seems that, based on the flimsiest of information that the apartment contained live hand grenades, agents of the Treasury Department, which is responsible for the enforcement of the 1968 Gun Control Act, decided to raid the Ballew home. Why they came in the dead of night and why they didn't identify themselves as the police and why they felt it was necessary to break down the door are questions that need to be answered by the Treasury Department.

All decent people are outraged by this unnecessary, stupid brutality. Such Nazi Storm Trooper-like behavior indicates not only arrogance but also utter stupidity.

As it turns out, Mr. Ballew has a responsible job as a Washington pressroom worker. He is a former Air Force military policeman. He has a fine character and no record of conviction for any crime.

This blundering performance apparently is not the first time that Treasury Department agents, operating in the middle of the night, have broken into the homes of people suspected of violating the Gun Control Act. The total number of night raids that has been admitted by the Treasury Department is 11. But, it should be 24 if the police are to be believed.

Mr. Ballew, as of this writing, has a bullet in his brain and a 40 percent chance of recovery. This is the result of this outrageous action.

Washington is the scene of numerous daily murders, assaults, rapes, etc. This fact completely justifies any defensive action that Mr. Ballew may have taken when the unidentified individuals broke down his door. The occupant of any home can only expect the worst in that atmosphere.

Undoubtedly, the Treasury Department will do its best to cover up this horrible situation, which will remind many Americans of the horrors of Nazi Germany, but it is to be hoped that the White House will not allow the Treasury Department to cover up the situation but will demand a thorough report.

It would seem that the enforcement of the 1968 Gun Control Act should be transferred to an arm of the government which would carry out its duties in a more professional fashion—and more in line with the fundamental American principle of the rights of the individual.

PRESIDENT'S JOURNEY TO PEKING

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, in my view President Nixon's announcement that he will undertake a Journey for peace to Peking is an important and exciting development. Hopefully it will facilitate negotiations to end the war in Vietnam promptly and will lead to a normalization of relations between the

United States and Peking. The effect of this announcement on the SALT talks remains to be seen, but clearly it could help reduce tensions throughout the world. In this regard, I am glad to note that the White House has kept the Soviet Union apprised of this projected trip.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I strongly commend the President for his bold initiative and great step forward that could positively affect generations to come.

JOBLESS VETERANS

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, recent figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show a slight, although heartening, decline in the rate of unemployment among veterans returning from service in Indochina. This lowered rate, positive though it may be, must not be viewed as the end of the major problem of job placement for GI's coming back to the United States after fighting for their country in Asia. The unemployment rate is still over 8 percent, a figure significantly greater than for nonveterans in the same age group.

It seems to me that when the United States asks a young man to risk his life for his country, that Nation assumes an obligation to him in simple justice to assist in his readjustment to civilian life. Even with the proof of recent Government efforts to aid the returning GI, the facts show a disturbing level of unemployment that must not be ignored by people who care about the plight of the veteran.

From the Revolutionary War to the present, more than 40 million men and women—of whom nearly 28 million are still living—have served their country during wartime.

Approximately half of our living war veterans saw service during World War II. Since that war, one out of every five persons 18 years or older is a veteran.

In fact, the ranks of my own State of Connecticut's veteran population has swelled nearly a third in the last decade to almost 440,000—with well over 62,000 of them Vietnam war veterans.

One of the deep concerns of the Congress today centers on this newest of veterans and the efforts to get him adjusted to his new role of a civilian so that he might continue to serve the Nation and society to the fullest extent of his talents and abilities. Our Nation and society will suffer if these efforts should fall short of their potential.

And one of the ways we can secure this goal is to provide meaningful and ready employment for the returning veterans.

Granted, the job picture is presently bleak. However, the National Alliance of Businessmen has recently agreed to seek 100,000 jobs for veterans next year. And, President Nixon has given a mandate to Secretary of Labor James D. Hodgson to come up with new efforts to give veterans employment or job training.

These initiatives come at a critical time. Unemployment among veterans was 8.1 percent in June as compared to 7.8 percent of the same age group of those who have not served their Nation in the military.

This Nation has always placed a high premium on patriotic military service in time of war. The innumerable benefits—from schooling to home loans—available to veterans testify to this commitment. Almost \$6 billion is spent annually on veterans' programs.

For example, veterans' costs in Connecticut for fiscal 1970 totaled an estimated \$107.5 million. According to the Veterans' Administration, \$57.9 million was paid on the claims of 58,587 living and dead veterans.

Yet, with all the spending and all the programs, our Vietnam citizen-soldier gets short shrift when it comes to finding the "medicine" he needs most in the readjustment process—a job. Because of the tight job market, extra efforts have been made to encourage veterans to take advantage of all the benefits, particularly vocational education training.

But the dire need for effective transitional assistance is not only necessary but owed to the Vietnam veterans returning to the jobless job market. Scores of bills have been introduced in the Congress toward this end, ranging from proposals to hike educational benefits more closely related to educational costs, job preferences for veterans, and training that leads to jobs.

Our newest veteran is deserving of all the help—help to himself—that our Nation can give him. For in the end, it is society itself which shares in such rich profits.

So, making life better for our veterans is everyone's job.

GROWING SCANDAL OF ELECTION COSTS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that campaign spending limitations are absolutely necessary. Without them we will continue to have high-cost campaigns which allow special interests to gain increasing importance in the political process.

In a recent editorial, the Milwaukee Journal observed that the cost of elections "is going up faster than anything else in these inflationary days and has reached the point of scandal."

The editorial concluded:

Ability, not money, must be the major basis for electing the public officials in a democracy. Our present system operates on money. Carried on at the present rising rate of expenditure, it will lead to worse scandal.

The editorial follows:

GROWING SCANDAL OF ELECTION COSTS

The cost of elections is going up faster than anything else in these inflationary days and has reached the point of scandal. The total reported cost of the 1968 elections was \$300 million and that, as the Citizens Re-

search Foundation on political spending points out, is only the peak of the iceberg. No one really knows the total cost.

Officially Richard Nixon spent \$9.02 million for radio-television time in 1968 and Hubert Humphrey officially spent \$4.2 million. However, records of the Federal Communications Commission show that radio-television stations were paid \$12.6 million by the Nixon forces and \$6.1 million by Humphrey's. Untold millions are expended by false-front committees that never get reported.

The 1968 total expenditure of about \$100 million to elect a president compares with \$60 million in 1964. And President Eisenhower was a bargain. In 1952 the presidential election expenditure totals—as officially reported—came to \$11.6 million.

Big contributors rose in numbers in 1968, too. Mrs. John D. Rockefeller gave \$1,482,625 to the presidential nomination campaign of her stepson, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, and had to pay a gift tax of \$900,000 on it in addition. Clement Stone of Chicago gave \$700,000 to candidates, \$500,000 of it to Nixon. Loans and contributions from just 50 people financed half of Humphrey's campaign.

There are serious implications in many of these large gifts. A big proportion comes from business interests and big labor. The true cost of an election also includes the eventual payoffs in contracts, special tax breaks, the overlooking of privately administered prices, lax enforcement of laws and patronage. In the latter case—and this is not new in our system—10 men who gave \$300,000 altogether to the Nixon campaign are now ambassadors. Money runs politics, and men without it or unable to get it can't compete.

The answer is stricter legislation governing campaign spending and contributions. An attempt to put curbs on rising radio-television spending was vetoed last year by Nixon. Now Congress is bogged down in trying to write a broader law. Any effective measure must put limits on individual contributions, and provide effective means of policing them. The Corrupt Practices Act now limits individual contributions to \$5,000, but two loans of \$240,000 each to the Humphrey campaign made by two individuals were handed to a lawyer who was not considered a political committee. He divided them up into \$5,000 lots for 48 separate committees. Such subterfuge must be ended.

It is time to consider seriously some form of public support for campaigns—such as free radio-television time, free mailing, and even direct financial aid for other purposes. Limits should be put on radio-television and some of the other costly forms of reaching people.

Ability, not money, must be the major basis for electing the public officials in a democracy. Our present system operates on money. Carried on at the present rising rate of expenditure, it will lead to worse scandal.

TRIBUTE TO MISS VICTORIA NOZERO

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to extend my congratulations to an outstanding young lady, Miss Victoria Nozero, of Anaheim, Calif. Miss Nozero, whose 25th birthday was Wednesday, has, through many accomplishments and deeds too numerous to mention, set an excellent example for the

many young people of her generation who reside in my district.

I have long felt that young people of exceptional and particular talents should be recognized, and I am most happy to so honor Miss Nozero today.

VOLUNTOWN'S 250TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, in this bicentennial era, it seems significant that four towns in my home State of Connecticut will celebrate centennials. One of these, Voluntown, a small community in my district, will begin a week-long 259th birthday anniversary next week—July 24–August 1. I am proud to take this opportunity to salute the people of Voluntown on this significant occasion in their history.

In 1969, a plot of land was designated to be the reward for gallant Connecticut fighters in the Narragansett War. A pirate's treasure is reportedly buried somewhere nearby. And George Washington slept in a house in what is now Voluntown, Conn.

This is all part of the history of Voluntown, which this week celebrates its 250th anniversary as an incorporated town. Dating back to the late 17th century, Voluntown was once controlled by unfriendly Indians. In 1696, a grant was given to Lt. Thomas Lefingwell of Norwich and Sgt. John Frink of Stonington "that they with the rest of the English volunteers in the former wars might have a plantation granted to them," and a plot 6 miles square, to be taken from conquered Indians' lands, was allotted.

The town, originally called Volunteers town, became a reality in 1700, and was incorporated in the Colony of Connecticut in 1721.

Voluntown has a long and rich history in my State. Located on the eastern border of Connecticut, near Rhode Island, the town has managed to preserve its character despite the heavy industrialization of much of the rest of the State. In fact, the latest census count still shows just 1,450 residents of this poultry and dairy farming area of Connecticut.

Voluntown, one of four Connecticut towns celebrating centennials this year, is the smallest, and oldest of the group. Other communities with birthdays this year are Beacon Falls and Newington—both 100 years old—and Winchester, 200 years old.

Voluntown has had a past with which any community would be proud. Responding to the call of the American Revolution, this tiny town, founded in a heritage of service to its Nation, sent men to fight immediately following the Battle of Lexington. In 1777, the town was reimbursed by the colony for the \$141 spent to send the troops.

A schoolhouse in 1737, a church in 1731, and industry by 1814 all display the tone of life in Voluntown in its early

days, a tone it continues through our day, scarcely tainted by the burdens of modern urban life.

This week the people of the community of Voluntown will be celebrating their anniversary recognizing their town as a comfortable and peaceful place to live for people during the past 250 years. Events such as lumbering, square dancing, and business and industrial displays will highlight this weeklong birthday party.

The people, the town, and the way of life of Voluntown, represent the ideals and aspirations of all of this country. I congratulate this community for its glorious past and give it best wishes for an equally successful future.

MODEL CITIES

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the fourth of a series of articles concerning Model Cities that recently appeared in the Atlanta Constitution:

QUESTION IS, WHO'S IN CHARGE HERE?

(By Duane Riner)

Model Cities has the money—\$7.2 million a year.

It enters into contracts with agencies to perform services for residents.

Then it has no power over those agencies beyond persuasion and their own willingness to cooperate.

It's a strange setup in which the clout of the Model Cities executive director is nil unless the mayor and Board of Aldermen are willing to give him some of theirs.

Or, as Emory University sociology professor Alvin Boskoff put it, Model Cities "is in effect a bystander rather than a participant—but it is responsible, despite a lack of suitable authority and power to discharge such responsibility."

Model Cities executive director Johnny C. Johnson was pictured by one official of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as having nothing but a "well of good will" as a tool with which to coordinate the 28 public and private agencies under contract to provide housing, educational opportunities, transportation, job-training—the whole bag of services.

The official, who declined to be identified, also wondered whether Johnson's well had run dry.

Last February Mayor Sam Massell and the Board of Aldermen reasserted their dominance over the foundering Model Cities program.

Many officials at HUD felt it was high time. A key element of the Model Cities concept is citizen participation. But at some point, the continuing forum must reduce its din long enough for decisions to be made.

And the only body capable of making decisions and issuing orders that will be heeded is the aldermanic board.

Edward H. Baxter, regional director of HUD, doesn't knock citizen input. He notes, however, that there is a tendency "on the part of each individual to think there is no citizen participation unless his opinion prevails."

Baxter adds: "You get to a point where you have to get a consensus and officials have to act. Planning on and on without executing is rather meaningless."

Massell was asked why the city decided to grab the reins of Model Cities and why he hasn't done it during the first year of his administration.

"It was a realization of the shortcomings which weren't apparent last year," Massell replied in an interview.

"I had anticipated all along that the program, because of its complexities, would have a stumbling period, an adjustment period, and I was aware of the dissatisfaction," the mayor added.

Massell said he intends to accelerate City Hall involvement in the Model Cities program and described the aldermanic board's action in asserting its authority as "just a matter of equity" because it wasn't fair for Model Cities residents to be saddled with the failures.

The new brand of City Hall concern was demonstrated Tuesday when Massell called together local and federal officials in an attempt to find out why the Model Cities housing program has stalled.

Johnson describes himself as a "psuedo, quasi-coordinator" but acknowledges that unless some housing gets off the ground pretty soon, "somebody's head is going to roll, and it may be mine."

In fact, Johnson says that unless his pledge of 530 housing unit starts is not well on the way toward being met before his November deadline, "I shall be fired or resigned because the pressure is going to be there. I shall have stepped on enough toes before November that something must give."

Massell, who has made some unkept housing pledges of his own in the Model Cities area, commented, "I have supported Johnny and will continue to do so, and I have confidence that if he sets a goal there's a good possibility it will be met."

Massell admits that meeting the pledge of 530 housing starts will be "very difficult, and I'm not any more satisfied with the state of affairs that he (Johnson) is."

Dan E. Sweat, the city's chief administrative officer, was the author of the citizen participation structure of the Model Cities program. He frankly acknowledges that it "got too far away from City Hall."

At one point, even some aldermen were under the impression that they had nothing to do with Model Cities.

One alderman said, "we don't have any responsibilities for Model Cities," Sweat recounted. "I said, 'Hell, you've got all the authority.'"

He described Massell as "very reluctant" to make any move that would seem to take control away from citizens.

And Sweat says he was called "every sort of redneck racist" when the Board of Aldermen finally did express its authority.

Yet, according to Sweat, "some of the aldermen still don't feel Model Cities is part of city government."

Massell and Sweat said recent efforts to strengthen City Hall's grip on Model Cities were spurred in part by high-level HUD officials.

Now that the city government has taken a grip on Model Cities, here's what it faces, in the opinion of Johnny Johnson:

"Housing is the most important decision this city has to make because the failure to deliver on that promise is going to bust this community wide open. The only thing keeping the temperament of the community down is that promise, and once that hope disappears, this city's got a real problem on its hands and it's going to know about it."

Model Cities residents can't understand, he says, "how you can plan for schools and housing at the same time, and you've got two schools coming up out of the ground and no house. Over 600 housing units have been taken out of the market and not a single house has been built."

Johnson said more than 300 housing units

were demolished through city code enforcement and an equal number removed through Housing Authority acquisition.

"They (the residents) will not tolerate any longer for us to clear land and let it stand vacant two or three years."

PLANS TO EXPAND AIRPORT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, to cope with a passenger flow projected to reach an annual 27 million by 1990—almost four times what it is today—Philadelphia's Director of Commerce S. Harry Galfand today unveiled the initial development plans for a multimillion dollar, step-by-step expansion of the Philadelphia International Airport. He said:

This is a tremendous investment in the economic development of our city. These designs will meet the anticipated growth of passenger and air cargo in the next 40 years.

When completed in 1990, the new facility will have:

Eight new terminals and 87 gates equipped to accommodate jumbo jets.

An additional 10,000 foot runway.

A series of connecting garages, and parking for 21,000 cars.

A rapid transit link to Center City.

An intra-terminal transit system.

A direct connection to the adjoining interstate network.

Philadelphia's Deputy Director of Commerce for Aviation, William Burns, and a specialist team led by architects of Vincent G. Kling and Partners designed the transportation city. The "multi-modal" design solves the most pressing problems facing airport planners today. Accessibility, parking, pedestrian traffic and baggage handling.

The new airport will be easily accessible by mass transit or auto; parking facilities will adjoin the terminal complex, and will be linked by free-flowing pedestrian corridors. Ticketing and baggage handling facilities will be located in spacious, uncongested areas. Vincent G. Kling says:

People movement is the prime design consideration. The passenger will have vehicles for lateral movement throughout the terminal. Provisions are being made for secondary movers, such as magic carpet systems now under development, that will effortlessly speed the passenger to his destination.

From the door of his house to the door of the airplane, this transportation center has been designed with the passenger in mind.

The design concept emphasizes a totally integrated transportation system, tying interstate highway and mass transit directly to the ticketing area and flight pavilion. A high-speed rapid transit link to 30th Street Station and Center City will connect the airport to the extensive suburban rail network and Philadelphia's subway system.

An interstate interchange at the airport, and new access roads, will provide the air traveler with maximum flexibility achieved through design cooperation

from the city department of streets and State department of transportation.

The overall traffic flow system makes Philadelphia International Airport accessible from southern New Jersey, the Wilmington area, and Philadelphia suburbs. Vincent Kling's partner-in-charge Dan Kopple says:

With this integrated system, we are trying to anticipate those changes.

Construction of interim facilities was completed early last year. It included new steel panel loading lounges which flank existing fingers on the airport's second level, and an increase in the number of gates from 27 to 39. The present terminal is being modified to ease traffic flow, and provide additional baggage facilities.

Construction of connecting roadways, the new mass transit system, two new terminal units and three new baggage claim units make up the next construction phase. Scheduled to begin in late 1971, it will cost about \$100 million. During this phase, gates will be increased to 60.

An economical, modular design approach to airport construction has been adopted. The terminal complex is one of simple shapes utilizing precast concrete and prepackaged mechanical systems, all of which will speed erection time and reduce costs.

The master plan features a continuum of eight two-story terminal units and six-story garages linked by a transportation street. A series of pedestrian corridors, perpendicular to the street and on the airport's second level, connect all passenger elements.

When completed, each major airline will have its own parking facility, baggage claim area, ticketing center, and flight pavilion—all linked by the transportation bridge. By 1990, there will be parking facilities for 21,000 cars—almost three times today's capacity.

Arriving by plane, a passenger will walk through the terminal area along the pedestrian corridor to escalators where he can descend to a lower level and rapid transit trains for the 30th Street station or to the baggage claim area and the parking garage, taxi stand, and limousine service beyond.

Three multilane, limited access roadways will link the adjacent interstate highway to the airport. Outbound passengers, arriving by car, will drive directly to the terminal on an enplaning roadway. A separate garage ramp will lead to an airport parking facility. Inbound passengers, leaving by taxi, bus, or car will depart by a separate deplaning roadway.

Philadelphia International is an airport of the future planned to serve the Delaware Valley region and designed to meet the needs of the next 40 years. While providing for regional demands, it will also attract a greater share of a growing international air traffic market.

As Galfand puts it:

Roads and waterways will remain important, but airways have become the prime arteries. Our airport is the principal portal of the Philadelphia region; it is vital to the economic and social progress of our city.

VEYSEY INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO ALLOW CALIFORNIA TO ENFORCE STRICT AUTOMOBILE EMISSION STANDARDS

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation amending the Federal Clean Air Act, to clarify California's right to enforce new, stringent automobile emission standards, without undue Federal interference.

California has pioneered this Nation's war against air pollution. In fact, much of the legislation, and most of the programs now in effect at the Federal level, came directly from efforts and research originating in California.

In 1967, the U.S. Senate formally noted this fact, when by a vote of 88 to 0 that body passed a measure, authored by Senator George Murphy, allowing California to set and enforce antipollution standards more stringent than Federal standards. The Murphy amendment directed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to recognize California's leadership in the environmental field, and it pointed out the Nation's dependence on that leadership.

Since that time, however, the Environmental Protection Agency has succeeded HEW in administering our antipollution programs. And the EPA recently refused California's request to enforce our new automobile emission standards—the strictest standards anywhere in the country.

The EPA was set up to crack down on pollution, and in most areas, it is performing admirably. However, by this decision—by adhering to the pleas of special interest groups—the EPA is forging a policy which will be a severe blow to all Californians, and to our efforts to combat our critical smog problem.

Even more serious, this EPA decision, if allowed to prevail, will deny to the Nation California's continued leadership in the fight against air pollution of all kinds.

My legislation will clarify and reaffirm the principle established by the Congress in 1967.

Under that principle, California has continued to serve as a bellweather for this country's efforts to preserve our environment.

The standards California developed prior to 1967 became the basis for the Federal Air Quality Act's provisions to control auto emissions. Now, using new experience and technology, California has adopted new, improved, and more stringent limits on automobile emissions.

Mr. Speaker, it was clearly the intent of Congress, under the Murphy amendment, to allow California to continue to move ahead in this area. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was given the right to review California's proposed standards, but the language of the provision—now 42 USCA 1857f-6A(b)—was "the Secretary shall, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, waive

application of this section", not "the Secretary may." Congress clearly intended the burden of this section to fall on the Federal Government—not on the State of California. The fact that the EPA has succeeded HEW, in administering this provision, certainly does not change the intent of Congress.

The report of the Senate Public Works Committee on the Air Quality Act, issued July 15, 1967, makes this doubly clear. I quote:

On the question of preemption, representatives of the State of California were clearly opposed to displacing that State's right to set more stringent standards to meet peculiar local conditions. The auto industry conversely was adamant that the nature of their manufacturing mechanism required a single national standard in order to eliminate undue economic strain on the industry.

The committee has taken cognizance of both of these points of view. Senator Murphy convinced the committee that California's unique problems and pioneering efforts justified a waiver of the preemption section to the State of California. As a result, the committee incorporated in section 202(b) a waiver amendment offered by Senator Murphy. It is true that, in the 15 years that auto emission standards have been debated and discussed, only the State of California has demonstrated compelling and extraordinary circumstances sufficiently different from the Nation as a whole to justify standards on automobile emissions which may, from time to time, need be more stringent than national standards.

The situation may change. Other regions of the Nation may develop air pollution situations related to automobile emissions which will require standards different from those applicable nationally. The committee expects the Secretary to inform the Congress of any such situation in order that expansion or change in the existing waiver provision may be considered.

Until such time as additional problems of this type arise it seemed appropriate that the waiver provision of subsection (b) should be limited solely to California. This approach can have several positive values:

1. Most importantly California will be able to continue its already excellent program to the benefit of the people of that State.
2. The Nation will have the benefit of California's experience with lower standards which will require new control systems and design. In fact California will continue to be the testing area for such lower standards and should those efforts to achieve lower emission level be successful it is expected that the Secretary will, if required to assure protection of the national health and welfare, give serious consideration to strengthening the Federal standards.
3. In the interim periods when California and the Federal Government have differing standards, the general consumer of the Nation will not be confronted with increased costs associated with new control systems.
4. The industry, confronted with only one potential variation, will be able to minimize economic disruption and therefore provide emission control systems at lower costs to the people of the Nation.

The intent and the benefits to the Nation are clear. But today somehow the tables have been turned. The environmental Protection Agency now places the burden on California to show cause why its new improved standards should not be disapproved.

I am not surprised that this has been tried since California's progress in this field has always been unpopular with those who would prefer to go slow on pollution abatement.

A Wall Street Journal article quoted a nameless "Federal expert" as saying that if California was granted the waiver the Federal Government would be under strong political pressures to tighten Federal requirements. The Federal expert was quoted as saying:

The question is if this is feasible for California, why not for the rest of the Country?

I would say to this Federal expert and others like him, that he ought to spend some time studying legislative history and the intent of the Congress. Congress intended that the waiver be granted to California could continue to be the Nation's pacesetter in pollution control. I might add further, as serious as the pollution problem is, a little pressure to improve air pollution control across the country would not hurt.

No, it is not surprising that this slowdown has been tried, but it would be intolerable if we put up with it.

California's smog problem is unique. Our combination of topography, low wind speeds, atmospheric inversions, sunlight, and concentration of people and automobiles is suffocating us with the most severe photochemical smog in the world. Our struggle against pollution, has actually become a struggle for survival. I am convinced that Californians are today dying of air pollution.

Today, California has one out of every nine automobiles in the Nation—one out of every 18 in the world. And within the next 30 years our consumption of automobile fuel will be tripled, if current trends continue.

Smog is not only killing people, it is killing our economy and our plant and animal life. The University of California has estimated that agricultural and native vegetation suffers a staggering \$200 million loss each year because of air pollution in California.

Today, children in Riverside cannot play outside on many summer days, without endangering their health. High school and college athletic teams in Southern California are often forced to practice indoors when smog alerts are sounded.

Recently, I received a letter from a young boy in Riverside. Its poignant plea was penetratingly simple. He said:

We are mad because pollution is killing babies and people. We are so sad, Mr. Congressman, time is running out. The "red coats" are coming.

Recently there was an article in the newspaper about grade school children in the area south of Chicago's loop drawing pictures in art classes. In the last three years the sun no longer appears. Before, there was always a bright smiling sun in the sky. No longer. There is no sun in the pictures now. It is frightening to realize that children today accept pollution as a natural part of their environment.

The question "What ever happened to Clean air" is no longer asked by isolated voices of concern in California. The citi-

zens of my State are almost one voice crying out in rising crescendo against the attack on the State's beauty and against the impairment of the quality of life.

No one can argue that California does not need stricter antipollution laws than other parts of the country. No one can argue that California has not pioneered breakthroughs, which have formed the basis for our nationwide antipollution efforts.

My legislation would simply restore and reaffirm California's right to lead the antipollution campaign. Our own self-preservation depends on having that capability, without interference or censure from the Federal Government or special interests.

I call on my colleagues from California and across the country to join with me in reasserting the intent of Congress that the Nation have the benefit of California's leadership in this field, and that automobile pollution abatement proceed as rapidly as technically possible.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 19, 1971

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation once again observes Captive Nations Week, first marked in 1959 as a result of a congressional resolution.

During the past 12 years four Presidents, many Governors, mayors, and other public officials have joined in the annual effort to call public attention to the plight of these peoples of East and central Europe.

During the past year there was the open protest in Poland last December when the Polish workers took to the streets to protest against their low standard of living. The toll of these incidents was 44 dead and 1,165 wounded.

The upheavals led to the downfall of Gomulka, and when further work stoppages occurred at the beginning of 1971, the new regime of Edward Gierek finally rescinded the December price increase directive that had triggered the protest.

These events in Poland have again brought into sharp focus the utter inability of communism to satisfy the material and spiritual needs and demands of the people.

As the 92d Congress convened last January, I reintroduced legislation to create a special Committee on Captive Nations. I have sought to have hearings on the measure, because I feel that a special committee could bring the plight of these people to public attention in a most impressive manner.

The goal of the Soviets at the present time is the maintenance of the status quo. In pressing for the convocation of a European conference on their terms, the Communists hope to put a final stamp of legality on their hegemony over east-central Europe as announced in the

notorious Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include the text of the Captive Nations Week Manifesto of 1971:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO 1971

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year is designated as Captive Nations Week.

The observance of this year's Captive Nations Week comes just seven months after the start of a chain of momentous events in Poland. In December, 1970, Polish workers took to the streets of many of Poland's cities—in open protest against the Gomulka regime's edict that had placed an intolerable burden on their already low standard of living. The toll of these food riots, according to the regime's figures, was, 45 dead and 1,165 wounded.

The upheavals led to Gomulka's downfall, and, when fresh work stoppages broke out in January and February of this year, the new regime of Edward Gierek rescinded the December price-increase directive. A shakeup in Poland's Communist Party, which had come in the wake of the December developments, indicates that the last word on the changes in Poland has yet to come.

The Polish events have again brought into sharp focus the inability of communism to satisfy the spiritual and material needs and demands of the people.

Communist regimes, backed by Soviet military power, have ruled over the countries of East and Central Europe for over two decades. The balance sheet of their tenure in power offers undeniable grounds for an indictment for tyranny, insensitivity and incompetence. In East and Central Europe, the Communists have systematically trampled upon human rights, have brooked no opposition and have established themselves as the sole font of wisdom and power.

Yet, political repression notwithstanding, the Communist regimes have been unable to "compensate" for their use of harsh tactics and methods by providing the people a decent standard of living. In divided Europe, the gap in the quality of life between its western and eastern parts has been widening with each passing year. The Communists have thus given the people of East and Central Europe the short end of the stick in both key sectors: in politics and personal life, the watchword is oppression and denial of inalienable rights; in the standard of living, the increase has been negligible—especially compared to the gains registered by other nations over the corresponding period.

The developments in Poland are but the latest in a series of dramatic proofs of popular discontent against Communist rule. Over the past 15 years, we have witnessed the Poznan riots and Polish October in 1956, the tragic but heroic Hungarian Revolution, also in 1956, and the "Czechoslovak Spring" in 1968. There have been other less publicized demonstrations of true popular sentiment in all the captive countries.

The message is clear. The people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania oppose Communist tyranny. Their aspirations and objectives are the same as those of all freedom-loving people in the world: the right to chart their own future; national sovereignty and self-determination; respect for and observance of their fundamental human rights; and a chance to rejoin, as free and equal partners, the family of nations.

We believe that a lasting peace in Europe, and the world, can come only after the captive nations have regained their freedom and national independence. As long as there are men and nations in bondage, the quest for a

genuine relaxation of tensions is bound to prove fruitless. A world half slave, half free remains a breeding ground for endless conflict. A community of free nations, on the other hand, is the best guarantee for the advent of true international comity, closer cooperation, and a just peace.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during or after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania.

We further stress that the Communist regimes in East and Central Europe continue to flaunt the will of the people by denying them the right to free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, their support of the right to self-determination for all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the U-nited Nations.

2. To raise, at international meetings and conferences, the issue of the denial of fundamental human rights to the peoples of East and Central Europe.

3. To reject any and all attempts by the USSR and the other Communist regimes to secure even a tacit recognition of the *status quo* in East and Central Europe, since such recognition would deal a staggering blow to the hopes of the captive peoples of regaining their freedom and independence.

4. To voice their opposition, on all appropriate occasions, to the methods of force and threats and intimidation used by the Communist regimes in their effort to continue holding East and Central Europe in bondage.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 18-24, their awareness of the importance of the fate of 100 million East and Central Europeans to mankind's long quest for world peace and justice.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,

Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

VASIL GERMENJI,

Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

THE NEED FOR DECLASSIFICATION

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent publication of the Pentagon Papers has helped to show Members of Congress and the American public how overclassified these documents were. Thousands of other documents in the Department of Defense and other related agencies of the Government are likewise overclassified.

Last month I introduced a resolution calling for a joint, bipartisan committee—to be known as the Joint Committee on Freedom of Information—to investigate classification procedures in Government.

Hearings will soon be held on H.R. 9853, a bill jointly introduced by Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT and Representative LESLIE ARENDS, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the ranking minority member, to set

up a national commission on security information. Hopefully, these upcoming hearings will provide a forum to openly discuss the overclassification question.

However, perhaps the greatest need for the declassification of information is right here in Congress. For example, the manner in which closed committee hearings are declassified varies from committee to committee. All too often while reading the printed report of a committee's closed hearings, one comes upon "... " which means that the information has been deleted for national security reasons. Who decides that the deleted information vitally affects our national security? Sometimes it is the committee chairman who on his own initiative and based on his own judgment of what constitutes a breach of national security, deletes this information from the printed hearings.

Such a procedure blatantly disregards the public right to know and acts so as to deny to the public and to Members of Congress themselves basic information they need to participate effectively in the democratic process.

In this connection I would like to insert into the RECORD the article "A Standard for Declassification?" by Walter Pincus, a distinguished newspaper reporter and a former chief investigator for the Symington subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The article from the Washington Post, July 16, 1971, follows:

A STANDARD FOR DECLASSIFICATION?

(By Walter Pincus)

Although the debate still goes on as to whether The New York Times, The Washington Post and other newspapers should have published the Pentagon Papers or excerpts from them, there appears to be almost unanimous agreement that not only these documents but thousands like them are overclassified. Authorities ranging from former Under Secretary of State George Ball to former Defense Department security officer William Florence have come forward to say that up to 99.5 per cent of material now classified should be declassified. Such statements are bound to compound public confusion and cynicism unless there are changes in the system, not only to establish some outside influence over it but to make it less restrictive and more rational.

The harder question remains: How do you declassify? Who has that authority, the Executive or Congress or both? What machinery can be established to guarantee the fullest flow of information both to the Congress and the public in this traditionally sensitive area of foreign/military policy?

No substantial long term reforms can be expected if the administration does not support them—for classification begins within the Executive branch. *In camera*, a special interagency committee is at work revising the security classification system. White House and Defense Department officials have insisted that the current review was initiated by the President last winter and in no way is related to the disclosures of the Pentagon Papers.

No doubt there are elements of truth and deception in that statement. With the trial of Daniel Ellsberg coming up, the administration can hardly put itself in the position of suddenly moving on the problem of overclassification while at the same time trying to convict a man for releasing "top secret" documents that he says were overclassified. Thus it is doubtful there will be much movement in the near future from the Exec-

utive, except to tighten up on security procedures as they did in the case of the Rand Corporation.

Congress does not have that problem. But it has many of its own. The major one is apparent lack of interest among senior members. Of the seven committees with prime responsibilities in the national security areas, only one—the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—has shown any concern with the overclassification question. Armed Services, Appropriations, Joint Atomic, and House Foreign Affairs have yet to be heard from.

Of the committees with oversight or secondary legislative responsibilities, only two subcommittees—one in House Government Operations under Rep. William Moorhead (D-Pa.) and the other, from Senate Judiciary, under Sen. Sam Ervin (D-N.C.)—have taken up the classification problem in the wake of the Pentagon Papers disclosures.

The fact is that key committee chairmen and perhaps a majority of the House and Senate don't want to get involved in the question of classification. It has little public appeal and carries with it the potential political threat that a member is seeking to spread on the record secrets that could help an enemy nation.

A second problem for Congress is simply what to legislate in this area. Currently the entire process from classification through declassification rests in the hands of the Executive. Congress passed the Espionage Act and some amendments. They provide only the broadest of frameworks for Executive Order 10501 and the myriad regulations that flow from it in the various agencies and departments.

Although they are questionable and oft-times confusing, the administration at least has some classification standards—Congress has none. The manner in which closed hearings are declassified varies from committee to committee, senator to senator. For example, the House Appropriations Committee recently released its hearings on the Defense Department's military personnel budget. At one point the question was asked about special pay in the U.S. Marines budget for support of Free World forces to the tune of \$1 million for officers and \$6.7 million for enlisted men.

"This program is for the payment of overseas allowances and clothing issued to the officers and men of the Marine Brigade . . ." was the reply printed. The "... " meant information had been deleted. Later a question was raised about \$3.2 million in the Marine budget for subsistence for Free World forces. The answer: "This subsistence is for the . . . located in Vietnam." What was the mystery? You can find the answer in the Senate Foreign Relation Committee's Symington subcommittee hearings on the Korean forces in Vietnam over a year earlier. In those hearings the administration cleared for publication detailed information of American payments of overseas allowances and subsistence to what then was a 3,000-man Korean Marine force serving in Vietnam. A year later that same information appears to be deleted from the House hearings. Why?

One reason may be that the House committee has no desire to put that information on the record. Another may be that the declassification process followed by the House committee does not take into consideration—or more likely is unaware of—material already cleared in earlier hearings released by other committees.

There is little chance that Congress could legislate a common declassification standard. But a measure could be passed that set up a standard declassification procedure which would guarantee to individual members or committees an opportunity to push declassification to the fullest with a staff trained to do just that.

Today, when a senator wants to draft a bill he goes to the Legislative Counsel's of-

vice and receives guidance on how best to phrase language to accomplish his purpose. That office (and a similar one exists in the House) is staffed by trained professionals experienced in the intricate art of legislative language and precedent.

A similar small group of professionals could be developed to handle declassification problems. They could provide the institutional memory for Congress of what has already been declassified—a capability that is now missing. They could comment on the administration's proposed deletions and aid in the negotiation for further declassification.

The Congress could also establish a procedure through which the administration's position on a classified matter could be challenged. One method might be to require the individual legislator or committee seeking to declassify a matter to get the support of two-thirds of his own body. A senator, for example, who failed to get satisfactory administration declassification of a document could call a closed session of the Senate, argue his case and seek support for his position. If he receives it, as in cases now of congressional contempt, the matter could then be put to the courts. The administration would be forced to make a positive showing, first in the closed Senate session, and later in the courts, on the specific manner in which release of the information would harm national security. The initial negotiation process and the requirement for two-thirds support would make certain purely political gestures would be eliminated and only those few critical issues would be forced into the courts.

Certainly there is room for variations for this suggestion. What can't be questioned is the need for Congress to move in this area. As Justice Potter Stewart observed in his perceptive concurring opinion in the recent court case, "... the hallmark of a truly effective internal security system would be the maximum possible disclosure, recognizing that secrecy can best be preserved only when credibility is truly maintained."

**THE PEACE CORPS RETURNEES:
"YOU CAN CHANGE THINGS"**

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, for a whole generation of young Americans, the Peace Corps has been a symbol of selfless service and dedication to the brotherhood of man. Begun by President Kennedy, it has served to channel the energy and idealism of tens of thousands of volunteers into helping people around the world build a better life.

Nothing creates good will between nations better than the kind of direct and personal contacts between their people that is promoted by the Peace Corps. One new school in a Latin American village, built with the help of American volunteers, can create more genuine good will than high-level diplomacy could ever hope to achieve.

Although the Peace Corps has had its problems over the past several years, partly due to the Vietnam war and partly due to increased awareness of our own domestic problems, its mission is still unfinished. And those thousands who have

served as Peace Corps volunteers continue to demonstrate the spirit of service and involvement. The Peace Corps has left them with a special kind of dedication.

Last week in the Louisville Courier Journal I read an article about a few young volunteers who illustrate this point well. Creighton Mershon and Delmar McCarley, both former volunteers in Venezuela, now work in the office of Louisville Mayor Frank Burke. Rose Grenough, who served in Colombia, was until recently a public assistance worker. Camille Erwin, a former volunteer in Malaysia, is a summer schoolteacher at Catherine Spalding College. James Skelton, once a volunteer in Ecuador, now serves with the rehabilitation services bureau of the Kentucky Department of Education.

Geoffrey Morris, a Louisville lawyer, served in Sierra Leone and hopes to run for public office. Charles Blau, a University of Louisville law student, is already running for public office in Jeffersonville. His wife, Cile is a teacher—they met as volunteers in Morocco. Kathy Beirne, of Cincinnati, spent 2 years on the tiny Pacific island of Fassarai. And Barkley Moore, of Lexington, holds the Peace Corps record for service—6 years and 4 months in Iran. He now works for the Peace Corps here in the United States, and hopes to go into social work.

The experience of all these people has shown the kind of lesson of involvement that being a Peace Corps volunteer has taught these young people. As Delmar McCarley put it:

You can't change the world, but you can change things that will help.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the article by Leah Larkin in a recent edition of the Courier about these fine young Americans:

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS COME HOME TO INVOLVEMENT
(By Leah Larkin)

Ten years ago this month, the first group of Peace Corps volunteers completed their training program. In August, 1961, they left for Ghana where they spent two years as secondary school teachers.

Since then, approximately 45,000 Americans—mostly young, college graduates—have given two years of voluntary service through the Peace Corps. They have served some 60 economically underdeveloped countries in Latin America, Africa, the Near East, Asia and the Pacific.

Most of them spent their term working in community development or teaching. They immersed themselves in another culture. They spoke a foreign language, ate different food and practiced strange customs. They lived and worked with the poor and tried to instigate change.

Often it was frustrating. Frequently it was discouraging. Almost always it was rewarding.

Then they came home—back to the land of color TVs and telephones, sleek, shiny cars and super highways, hamburgers and hot dogs. It was strange at first. Just as it had taken time to adjust to the language, the stares, the poverty and disease in their host country, it took time to re-adjust to America.

The Peace Corps experience is special. Whether the volunteers come back embracing the stars and stripes or disillusioned with the United States, they are changed persons. Whether their two years were filled with

satisfying accomplishments or a succession of frustrations, most likely they would do it again.

If there is one thing that returned volunteers agree on, it's this: The experience did more for them than they did for the host country.

Just what did the experience do for the volunteers? How did it change them? What happens to volunteers when they come home?

The Peace Corps has conducted studies on returned volunteers. Research shows that the experience influences many to seek social service-type careers or teaching positions, work similar to that they did abroad. According to statistics, 51 per cent of former volunteers go back to school, 20 per cent go into teaching, 20 per cent into social service-type work, 4 per cent into business, and the remaining 5 per cent divided among government, law and other professions.

Ten former volunteers were interviewed in the Louisville area. Of the 10, five went back to school after returning from the Peace Corps, although only one is in school now. There are teachers. Four work in social service oriented fields. One is in government and one practices law.

Camille Erwin, 27, served as a volunteer in Malaysia (1967-'69) and now teaches summer school at Spalding College, from where she was graduated. She sees returned volunteers as "subtle, quiet radicals." They don't talk about tearing down the establishment, but changing it."

After spending two years among the poor, struggling to generate change, it is not surprising that returned volunteers are still committed to help their fellow man and that they want to work for positive changes in our society.

Several of those interviewed hope to become involved and work to improve American society through government and politics.

Geoffrey Morris, 29, went to the University of Louisville School of Law after serving as a volunteer in Sierra Leone (1965-'67). He now practices law in Louisville with the Alan N. Leibson law firm, but he is committed to service.

"You've got to be in a position of power before you can do any good for your fellow man. I would like to work within the political system. Someday I will run for office. If not, I certainly hope to be in a position where I can influence someone in power," Morris said.

Charles Blau, 28, is already running for office—city judge of Jeffersonville. Blau and his wife, Cile, who is from Joliet, Ill., met as volunteers in Morocco (1966-'68) and were married there. She is a teacher at Providence High School in Clarksville. He is in law school at the U of L.

Creighton Mershon, 29, works within the political framework as a special assistant to Louisville Mayor Frank Burke. He earned a law degree from U of L after returning from Venezuela in 1965.

Mershon, a graduate of Bellarmine-Ursuline College, finds his Peace Corps experience helpful in his current position. "A tremendous number of foreign visitors, particularly from Latin America, come to Louisville," he said. Because of his experience and ability to speak Spanish, he can help them. He also works on special projects with Louisville's sister city, Quito, Ecuador.

"When I joined the Peace Corps, I thought I would build the world. Now I don't think that can be done. You can't change the world, but you can change things that will help," said Delmar McCarley, 31, a former volunteer in Venezuela (1962-'64).

HELPS MINORITIES

McCarley also works in Mayor Burke's office, but as a special assistant for Manpower

Planning, a program which coordinates employment and employment training focusing on the underprivileged in this area. McCauley says he is now doing what he had hoped to do—helping minorities.

Working within the system for change has not been that satisfying for all former volunteers.

"I wanted to really get involved and effect change when I got back. I had hoped working within the structure, I would be able to effect change, yet this seems less and less likely," said Rose Grenough, 28, a former volunteer in Columbia (1965-'67). Miss Grenough, an alumna of Spalding College, recently resigned from her job with the Work Incentive Program in the public assistance division of the Kentucky Department of Economic Security. She hopes to find a position in the education field.

Most of the former volunteers interviewed agreed that the Peace Corps experience had a broadening effect on their attitudes and views. Many said it made them a better, stronger person. Some spoke of the positive effects it had on the host country.

"The Peace Corps definitely makes you more aware of the world around you. It made us very critical of the United States. It gives you an idea of the opportunities available to really do something. You care more. You want to get involved," said Mrs. Blau.

For Creighton Morshon, "It was a great maturing experience. I went in fresh out of college. I didn't really know what I wanted to do. . . . It changed my life."

Miss Erwin summed it up this way: "The whole experience is so personal. Everyone can get something out of it. Everyone gains in some area where they were weak. It makes such a big difference in you. You are never the same."

James Skelton, 31, a former volunteer in Ecuador (1962-64), who now works for the Louisville Bureau of Rehabilitation Service in the Kentucky Department of Education, said his experience gave him a "more objective view of this country and a better understanding of another culture." Skelton, a graduate of Bellarmine-Ursuline, met his wife, Irma, an Ecuadorian, while in the Peace Corps.

All the former volunteers interviewed talked about some of their experiences in the host country. Yet Kathy Beirne's experience comes closest to the original image of a volunteer isolated in the boon-docks and living in a mud hut. Miss Beirne, 25, spent two years (1968-70) on the Micronesian island of Fassar, where she was the only American among 70 natives. She now teaches a special reading program in Cincinnati.

Barkley Moore, 29, of Lexington, has been called the "Peace Corps super star" by a member of the organization's Washington staff. While most volunteers return to the U.S. after two years in their host country, Moore spent six years and four months in Iran, the longest term of any volunteer.

Moore, a graduate of the University of Kentucky, is now working for the Peace Corps in this country. He travels and speaks to groups about the organization and his experiences. But this is temporary and he hopes to go into social work.

The value of the Peace Corps is "not in how much material progress the volunteer makes, but in how many people he influences," Moore said. "The Peace Corps goes beyond the dollars of foreign aid." He thinks volunteers leave a lasting contribution with the people they work with, and "only these people can develop their country."

There's no doubt that Moore made an impact on Iranians. Since he left the country last December, he has received over 400 letters from Iran. In one letter a student called Moore "a victory target because you show to us we can do everything we wish."

THE NATIONAL RETIRED TEACHERS ASSOCIATION AND THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS ARE PROVING THAT REASON, RESPECT, AND UNDERSTANDING ARE STILL THE KEYS TO LEGISLATIVE SUCCESS

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in this era of confrontation politics and nonnegotiable demands, the 2.9 million-member National Retired Teachers Association—American Association of Retired Persons are proving that reason, respect, and understanding are still the keys to legislative success.

These associations are in the forefront of efforts to improve the lot of older Americans. Yet they seek to work with Government rather than against it, as partners rather than adversaries. Theirs is a philosophy of cooperation, not coercion; persuasion, not protest. Above all, they conduct their legislative activities with a sense of dignity and purpose which reflects the attitudes of the older Americans whom they represent.

As proof of their success, President Nixon flew to Chicago last month to address their five-State regional conference—the first time, I believe, that a President has left Washington specifically to attend a meeting of older Americans.

At the same conference, Bernard E. Nash, executive director of NRTA-AARP and former U.S. Deputy Commissioner on Aging, explained the basic legislative philosophy of his organization. I am certain that our colleagues will be interested in and appreciative of Mr. Nash's remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I recommend them as required reading for any organization which seeks to obtain the support of Congress for its cause:

REMARKS BY BERNARD E. NASH

Welcome to what is truly the most significant legislative session in the history of our Associations. Before our distinguished guest arrives, our Legislative Counsel (Mr. Cy Brickfield) and I want to share with you some thoughts on our Legislative Goals for the 1970's—and on the manner in which our Association can best achieve these goals.

I am proud of our past legislative accomplishments and of the current objectives developed by your Legislative Council. And I am equally proud of the methods which we have used—and will continue to use—in attaining them. Our legislative philosophy is based on rational dialogue, common sense, understanding of the needs of others, and, above all, respect. Some other organizations have today seemingly abandoned these precepts. They have concluded that legislative success must be measured in decibels, that noise and militancy are more important than substance and purpose, that it is better to demand than to discuss.

Even some older Americans. I am sad to say, have abandoned their dignity for a picket sign. Clenched-fist clichés about "Senior Power" have too often replaced logical, rational, knowledgeable discourse and constructive action to meet the needs of older Americans.

Our Associations believe that there is, indeed, a "Senior Power." But it lies in the power of seniors effectively applied in constructive action rather than in some futile display of pressure tactics.

That is not our way. While others shout, we speak softly. While others protest, we persuade. This is not to suggest that we will not pursue our legislative objectives with vigor and purposefulness. On the contrary, we will continue to press at every level of government for more attention to the many serious problems which confront older Americans today. And I am confident that we will achieve our goals—not because we are loud, not because we are militant, but because we are right.

We can achieve our goals for adequate housing, income, health care and so forth, without losing the dignity which is the hallmark of older Americans. We seek from government only that which we cannot obtain for ourselves. We ask to be partners with government, not wards of it. We do not want special treatment. We want to be treated as Americans—as welcome participants in the American way of life.

That is our legislative strategy. And I believe the visit to our conference later this morning by President Nixon—to my knowledge the first time a President has made a special trip from Washington to address a meeting of older citizens—is evidence of the fact that the strategy works. . . .

PROGRAMS FOR PREGNANT SCHOOLGIRLS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention today a program that I feel to be of critical importance. I am referring to the program for pregnant schoolgirls under the Maternal and Child Health Service. These programs were established under research and demonstration grants authorized by title V of the Social Security Act.

The aim of these demonstration projects is to enable pregnant schoolgirls to continue their high school education during pregnancy and to provide prenatal and hospital delivery care, social services, vocational counseling, and family planning services. Another focus of the program is to demonstrate that comprehensive services to these girls, in a crisis point in their lives, can sharply reduce repeated out-of-wedlock pregnancies. These programs are supported by funds from various sources including the Maternal and Child Health Service, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education, and local resources.

Early in 1960, it was noted that the number of births to adolescents was on the increase despite a decline in the overall national birth rate. In 1960, a study of over a hundred unwed pregnant adolescent girls in New Haven, Conn., showed that over a 5-year period they had given birth to 349 babies. The study concluded by saying that these girls did not have any special services or community programs designed to meet their needs. The need for a comprehensive program for pregnant schoolgirls had been recognized.

There are now approximately 150 comprehensive programs serving more than 20,000 girls throughout the country. Among the services provided by various programs are prenatal and postpartum care, group and individual counseling, child care training, personal and family living, family planning information, and instruction in homemaking.

The program in New York has been particularly innovative in its approach to providing comprehensive services to the pregnant teenager. The New York program has achieved such notable accomplishments as: First, establishing a program of service to putative fathers; second, establishing group work with the siblings of the pregnant school age girls; third, providing social work follow-through for at least 1 year following birth; fourth, establishment of infant day-care centers for the babies of the girls; fifth, the establishment of a family counseling program for the parents of the pregnant girl and the putative father; sixth, patient care on individual appointment basis; seventh, use of nurse-midwives and a pediatric nursing counselor; eighth, establishment of a community resource program—which is aimed at helping the girls to learn to know and use total community resources. The program is also set up to help the girls grow culturally, as well as to learn to use leisure time constructively.

These programs have demonstrated comprehensive services can sharply reduce repeated out-of-wedlock pregnancies. New York City has an outstanding record, for in one of its programs only 11 out of 492 girls had a subsequent pregnancy out of wedlock after 2 years. Programs such as the pregnant school girls projects in New York City are unusually valuable. These programs provide to many pregnant girls in need of help the opportunity to receive it at an age when there is much room for learning, future planning, and change.

I encourage Members of the Congress to bear in mind the benefits of these programs are bringing to those young women in need of help and encouragement. The entire spectrum of programs conducted by the Maternal and Child Health Service are improving the quality of life among low-income mothers and their offspring, and I commend to my colleagues the recommendation of the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Coalition for Health Funding that \$325 million be appropriated for maternal and child health activities authorities under title V of the Social Security Act. The text of these recommendations are included for your examination:

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH ACTIVITIES

In February 1969 President Nixon called for "a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life." The American Academy of Pediatrics now calls for tangible manifestation of that commitment, and we earnestly beseech the assistance of Congress. As a first step, the Academy recommends an appropriation of \$325 million for Maternal and Child Health activities under Title V of the Social Security Act, an increase of \$90 million over the President's fiscal year 1972 request.

I. FORMULA GRANTS

A. Maternal and Child Health Services:

States use Federal funds, together with the state and local funds, for the conduct of programs to promote the health of mothers and children. These programs include such services as prenatal and postpartum clinics, visits by public health nurses to homes before and after babies are born to help mothers care for their infants, well-child clinics where mothers can bring their babies and young children for examination and immunizations, and conferences where mothers may receive competent advice on how to prevent illness and any questions about the care of infants can be answered. Early detection and prevention are the basis of this program wherein children receive visual screening, audiometric screening, dental screening, immunizations and periodic examinations. The program assists in meeting inpatient hospital or maternity home expenses for mothers in connection with the maternity cycle.

During the past three years, the state Maternal and Child Health programs have not been supported by increased Federal funds, except for a recent modest increase in appropriation mandated toward family planning activities. The proposed 1972 appropriation is the same amount as appropriated in 1971. Increased Federal support is necessary so that programs might not only continue services at the present level but might also expand and improve programs to provide services to more women and to more children.

B. CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

The authorizing legislation for Crippled Children's Services provides that such services should be made available to all children in every state by 1975. Last year approximately 490,000 children received physician services under the Crippled Children's Program and 84,000 were hospitalized.

The scope of services provided has been expanded since the program was established in 1935 from the provision of service to children with orthopedic handicaps capable of surgical correction to multiple handicapped children; mentally retarded children; children with cystic fibrosis, hemophilia, and leukemia; and so forth. 35,000 children with congenital heart defects were treated through Crippled Children's Programs in 1969, a sixteen fold increase in the number since 1950 when 2,200 were treated.

States are attempting to extend the program to rural areas periodically traveling from town to town to conduct clinics, locating handicapped children, providing diagnostic evaluation and then attempting to provide medical care, hospitalization and continuing care to those youngsters in need. States are innovating through the Crippled Children's Program attempting to reduce the length and frequency of hospitalization, establishing regional treatment centers, and combining the health and educational needs of children through preschool rehabilitation projects.

Unfortunately, many Crippled Children's Projects are making little or no progress toward the inclusion of more handicapped children, and indeed many states have been forced to keep their programs at a stationary level refusing to include children in need of service.

Appropriations are desperately needed to provide services to crippled children not now receiving care. In 1970 the appropriation for this program was \$58 million, and in 1971 the appropriation was increased to \$58.6 million. General inflationary pressures, increased cost of hospitalization, and increase in physicians fees permit few Crippled Children's Programs to continue at their present program level and many are making substantial cutbacks in the variety of services provided as well as the number of children reached.

C. Recommendations:

The recent plateauing of Federal support for Maternal and Child Health Services and Crippled Children's Services has significantly affected state programs resulting in many instances in the elimination of services, delay of services, loss of program personnel and a freeze on vacant positions. The American Academy of Pediatrics recommends that the Congress appropriate \$158.25 million for Maternal and Child Health formula grants. This increase of \$38.6 million is an investment of the Federal dollar which will not only improve the health care of those served by the Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Programs but will serve as a corridor towards improving the quality of life among American people.

II. PROJECT GRANTS

A. Maternity and Infant Care Projects:

The infant mortality rate in the United States reached an alltime record low in 1970 reflected by the provisional rate of 19.8 deaths of babies under one year of age for each 1,000 live births. This represents a decrease of 4.3 percent from the previous low established in 1969. By color, the infant mortality rate in 1970 was 17.9 for the white population and 31.8 for all others. This is one of the narrowest gaps ever recorded.

The infant mortality rates are being decreased significantly in large cities of this nation due to the tremendous impact of Maternity and Infant Care Projects (M & I). These projects have been established in areas where infant and maternal mortality rates were among the highest.

The need for these special projects currently exceed the resources being made available. New project applications cannot be funded and currently existing programs are unable to expand services to an estimated quarter-million high risk women. Despite this inadequacy, the proposed budget of the President makes no provision for an expansion of the number of mothers and infants served.

The importance of these projects reaches beyond a statistical justification, for the fundamental benefit of these efforts is the improved quality of life for mothers and their newborn infants.

B. Children and Youth Projects:

Children and Youth Projects provide comprehensive health services to school and preschool children in areas where low income families are concentrated. Forty-one percent of those registered were under one year of age, 57% were ages 1 to 9. The impact of these projects toward improving the quality of life for the children of this nation are borne out in data reflecting the decrease in illness among children served, a 50% decrease in the number of children requiring hospitalization, and a reduction in the length of stay of hospitalization.

Children are most responsive to therapy, and one of the important objectives of the Children and Youth Projects is screening for correctable defects. Screening programs for visual impairment, hearing loss, lead-based paint poisoning and associated followup treatment have been components of many projects. Work is underway to document the prevalence of malnutrition in Children and Youth registrants and to develop innovative programs to correct this serious problem.

Through preventive health services, diagnosis and treatment these projects are assuring that the advances and advantages of pediatrics are provided to low income children. These programs document improved health of children served, yet the areas of unmet need are many. Expansion of present programs and the establishment of new projects in areas where health care services are badly needed will not be achieved by a token increase in appropriations.

C. Dental Health of Children:

Section 510 of Title V provides that special project grants may be made to promote

dental health of children and youth of school or preschool age, particularly in areas with concentrations of low income families. These grants, not to exceed 75% of the costs of any project, are available to state health agencies, to health agencies of any political subdivision of a state, and to any other public or nonprofit private agency, institution or organization. During the fiscal year 1971 only seven such projects were in operation.

It is estimated that half of all children in the U.S. under age 15 have never visited a dentist, and that 3 out of 4 children living in low income families have never been to a dentist. The impact of prophylaxis and early treatment can be seen in evidence collected through the dental services component of the C & Y Projects wherein, at recall examinations, the number of dental carries for children treated had decreased by between 50 and 65 percent.

Several communities are in the process of developing dental care projects to bring the benefits of this activity to children in low income families. The minimal appropriation for this activity in 1971 provided funds for the establishment of seven projects, but five times as many programs might be started immediately if appropriations were available.

D. Recommendation:

The American Academy of Pediatrics recommends an appropriation of \$130 million in Maternal and Child Health for special project grants authorized under Title V of the Social Security Act. This represents an increase of \$40 million over the Administration's proposed budget, indeed a small measure to an activity designated as deserving of a national commitment. The "fundable but no funds available" dilemma must be broken if we wish to further reduce infant mortality, decrease hospitalization frequency and rate, and improve the health status of urban and rural low income populations.

III. RESEARCH AND TRAINING

A. Research:

Studies which show promise of substantially contributing to the advancement of Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Services are supported through research grants authorized under Title V of the Social Security Act. Current studies include the unwanted pregnancy, the unwanted child, long term results of care for children with limb deficiencies, a national study of maternity care, development of models of family planning programs, systems analysis of pediatric clinic efficiency, and studies designed to identify factors contributing to interstate differences in infant mortality. Research into health delivery systems for mothers and also for children have received a priority.

B. Training:

The Maternal and Child Health Title of the Social Security Act authorizes training of personnel for health care and related services provided to mothers and children, particularly mentally retarded children and children with multiple handicaps. This training support is helping to increase the health manpower pool and is assisting also in the development of an expanded role for allied health personnel. Maternal and Child Health funds have been used in the past to assist in the development of the nurse midwife and pediatric nurse associate so that more effective nursing skills might extend the scope of health services and increase their availability. Various allied health training programs are supported through this authorization and several projects have been established to assure that trainees might move up the career ladder as they gain experience and increase their health knowledge.

C. Recommendation of the Level of Funding:

It is essential that research and training activities of the Maternal and Child Health Service are funded adequately so as to per-

mit a continued impact upon the delivery of health services. Due to the excellence of these programs and their effect on the planning and delivery of health care to mothers and children, the American Academy of Pediatrics recommends an increase of \$11 million to a level of \$32.25 million.

Family planning services

Family planning is an essential component of comprehensive health programs. Family planning reduces infant and maternal morbidity and mortality, enables women to decide the number of children they wish to have, and permits spacing of offspring.

The American Academy of Pediatrics supports the appropriation request of the President in the amount of \$90.9 million for family planning services.

Communicable disease control

Measles has increased by 175% (30,900 cases reported) from October 1970 through March 1971 as compared to the same period last year. The rate of immunization against measles of children 1-4 years of age in central city poverty areas has dropped to 41% this past year.

Epidemic polio is a threat unless vigorous vaccination efforts are carried out. The polio immunization levels have steadily dropped since 1964, with only half of the children of low income urban families currently protected.

The "stop rubella" program has reached about half of the child population to date.

Veneral disease is spreading at alarming rates.

States and local communities are hampered in their immunization efforts because of a shortage of funds. The Administration has sought no funds under the Communicable Disease Control Act passed in the 91st Congress which authorizes \$90 million in fiscal year 1972 to assist the states in mounting meaningful programs. It is estimated that \$12 to \$15 million are needed only to effect a national commitment to measles eradication. Concentrated efforts are needed to eradicate these diseases which now should be extinct, and a Federal financial commitment to support local and state efforts is imperative.

Lead based paint poisoning

Lead based paint poisoning is a silent epidemic, ravaging the lives and minds of young children. Funds have not been requested by the Administration to mount pilot programs of screening, education, medical treatment and housing rehabilitation. The Academy recommends \$20 million be appropriated for use by communities as seed money in establishing lead eradication programs.

"THE WELFARE BILL—SUSPICIONS BORNE OUT"

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I address myself today to an issue of which we were all aware when we voted on H.R. 1 a few weeks ago. It was a subject that we chose to ignore—to sweep under the rug—to try to forget. Much as we tried to blot from our minds the plight of those whose very existence was affected by our decisions on that bill.

I am speaking of the willingness—in fact, the eagerness—of our State Governments to cut back on the level of assistance granted to welfare recipients. We all knew that this was the case when

we voted to accept H.R. 1 and title IV. Some of us spoke of this legislation as the best possible bill that could be enacted at this time.

Yet at the same time we knew that as a consequence hundreds of thousands of American citizens would face a reduction in the meager assistance granted them by the State governments. There was also much rhetoric during that debate about insuring that welfare recipients did not cheat the Federal Government or the localities by illegally applying for benefits. One would have thought that individuals on welfare were a different breed of person—constantly looking for a means to cheat the Government.

Two recent newspaper accounts have made abundantly clear the hypocrisy and deviousness of much that we said on this floor during the consideration of H.R. 1. One story disclosed that a confidential Federal survey had found that 10 States, and possibly more, are reducing welfare benefits this year. Specialists in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare found that additional reductions were likely in 12 more States. The Members of this House did not require the leaking of such a study to inform them of this alarming trend among the States and localities.

We are in touch with our State governors. We are abreast of political developments outside of this building and this city. We knew that the States were heeding the pressures to reduce their budgets and that welfare recipients would be those most sharply affected by these economy measures.

In light of this knowledge, what did we do on June 18 when we approved H.R. 1? We adopted a hold harmless provision under which States are provided added incentives to heighten the trend toward lower benefits. The political reality of the moment makes clear what the language of the bill does not.

The second article concerning the welfare situation was not a leak from HEW. It was an account of a report that was released by the Department. This study showed that less than 1 percent of the welfare recipients in this country in 1970 were suspected of fraud by State agencies. This information as well should not have come as a surprise to my colleagues.

Nevertheless it is common indeed for a discussion of the welfare situation to proceed unencumbered by the weight of such statistical fact. We speak of people remaining on welfare instead of becoming productive members of our society when only 5 percent of those on welfare are considered employable by government agency standards. We decry the endless cycle of welfare dependency in which several generations of a family remain on public assistance, but we fail to muster sufficient money or concern to cope with the problems that underlie this situation.

The necessity of bettering our welfare system is the paramount domestic issue before this Congress. We cannot deal with this problem by appealing to popular prejudices while ignoring the realities and the consequences of the situation before us. If the American people are to

regain in some small measure their faith in the efficacy and the intentions of our system of government and those who are a part of it, we must enact a true welfare reform bill this year. Hopefully, the Senate will help us in achieving this goal. To do so, the Senate must make major improvements in the legislation which was passed by this body.

I have circulated a letter to my colleagues in this House. It is our intent to send this letter to the members of the Senate Finance Committee as an expression of our concern for the passage of a true welfare reform bill in this session of the Congress. I urge my colleagues to join us in this vital effort by adding their names to the letter which I now insert into the RECORD at this point.

DEAR SENATORS (all members of Senate Finance Committee): If true welfare reform is to be enacted in this session of the Congress, it is incumbent upon the Senate, and particularly the members of the Senate Finance Committee, to draft legislation which will forcefully deal with the welfare crisis before us. Some of us voted for Title IV of H.R. 1 when it was before us in the House of Representatives. Some of us did not. None of us is fully satisfied with the bill as it now stands.

We therefore urge you to adopt the following changes which must be made in President Nixon's Family Assistance Plan if it is to represent a real step forward in the reform of our welfare system.

(1) *States must maintain their present level of benefits.* No welfare recipients should be worse off financially under the new program than they are under the present AFDC system. President Nixon made this commitment to the nation when he announced his welfare reform program in August, 1969.

In the vast majority of states, recipients are currently receiving higher benefits than the \$2400 floor established in H.R. 1. The federal government must pledge to undertake a significant percentage of the cost if the states are realistically to be expected to supplement the new federal payment levels. The hold harmless provision does not provide sufficient assurance that states will maintain their current level of benefits.

(2) *The \$2400 benefit level for FAP-OFF recipients is inadequate and inequitable.* Administration spokesmen have admitted that such is true. We cannot establish a payment level that is woefully below the poverty level as determined by the Department of Labor. Neither can we support the payment standards currently in the bill which would result in an aged couple receiving the same stipend from the government that a poor family of four does.

(3) *Payments to FAP-OFF families must be adjusted automatically to the rise in the cost-of-living.* This principle has been adopted for Social Security beneficiaries under Title I of H.R. 1. If it is not extended to FAP-OFF recipients, their status as second-class citizens will again be worsened.

(4) *Mothers of children under six must not be required to seek job training.* Under current law, the mother may remain in the home until her child reaches the age of six. The Administration supports keeping the age level at this point. The change in the law under H.R. 1 is certainly not in accord with our desires to strengthen the family unit of the welfare recipients.

(5) *Adequate funding must be provided for child care centers and for the job training-employment aspects of the bill.* We cannot force mothers to register for job training if the child care available for their offspring is not in the best interests of the well being of those children. That will assuredly

not be the case if we fail to increase the present allocation of \$2 billion for the child care of 1 1/4 million children.

It is the Administration's estimate that 2.6 million families contain people who will register for employment services. Yet H.R. 1 provides for only 412,000 training and job placements slots and 300,000 public service jobs. The sum allotted for job training is only \$540 million. We cannot hold out child care centers and job training as panaceas to the endless cycle of welfare dependency if we fail to fund those programs at a realistic level.

(6) *Proper working conditions must be insured for welfare recipients.* People should not be forced to accept work at \$1.20 an hour, 3/4 of the federal minimum wage. The only provision in the bill limiting the types of jobs to which recipients can be assigned is a prohibition against their being used to break strikes. Further protections must be added to the bill to guarantee that employed welfare recipients will not be forced to work under substandard conditions.

(7) *The rights guaranteed to welfare recipients under current law must not be tampered with.* The provisions of H.R. 1 permitting the states to reimpose residency requirements and weakening the procedural rights of welfare recipients are most glaringly in disaccord with this principle. If we expect welfare recipients to become full citizens of our society, they must be treated as such.

(8) *Eligibility for assistance must be based on the current need of the applicant.* H.R. 1 would disqualify any person who had earned an amount of income over the previous nine months that, if earned regularly, would make him ineligible for assistance. This provision is highly discriminatory towards seasonal workers, such as migrant laborers. This marks a change from the present practice of eligibility being based on current need.

(9) *Assistance must be provided for indigent couples without children as well as single individuals.* At present some states have undertaken such assistance programs without any federal financial assistance. Coverage should be extended to such individuals under the Family Assistance Plan.

The need for overhaul of the welfare system is the paramount domestic issue we face in this session of the Congress. If we are to restore in some small measure the faith of the American people in our elected system of government, we must deal forthrightly and equitably with the welfare crisis by making H.R. 1 a true step forward in the reform of the welfare system.

THE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT
MUST REVAMP ITS POLICIES ON
PREVENTION OF "EXOTIC" DIS-
EASES

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, although the current outbreak of Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis—VEE—is confined to the southwestern part of the country, it appears likely that this disease may spread. The Department of Agriculture has declared an emergency, and has ordered that all horses in a five-State area of the Southwest be vaccinated against the disease. We are all very concerned about this because the disease is not only fatal to horses, but it can be highly infectious to humans as well.

What is especially distressing, however, is that this outbreak could have been averted if the Department of Agriculture had not discouraged the testing of a VEE vaccine through its licensing procedures.

This lack of foresight by the Department of Agriculture was originally called to my attention by a horse breeder in my district who advised me that he and other concerned persons and groups had been warning USDA for quite some time now that an outbreak was imminent. Upon further investigation, I learned that USDA had indeed dragged its feet on this matter.

We have seen a steady progression of VEE northward over the years. A major outbreak was treated in Colombia, South America, several years ago. There were also emergencies in Panama, Costa Rica, and San Salvador in Central America.

Before November of 1970, 6,000 horses were dead of this disease in Mexico. At that time the American Horse Council issued a position paper calling upon USDA to take precautionary measures against VEE, and suggested guidelines for action in case the disease did enter the country. By then it was not a question of whether the disease would enter the country, but when.

Yet, it was not until March of 1971 that the USDA Agricultural Research Service announced its intention to evaluate the VEE threat.

This delay might be understandable if we did not know anything about VEE. However, we know quite a bit about this disease, and a human vaccine against VEE has existed for many years.

This vaccine was originally developed by the Department of Defense for use among soldiers who might be infected with the disease through germ warfare. The VEE virus is considered a powerful biological weapon.

What is still not known, however, is whether this vaccine is safe and effective for horses. No drug firms were willing to risk the expense of testing the vaccine because there was no chance of ever getting the vaccine licensed under current USDA policy.

It has been a policy of long standing in the U.S. Department of Agriculture to not issue licenses for products produced from biological agents which cause disease exotic to this country. VEE is such a disease.

One Pennsylvania firm, the National Drug Co. in Swiftwater, applied for licensing of this vaccine over 10 years ago, but was denied by USDA under this policy. Negotiations between USDA and the National Drug Co. have been going on even up until the time of the VEE outbreak.

The Department of Agriculture was no doubt trying to be prudent in establishing this policy, but it does not take into account the very real threat posed by diseases alien to this country but which could easily be carried across our borders.

Furthermore, there are no facilities in the United States for properly testing this vaccine, and the only planned facility in Denver will not be ready until this fall. The USDA is currently engaged in a testing program in Mexico in coopera-

tion with the U.S. Public Health Service and the Mexican Government.

However, the results of these tests will not be known until the middle of next month. Nor are the tests broad enough or comprehensive enough to meet USDA's own criteria for licensing the vaccine.

As a result of this lack of foresight we are faced with the unhappy alternative of combating a disease with an untested vaccine which could actually spread rather than contain VEE.

Also, it is unfortunate that we must now resort to pesticides to prevent the further spread of VEE because it is suspected that this disease is carried by culex and salt water mosquitoes. This is occurring at a time when we should be curtailing rather than expanding the use of pesticides because of their potential for being harmful to the environment.

In fairness to the Department of Agriculture, I must say that they are doing all they can be doing at the present time to contain and eradicate VEE. However, their actions amount to locking the barn door after the horse is gone.

I have written to the Department of Agriculture urging Secretary Hardin to use this experience as the basis for a re-evaluation of their policies with reference to exotic diseases and their prevention. In the future, we must look far beyond our own borders for potential threats to our human and livestock populations. We should try to anticipate and prepare to meet these exotic diseases with the full realization that they can find their way into this country.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commentary on the misuse of the Nation's natural resources:

MISUSE OF NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

Since World War II, man has consumed more of the world's natural resources than since the time he first came on the face of the earth.

The United States, the world's leading industrial nation, makes up about 6 percent of the world's population, but consumes 35 percent of the world's total energy output. More gas, oil, coal and nuclear energy is used in the U.S. than in the Soviet Union, Britain, West Germany and Japan combined.

Our unbridled economic growth, however, is now producing some symptoms of misuse of our natural resources—growing pollution problems and a growing energy crisis.

Until recently, I tended to think the energy crisis was a national problem—a critical one, to be sure—but without much direct application to the Ninth District. I learned, however, that at least two communities had lost new industry because of a shortage of natural gas. The energy crisis is being felt in the Ninth District with lost opportunities for employment and productivity.

Our Nation's consumption of energy sources is increasing faster than our population increase and our basic economic growth.

In the next 30 years, the American population will increase by another 120 million, and we will be using from three to four times the energy output we have today. While the fuels which run the American economy may not be in immediate danger of depletion, they are limited and will be exhausted prematurely if our energy demands continue to accelerate.

Petroleum, which provides about 44 percent of the Nation's total energy needs, is getting harder to find and extract. We now have enough in domestic reserves for another 10 years. New sources are being found offshore and in the frozen tundra of Alaska, but the difficulty of access will raise petroleum costs. Relying on the huge Middle East oil reserves makes the U.S. dependent on foreign sources and is undesirable.

Coal, the primary source of fuel for electric utilities, represents this Nation's largest reserve of fossil fuel. We have more than 1,000 years of supply in known reserves. However, coal is expensive to transport, creates pollution when it is burned, and makes a shambles of the land when it is strip-mined.

Natural gas, which accounts for about 32 percent of all energy consumed in the U.S., is in short supply. Experts say there is enough left in domestic reserves for another 12 to 13 years. Water power produces about 16 percent of our electricity, but sites for hydroelectric power stations are getting harder and harder to find.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that we are moving towards a nuclear-powered future. Nuclear reactors appear to offer the best solution to our growing energy shortage, and the best means of producing power without ravaging our environment. There are sufficient nuclear fuel reserves to last until more sophisticated reactors—creating power by a fusion process—are developed. At present, we have 21 nuclear reactors producing about 2 percent of our electrical power. In the next decade, nuclear generation will produce about a fourth of our power needs.

Our energy crisis involves far more than some reordered use of our resources, however. It is prompting some fundamental questions about economic growth and its relation to the good life. We are now beginning to question one of this Nation's most cherished axioms: unimpaird economic growth is essential to this country.

Some experts argue that we must use less goods and services, others contend that our economic growth should not be curtailed but redirected to repair some of the ravages of the boundless economic growth of the past.

We are just beginning the debate over our energy needs versus our environmental needs. Air, water and other environmental standards are being established on a national basis for the first time. Congress' rejection of the SST, the cancellation of the jetport in the Florida Everglades, and the halting of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal also show a more selective approach towards growth and its consequences.

RESTORING THE VOTING RIGHTS OF EX-FELONS

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill, which is co-sponsored by Congressmen DRIGGS, GUDE, MIKVA, and DELLUMS, that would revise the District of Columbia Election Act in two important respects: First, ex-felons,

who are generally prohibited from voting under existing law, would be restored their right to vote, and second, the residency requirement in the District for all voters would be reduced to 30 days in all elections. This second change is in line with a recent court decision holding invalid the District's 1-year residency requirement as it applied to the Delegate race. Because the decision did not specifically run to local elections, such as that for the school board, an amendment is necessary in order to make the voter registration requirements uniform for all District of Columbia elections.

The most important feature of the legislation is the restoration of voting rights to ex-convicts. In the District of Columbia alone, I understand that there are 20,000 to 25,000 members of this oppressed minority group, who are denied the right to vote under existing law, and are, thus, denied the right to hold public office and to serve as jurors. Daily, they are discriminated against in seeking employment, and find it almost impossible to secure the necessary permits and licenses to operate a business in the District. I believe that the time has come when we must realize that civil rights can no longer be denied to American citizens who have been convicted of a felony but who have paid their debts to society.

One thing we can do immediately to restore the full civil rights of ex-convicts is to return to them the right to vote. Existing election laws in the District of Columbia forever bar a convicted ex-felon from meaningfully participating in the democratic process by denying him the right to vote and to run for office unless a Presidential pardon is obtained. This provision is unjust, is unreasonably punitive, and hampers rehabilitation. It must be changed. How can we expect the ex-felon to reenter society and to become a productive member if our laws brand him as a second-class citizen. The only hope that an ex-convict now has for restoration of his civil rights is that he might be able to secure a Presidential pardon. But pardons are all but impossible to secure and take many years to process.

Efforts have been made to change the law by bringing law suits in the courts. Several ex-convict groups, together with the Washington Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, have brought a law suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia arguing that this law denying ex-felons the right to vote is unconstitutional. The District court rejected the claim, and the case is now being appealed to the Supreme Court.

While the Supreme Court may yet declared unconstitutional this law prohibiting an ex-felon from voting, I think that a legislative strategy is now called for.

As a first step toward this goal of restoring the civil rights of ex-felons—and I stress that this is only a first step—I am introducing this legislation that would eliminate the broad voting disqualification in existing law for ex-felons. Some 23 States have laws more lenient than those in the District. Several States have no disenfranchisement statute at all; others limit the disqualification to crimes of treason. The Amer-

ican Law Institute's Model Penal Code would only disqualify the felon from voting as long as he is under sentence of imprisonment. My bill would restore the voting rights of the ex-felon at the moment his incarceration ends, even though he is released on probation or parole. Other proposals I have seen would only restore his rights after the probationary or parole period has ended, which in some cases may be many years after incarceration. The reason for the approach taken in this legislation is that I view the restoration of a convict's political rights not only as morally imperative but also as a rehabilitative tool. If a convict is to succeed in his probation and successfully re-enter society, we must treat him as a full and first-class member of our community and not as an outcast. He must be able to join his fellow citizens in the democratic process so he can work to change the conditions in our society that cause crime and alienation. I think this legislation is an important beginning. I have set forth the text of the bill as follows:

H.R. 9893

A bill to facilitate voting in the District of Columbia by persons who have been convicted of a felony and have been pardoned or have served their sentence imposed for that felony

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1101) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'qualified elector' means any person (A) who, for the purpose of voting in an election under this Act, has resided in the District continuously during the thirty-day period ending on the day of such election (B) who is a citizen of the United States, (C) who is, or will be on the day of the next election, at least eighteen years old, (D) who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, (E) who has not been convicted in the United States of an offense which is a felony in the District or if he has been so convicted has been pardoned of such offense, has completed the sentence of imprisonment required of him for such offense or has been paroled, and (F) who certifies that he has not, within thirty days immediately preceding the day of the election, claimed the right to vote or voted in any election in any State or territory of the United States (other than the District of Columbia)."

CAMPAIGN FINANCING AND REPORTING: THE URGENT NEED FOR REFORM

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been growing evidence that existing laws and practices regarding campaign financing and reporting are not only ineffective, but are severely undermining public interest. Because I feel that these issues must be addressed squarely and boldly in the public forum, I insert in

the RECORD a copy of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration.

Urgent and major overhaul to laws and practices relating to campaign financing are, I believe, one of the five or six changes we must make if we are to have a workable political system and society that functions equitably for all citizens. I commend this subcommittee for again raising this issue in the Congress and its indepth investigation. My testimony follows:

CAMPAIGN FINANCING AND REPORTING: THE URGENT NEED FOR REFORM

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been growing evidence that existing laws and practices regarding campaign financing and reporting are not only ineffective, but are severely undermining the public interest. Common Cause, a citizens' lobby group under the leadership of John Gardner, has filed suit against the Republic and Democratic National Committee for violating the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. And, before the 91st Congress adjourned, several days of hearings were held on this subject by the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct under the chairmanship of our colleague, Congressman MELVIN PRICE.

Because I feel these issues must be addressed squarely and boldly in the public forum, I insert in the RECORD a copy of my testimony before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Urgent and major overhaul to laws and practices relating to campaign financing are, I believe, one of the five or six changes we must make if we are to have a workable political system and society that functions equitably for all citizens.

In addition, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the experience of the Poole Broadcasting Co. in Flint, Poole, a privately operated TV station, has been vigorously pioneering to find more economical and fair ways that TV can help candidates communicate with the electorate. Following my testimony is a copy of the statement of the president of the Poole Broadcasting Co., Mr. Albert J. Gillen:

CAMPAIGN FINANCING AND REPORTING: THE URGENT NEED FOR REFORM

I. CAMPAIGN FINANCING—THE LARGER PERSPECTIVE

Domestic and international issues which we face today are so complex and so tough that it is not easy to see our way through to good solutions in the near future. However, the processes of politics and government are the environment in which men and women in public service work to deal with the issues which confront our country. While we may not find easy answers to our problems, we can, nevertheless, reform and re-tool the conditions which affect who is elected, how they are elected, and the way they do their job after they are elected.

Today, the problem of campaign reporting and financing seriously cripple candidates and, to some extent, elected officials and undermines the performance of our entire governmental system. Financial obstacles, pressures, and disproportionate influences keep many good people from running for office and create an unhealthy potential for affecting the job performance of those who do run and those who are elected. If we understand the urgency, and if we resolve to make crucial and long overdue reforms in this area, we can upgrade and greatly broaden the number and quality of people who participate in elective politics, the quantity of their performance, and, in turn, the faith and confidence of the electorate. As a result, this single set of reforms may do more to increase our capacity to deal with today's issues than anything else we can do.

The purpose of this statement is to express the urgent need for such reform, the obstacles to reform, the objectives and principles which should guide reforms, and to outline specific areas and recommendations where reforms can be made.

II. THE NEED FOR REFORM

The problems created by outdated and almost totally ineffective laws governing campaign financing and reporting are legion. Among them are:

1. Of the estimated \$150 to \$250 million spent on campaigns in a major election year in the United States, only a small fraction—10-20% at the most—is reported.
2. Unrealistic and unenforced laws have led to a condition where evasion, manipulation and outright disregard for the law are the norm, not the exception. For all practical purposes, political financial contributions and expenditures are virtually uncontrolled.
3. The tacit acceptance of this sham and hypocrisy in high prices—both public and private—breeds a disrespect for the law, an insidious double-standard, and a deepening public cynicism about our political processes which, taken together, undermine public leadership and the "consent of the governed" on which our democracy depends.
4. That information which is reported is so incomplete and so after-the-fact that there is little basis for effective enforcement, for understanding the unhealthy influence of special interests on our political system, or for having the data available on which to base intelligent decisions for reform.
5. The costs of campaigning—both for nominations and for general elections—and in some cases doing the job and communicating with the constituency after election—have skyrocketed at an ever-increasing rate. The upward pressures include the costs of TV and other media techniques—even something as basic as postage; the costs of travel; communicating about more complex issues while competing with all the other bits of information which bombard the average citizen every day; and the cost of professional information research and management techniques which are necessary to allocate and use campaign resources effectively. At the same time, the necessary funds for waging campaigns have not begun to increase at a proportional rate. The result is an everwidening gap between the cost and the sources of income associated with competing in public service. The consequences are serious:
 - (a) Many good men and women are unable to run for office because they are in effect priced out of the competition.
 - (b) Politics is fast becoming a rich man's game.
 - (c) Those who do run for office are forced to find ways to make up this deficit and, all too often, must seek and accept large contributions from special individual or group interests.

This gap is further accentuated by the very real advantages that an incumbent office holder often holds over a challenger. Thus, there is an increasing potential for the "public interest" to be compromised or distorted through the sometimes subtle and often not so subtle pressures of disproportionate financial obligations.
6. Only a small fraction of the electorate participates financially in the costs of running for office—with the largest estimates being between 10-15%. This means:
 - (a) a small number of people can potentially exert an influence far beyond their numbers and
 - (b) more important, over 85% of our citizens do not have a sense of investment—either personal or financial—in the system. The danger here is that they—like one who is not a stockholder—are less likely to share an interest in, or a high expectation of performance from, an enterprise in which they do not participate. The dual conse-

quences are that they may do less themselves and demand less of their elected officials.

7. The current chaotic patchwork of laws in this area at the local, state and federal levels are so confusing and riddled with loopholes that they actually encourage violations of the law. For the most part, they were formed decades ago when conditions and times were vastly different than today. The most blatant example of an unrealistic statute is that which prohibits the expenditures on a congressional campaign from exceeding \$5,000 and a senatorial campaign from exceeding \$25,000. This has led to the unbridled proliferation of campaign committees—allowing virtually unlimited amounts of contributions to a campaign, thus making a wholesale mockery of an existing, but outdated, statute. The by-product of violating these unrealistic ceilings opens the door on the one hand to excessive contributions and spending, and on the other, fragmenting, and thus obscuring the precise source of, cumulative large donations and contributors. And so, the public, and sometimes even candidates themselves, have no way of pinpointing the source and the magnitude of excessive special interest participation and disproportionate financial obligations. Large donors can further obscure their contribution and influence by giving through relatives, nominal "front" groups and by other devious means.

III. OBSTACLES TO REFORM

1. Disclosure and reporting is so fragmented and decentralized at local and state levels that there is virtually no way the public can have the facts they need in order to initiate intelligent, systematic and effective reform.

2. The complexity of the law and the lack of uniformity among the 50 states and the 1000's of local jurisdictions makes it exceedingly difficult to create a simple and universal pattern which will govern local, state and federal campaign financing and reporting.

3. The hypocrisy of existing laws and the consequent absence of any attempts to prosecute the violators has prevented the dramatic focusing of the crisis.

4. Incumbents at all levels of government have a vested interest in the system within which they have been elected and are notoriously reluctant to change the rules of the game in which they now feel relatively safe. Thus, there is a lack of bold public leadership on the issue.

5. Special interests—whether large individual or group contributors—also have a vested interest in the existing inadequate system and enjoy the relative security of their present relationships with their potential for continued influence. And so, there is a lack of bold private leadership.

IV. THE STRATEGY FOR REFORM—OBJECTIVES AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Though campaign finances and reporting is indeed approaching a crisis situation, the outlook need not be altogether gloomy. One asset we can begin with is a growing body of expertise in the area. Among the excellent studies are:

Financing a Better Election System by the Committee for Economic Development.

Regulation of Political Finance by the Institute for Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

Congress and the Public Trust by the New York Bar Assn.

The Costs of Democracy by Alexander Heard, University of North Carolina Press.

Electing Congress, the Financial Dilemma by the 20th Century Fund

An analysis of these kinds of studies makes it clear that lack of bold and sophisticated recommendations are not one of the obstacles to reform. There are, in fact, many sensible and practical reforms that can be

made now, and there are still others that can be made now, and there are still others that we can make after we have collected more information and have done some testing.

What follows will be a strategy for reform which evolves from my own experience in politics, combined with the expertise of others who have studied this need. This strategy will be derived from the previous understanding of the need for reform and will proceed with the major ideas which should shape an effective strategy—and will conclude with specific recommendations, some which can be implemented now and some which suggest areas for more sophisticated refinements in the future.

One thing is clear, this is not an ideal world and one set of reforms, however, well thought out, cannot possibly resolve all the problems. There are many alternatives which can be considered and it is the job of public leadership and citizens at large to decide which reforms will encourage the best performance for our political system in the public interest—while at the same time incurring the least compromise to our freedoms and to our American sense of initiative and competition. It is further clear that conditions are changing more rapidly than ever before, and that real reforms cannot be a static gesture, but rather must provide for systematic ongoing revisions which keep pace with change in the future.

A. The objective of reform

A political system that functions truly in the public interest must be openly accessible to fair competition among the best men and ideas, at any given level and at any given time in the country. It is equally important that there be an informed electorate with a maximum of public participation in the political process. For this to happen there needs to be the highest degree of respect and confidence in the system and in its leadership, with the "consent of the governed" being freely and positively expressed.

B. Principles for achieving this objective

1. Meaningful reform should ensure maximum competition and fully open access to potential candidates and positions by reducing the financial obstacles to running for office and by cultivating sufficient no-strings-attached resources to adequately and vigorously inform the public on the issues and candidacies of every election contest. While searching for realistic ways to hold down campaign expenditures, it is equally important to concurrently provide legitimate sources of income which can remove the pressure of anyone having to accept disproportionate donations from individuals and special interests.

2. Meaningful reform must be comprehensive, dealing with all aspects of finances and disclosure, rather than simply being negative and regulatory, or affecting just one or two campaign costs, e.g. T.V. broadcasting. The election process, and its necessary financing should be viewed as a positive and indispensable process of informing the electorate. As such, the issue is not one of simple restriction and regulation, but rather how to nourish this process, how to give it integrity and how to make it healthy and respectable from all aspects.

3. Meaningful reform must consider various means of providing new sources of income, including the possibilities of public subsidies, but should leave to the candidates and political parties, the responsibility for raising a substantial amount of the necessary funds. The ability to attract and raise substantial campaign resources, should be one of the tests which a candidate should be required to meet in his effort to earn public support.

In an ideal world, the concepts of participatory democracy suggest that every citizen should share proportionately in the financial requirements as well as the other dimen-

sions of the political process—and this implies some form of either public subsidy by taxation or by vastly broadened voluntary financial participation.

4. Meaningful reform should seek to broaden the present small base of citizen financial participation on the theory that the more people who have a sense of personal investment in making the system work, the greater the corresponding force of the public interest that candidates and incumbents will have to respond to.

5. Meaningful reform should eliminate gross financial excesses which undermine fair competition. This is one of the most important priorities and a more easily administered task than imposing arbitrary or unrealistic limitations designed to force down the ceiling of even average levels of campaign expenditures.

6. Meaningful reform should shift the burden of certain campaign costs away from the candidate to the public treasury if they concern activities which affect all candidates equally and do not differentiate one candidate or campaign against another—e.g. voter registration, voter identification, etc.

7. Meaningful reform should place the highest importance in public disclosure and scrutiny as the method for spot-lighting and controlling financial excesses and improper influence. The purpose is to cultivate respect for the system and confidence if an informed electorate, rather than to impose arbitrary restrictions which risk forcing candidates and contributors to go around the law.

8. Meaningful reform should work toward eliminating the confusion, the inconsistency and the lack of pattern among local, state and federal jurisdictions. Simplicity, consistency, uniformity, and visibility and accountability should be the goals.

9. Meaningful reform should ensure that special interest groups, whether business, labor, religious, professional, educational or any other—(a) cannot exert influence beyond the number of their individual citizen participants and (b) are treated absolutely equal under the law so that any one interest group does not enjoy leverage greater than another.

10. Meaningful reform should provide for vigorous involvement of the two major parties, but in no way inhibit the involvement of independent candidates or additional party movements through inequities in financing and regulations.

11. Meaningful reform should not be a one-shot deal—but rather a bold first step with a permanent on-going mechanism for testing and implementing reforms as conditions continue to change.

V. SPECIFIC AREAS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORM

A. Drastically tighten reporting and disclosure requirements

1. There should be a required designation of one official consolidated committee for each candidacy for financial purposes—both income and expense. To avoid proliferation of committees, each candidate should be required to submit one consolidated committee financial statement regardless of how many groups may be working on his behalf and whether or not his candidacy is officially declared. The candidate and the chairman of each of these groups should be legally responsible for meeting this provision.

2. There should be regular reports by all official committees. Every committee including the official consolidated committee for each candidacy, should make annual and quarterly reports as well as a report 20 and 10 days before each primary and general election—and finally submit a complete record of income and expense within 30 days after election. The purpose here is to ensure that

no income or expense is left unreported because they occurred before a candidacy was officially declared or after election day. Secondly, that certain reports are made prior to election day so as to provide the public with "before the fact" information upon which to judge the financial integrity of each candidate.

3. *We must plug loopholes in financial reports.* Reporting should include—in addition to cash accounting—further accounting for goods, services, loans, pledges or any other transaction which has a convertible financial value—even if it must be approximated.

4. *We must eliminate any artificial distinction between the on-the-job finances of an incumbent which are used politically and his actual political campaign finances.* Each incumbent should report any income and expense for the year not only for his campaign, but for executing his job over and above his statutory allowances. An incumbent could draw the line wherever he wished between on-the-job and campaign expenses. The public could then judge the entire picture—not just part of it.

5. *We should eliminate any artificial distinction between candidates' personal and candidate's campaign finances.* The official consolidated committee report for each candidacy should include that campaign-related income and expense which involves the personal income or expense of the candidate himself.

6. *We should require CPA audits for all candidacies, parties, committees, conventions, testimonials, etc.* Just as a corporation or most legal enterprises are required to submit a financial audit by a CPA, this should be a requirement of all candidacies and other political enterprises as listed above. This audit should include sources and uses of funds, as well as assets and liabilities and should be required as an automatic part of every mandated report.

7. *All candidates, parties, interest groups, and other political enterprises should be required to list the names and addresses of all contributors who, in the aggregate, have given over \$100.*

8. *All reports should be available to the public within two days after filing.* One central reporting repository should be designated in each state and one should be designated for the federal government. The public should have access at the designated repository to any report filed and should be notified as to which reports have not been filed. The designation of one repository in a state would eliminate the problem in a state like Michigan where many reports are required only at the county level, thus failing to provide a centralized, consolidated financial picture of a statewide or federal campaign anywhere in the state.

9. *The state and federal governments should assume the responsibility and cost of printing a public edition of all post-campaign final reports within 90 days after election.* This limited edition should be sent to all major newspapers and broadcast media.

10. *We should require reporting of campaign contributions by large contributors, individuals or groups.* In addition to requiring reports from those who accept contributions, we should also require reports from those who make them. Major contributions—as defined by any individual or group that contributes over \$1,000 in a calendar year to all political parties or candidates—should file one consolidated report listing the recipients, amounts, and dates of such contributions. This should be filed with the appropriate state and federal registry and certify that the donor is giving only his own money and not giving any other money through another person or group.

11. *Political parties should be subject to the same reporting requirements as interest*

groups and candidates. Presently, political parties can abide by much less exacting reporting requirements than individual and interest groups and thereby can be a vehicle for loopholes.

B. Provide reasonable and equitable access to communications media

1. *We should repeal Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act requiring broadcasters to provide equal time to any and all major and minor candidates at any level of office.* The practical result of this act has been to discourage broadcasters from offering free time and coverage. Instead, Congress and the FCC should outline a policy which encourages broadcasters to exercise initiative in providing free time and coverage on an equitable and reasonable basis—leaving flexibility to the broadcaster to judge which candidates are so marginal as to not merit proportional coverage.

2. *All legitimate candidates should be assured fair, equal and adequate access to paid broadcast time.* This is a minimum condition.

3. *We should reduce the cost of broadcasting time through tax incentives or other methods of communication subsidy.* Increasing costs, especially TV, must not stand in the way of adequately informing the public about a legitimate candidacy or issues. Many methods have been proposed. One practical combination would be for broadcasters to sell time at the lowest commercial rate or some fraction thereof—for example, 50% of the lowest commercial rate. The cost to the broadcaster of this discount would be defrayed by allowing him a tax deduction equivalent to the amount of discount from the commercial rate. The provision of some basic amount of free broadcast time should be considered carefully. One big issue is who should bear the cost of free broadcast time—the broadcaster or the government (the public). Since there are many problems with either method, further study should be made as to how to best provide the incentives or the subsidies for some minimum amount of free time.

4. *We should recognize the extreme differences in broadcasting costs and coverage in different geographical and market areas.* This is the biggest problem in the way of formulating a consistent policy involving political candidates and the broadcast, media, for example, the difference between large metropolitan areas and small communities. A radio or TV station in a large metropolitan area may cover many constituencies and reach into several states. Whereas in a small community, a radio or TV station may only cover a fraction of one constituency. This problem of broadcast markets and their inconsistent relation to political constituencies must be studied further before a practical policy can be developed which will apply to all elections.

5. *We should make the U.S. mail accessible to all federal candidates—challengers as well as incumbents.* By providing what is the equivalent of a postal subsidy to each federal candidate, each could be allowed at least one piece of free (franked) mail to every resident of his constituency. The lopsided advantage of the incumbent will be somewhat reduced and fair competition to inform the voters will be enhanced.

6. *We should consider government subsidized political information brochures at the state and federal levels.* It would be possible for a state to provide equal space to federal and certain top level state candidates in political mailing to be sent to every household. Equal space could be offered to each candidate to be designed and utilized as he saw fit.

7. *We should explore the potential of public TV, educational TV and cable TV as media which in the future may offer vast opportunity for systematic and cost effective com-*

munication to localized political constituencies.

C. Develop workable limits to curb excessive financial contributing and spending

1. *We should not impose arbitrary limits at the present time on total overall campaign expenditures.* The consensus among most experts on this subject is that overall limits are difficult to administer and may well be unenforceable. Or, they may result in driving certain campaign expenditures underground. These difficulties are compounded by extreme variations in the cost of campaigns in different types of districts. In addition, conditions are changing rapidly in different ways and at different rates throughout the country. Also campaign costs are going steadily up. We should be careful not to hastily set limits tied to some over simplified index which could not possibly apply equitably to all areas and elections. Instead Congress should commission a group to recommend a realistic and enforceable approach for limiting campaign expenses 2 to 4 years from now. These judgments must be based on more complete and sophisticated information than is available.

2. *We should repeal existing campaign expenditure limits for the House and Senate.* As previously mentioned, these anachronistic limits are at the heart of today's hypocrisy.

3. *We must strengthen public reporting and disclosure requirements.* Full disclosure and public scrutiny offer the best means of preventing and controlling excesses and abuses—at least until such time as workable units can be developed. Even then, full disclosure should be the number one priority.

4. *Do not impose arbitrary limits on the broadcast media for similar reasons.* Attempts to limit one channel of communication may result in campaigns committing abuses and excesses through another channel, e.g. mail, billboards, telephones, etc. However, we should explore the feasibility of limiting the candidate who would use television so excessively as to pre-empt the capacity of another candidate to communicate on television. In our desire to curb excesses on television, we should be careful not to dilute the extraordinarily positive potential that television offers as a media for informing the modern electorate.

5. *Develop realistic limits for contributions.* There is considerably more agreement between experts that the limits on contributions can be enforced, if at the same time other sources of income and methods of defraying campaign expenses are instituted. The degree of limitation is less important than the capacity to administer this limit and to live within it. There are various proposals for limits to individuals and groups contributing, e.g. \$2,000 to federal and statewide races, \$5,000 to the Presidential race and \$15,000 total to all elections within one calendar year.

6. *We should tighten the curbs on special interest groups.* Consideration should be given to either (a) the outright prohibition of any political contributions by any special interest group, or (b) requiring that every special interest group be subject to the same ground rules. Corporations, labor unions and all other special interest groups should be treated alike with respect to campaign contributions and involvement. Here again, the guiding principles should be that it is better to have a controlled and publicly visible participant, than it is to have an unrealistic prohibition that creates underground activity. To the extent that "political education affiliates" are a feasible alternative to outright prohibition from political participation than their membership, organization, financial participation, goods-service-manpower participation, should be entirely voluntary and independent from membership in the primary group. Every political action group should be subject to the full and strin-

gent letter of revised reporting and disclosure laws. Present loopholes such as that allowing business partnerships to make political contributions, or that allowing testimonial dinners to escape the most stringent reporting requirements should be eliminated.

7. *Limit the personal funds that a candidate may contribute to his own campaign.* Set a realistic limit, such as \$25,000—or perhaps even considerably more—to prevent an extremely wealthy man from personally financing his campaign—allowing him an unfair advantage over an opponent who does not have such unique economic leverage.

D. Broaden the base of financial support

1. *Explore the feasibility of public subsidy as one part of the campaign financing mix.* Though most experts would agree that public subsidy is not practical or acceptable at this time, there is a growing interest in the potential of this method of financing in the future. The 2 biggest arguments in its favor are (a) it takes the pressure off private and special interest group influence and (b) it recognizes the political process as part of the general welfare which should be shared in by all citizens. The disadvantages to public subsidy are (a) the difficulty in equitably distributing and administering the subsidy (b) it's politically unacceptable at this time and (c) it is perceived by some as undermining the traditional American value of volunteerism and personal participation. In any case, the disadvantages seem to outweigh the advantages at this time. But if campaign costs continue their rapid rise, we will have to be prepared to think in terms of some partial method of subsidy at state and federal levels.

2. *Provide tax incentives for expanding citizen financial contributions—especially among the small givers.* For example, allow a 50% tax credit on donations up to \$50. (\$25 maximum credit). A tax credit would be preferable over a tax deduction as the credit is more of an advantage to the low and moderate income givers while the deductions works more to the advantage of the upper income large donor. The purpose would be to greatly encourage direct, personal participation among as much expended part of the electorate so as to take the pressure off seeking and accepting large contributions. One method of administering this tax credit, while still keeping the involvement at the local level, has been suggested by many experts—it would involve the individual purchasing of political money orders through the local post office thus assuring records for the recipient, the contributor, and the government.

3. *Articulate governmental policy at the state and national level which would encourage non-political organizations of all kinds to engage in bipartisan political fund-raising programs.* The cost of these programs could be a tax deductible expense. It is essential that individual participation in these original programs be entirely voluntary.

4. *Consider the possibility of a cash grant for legitimate major candidates in the election for President.* Although a grant of several million dollars to the campaigns of major presidential candidates would only partially subsidize their great expense, it would relieve the pressure on local fund-raising efforts and allow more of the money to be used in state and congressional campaigns where it is originally contributed.

E. Shift certain expenses from the candidates to Government

1. There are a range of costs in an election which result from activities which do not differentiate one candidate from another—for example, comprehensive voter registration; providing voter identification data to candidates and parties; the costs of disclosure, reporting, and auditing; the costs of providing basic information brochures on

the candidates and issues. *Financial pressure on candidates could be reduced if all non-competitive expenses could be assumed by governments just as they now assume the costs of voting machines and certain election day activities.*

VI. ORGANIZING AND ENFORCING REFORM

We will not improve the current situation with good ideas alone. We need to organize and coordinate reform at local, state and federal levels and set up a mechanism for administering and enforcing these reforms without exception. We should take the following steps.

1. *Establish an independent, non-partisan, Federal Election Commission with full powers to administer and enforce campaign financing and reporting requirements and to organize an on-going process for evaluating, testing and recommending further reforms to the Congress.*

2. *Define policies, procedures and penalties for enforcement precisely, pinpointing responsibility for review, publication of abuses and violations, and enforcement.*

3. *Institute a management information system task force under the Federal Election Commission to develop formats for reporting and disclosure—utilizing top experts in government, business and education.* These formats would be utilized by all candidates and reporting groups so that their data could be submitted in a form which is immediately useful for enforcement, for public understanding and for intelligently evaluating the need for additional reforms. These formats should be as simple and as consistent as possible so that the data can be consolidated quickly within a given state and around the country, and so that disclosure can be made before the fact. . . .

4. *The Federal Elections Commission and the Congress should take whatever steps necessary to cause the 50 states to undertake reforms at the earliest possible time leading to a uniform and consistent pattern among federal, state and local jurisdictions.* Also, the Congress and the Federal Election Commission should recommend a model to the states which would create a much more uniform pattern of voter registration, voter identification, schedule of primaries and conventions and perhaps even the shortening of campaigns and reduction of the number of elected officials where appropriate. These reforms could vastly simplify and therefore help to reduce some of the expenses associated with campaigns. Federal subsidies and incentives should be available to those states which move in accord with an urgent and specified timetable.

VII. CONCLUSION

The need for reform has reached crisis proportions. There is no lack of good and effective approaches to reform. The missing ingredient is leadership. Congress must assume the leadership and in doing so has the opportunity to help renew our political system and to make it far more effective and responsive than it is now. At a time when our political institutions seem to be wallowing in ineffectiveness and when public confidence in the mechanism and men of government is at an all time low, Congress has no more urgent business than to face up to these reforms itself and to provide the national leadership for the 50 states to make concurrent reforms. There is no reason why this crucial act cannot begin right now and be bodily underway within a few months.

APPENDIX

Finally, I wish to include in the public record for committee consideration, a summary of the experience of Poole Broadcasting Company which is located in my Congressional district.

Poole, a privately operated station, has been vigorously pioneering to find economical ways that TV can help to bring candidates

and the electorate into closer and better informed contact. Their experience, gained at their own initiative, should be shared with anyone considering the role of TV in elections, especially in campaign financing.

JIM COPLEY ADDRESSES ASSOCIATED PRESS GATHERING

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of what has taken place in recent days in this body, the views of Jim Copley of the Copley Newspapers come like a fresh breeze in a smoke-filled room. I hope that those who were present when Mr. Copley made these remarks to the California-Nevada Associated Press Association on Saturday, July 10, will profit by his words. I pass them along to you, and hope you too shall profit:

WELCOMING REMARKS OF JAMES S. COPLEY AT THE CALIFORNIA-NEVADA ASSOCIATED PRESS ASSOCIATION

It is a pleasure for me to welcome you to this meeting of members of the California and Nevada Associated Press Association. . . special because my home town is across the bay.

It also is a special privilege for us to assemble in Coronado in the spirit of a co-operative that dates its origin back to 1848.

Indeed, we should remind ourselves that—in this fast-moving, ever-changing world—there are certain fundamental values that remain with us. One is The Associated Press and the spirit, which it represents, of a dedication to objective, dispassionate reporting of man and his doings.

This objective, dispassionate reporting is what The Associated Press was created to accomplish, and, despite all the change . . . all the turmoil . . . since 1848, that is what The Associated Press—our Associated Press—is accomplishing today.

This, then, is what makes our co-operative unique . . . unchanging dedication to a journalistic ideal which, really, is unmatched anywhere in the world.

Only in the United States of America do we have publishers, broadcasters and others in the communications industry banding together in one organization for the sole purpose of having unbiased and objective news reports. The AP has no other purpose.

Much of the post-war world has seen the development of national news services frequently supported in whole or part by government funds—with the inevitable results.

Speaking from my own experience with the Inter American Press Association, attempts to make the flow of news conform to government controls unfortunately continue in many areas of the world.

It is good, then, that the basic principles of the Associated Press have remained unchanged for more than a century.

Methods of gathering, distributing and displaying news, however, are changing rapidly, as we all know.

As you saw earlier in the film, we have AP men whose primary writing tool is a CRT console. We have a technical staff whose mission no longer is limited to the care and feeding of M15 teleprinters.

So, with our basic mission of objective news unchanged, there is great change under way in the methods we use to accomplish that basic mission. As is already evident, this is not change simply for the sake of change.

One of the great strengths of the Associated Press has been its strong state and regional reports. After World War II, many thought there would be a diminishing of interest in local news as we faced tremendous international and national challenges.

However, in recent years, there has been a significant change in public attitude. Government and international problems have grown so enormously that the average citizen, as an individual, has felt a sense of frustration in trying to influence them or make his views felt. As a result, he has turned toward those things that he feels he can deal with and influence.

His interest has sharpened in the local and regional events that affect him directly and personally, problems in schools . . . in traffic . . . in the hundreds of urban ills that plague suburbs and cities.

If San Francisco solves a school problem, it is of interest in Los Angeles, Reno and Phoenix, to mention just a few cities.

In short, the reader's interest in local and regional news has been intensified. It is closer to home and he can play a part in it.

This is not to say that he has lost his interest in national affairs. To the contrary, he is deeply interested in them, and our obligation to him in this regard is very great.

This obligation is sharply underscored by the current crisis created by the publication of secret state documents by the New York Times and other newspapers, and by the Supreme Court decision that followed.

The reading public is hungry for news of the matter. In this case, however, it is not just news. It is news that involves us very deeply.

Consequently, it would be idle were we, responsible members of an old and respected press association, to complete this meeting without facing up to a few of the realities which the crisis embodies for us.

Viewed soberly, it is plain that an almost monumental challenge has been laid down to our basic dedication to pursue and present the news to our readers fairly, and in complete and dispassionate form.

In this regard, I believe that time will show the New York Times, and other newspapers that have elected to identify with the Times, have done the profession of journalism a disservice.

The Times has contended that the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America is in issue.

But is it really?

The First Amendment prohibits the Congress from passing laws abridging freedom of the press. I doubt if there is any likelihood that Congress has any such intent.

What has happened really has nothing to do with freedom of the press. The New York Times came into the possession of stolen documents which the government regards as sensitive. Making no known effort to procure their declassification to permit their legal publication—and against the advice of the federal government—the Times elected to publish the documents. In short, there was a straightforward route to follow, not in any way involved with freedom of the press, and the Times chose not to follow it.

Apart from questions of the relative sensitivity of each of the 7,000 documents involved; apart from the damage that may come from giving the world an accurate insight to our private, national reasoning processes; apart from the possibility that our enemies may benefit in their cryptographic analysis from seeing the exact text of our secret communications; apart from all of these things there is another matter which affects all of us here.

It is the question of press behavior.

The Supreme Court did not rule on this. The Court merely declared that, in its opinion, publication of the material in the hands of the Times and its colleagues would not gravely injure the United States of America.

The Court did not in any way condone the fact that the Times and its colleagues received stolen property and that they did so knowingly. This behavior certainly cannot enhance the luster of our great profession.

Against this background it is imperative that journalists at large meet fully their obligation to the public to pursue with great aggressiveness every critical element of the issue.

For instance, too little is known so far concerning the how, the why and the wherefore of the stolen papers. The reading public is hungry to know who were the various people involved in the theft, how the Times received the documents and how other newspapers also received them.

They are curious to know who harbored Mr. Ellsberg, why the Times has not yet been prosecuted for unauthorized possession of stolen goods, how this whole chain of events is affecting our international relations, and the answers to many other questions.

In short, we are involved in a serious news story and, as is our tradition, we must do the job fully and fearlessly, even though it may affect us adversely.

As all of these grave issues swirl about us, I believe it will be beneficial for us to reflect again upon facts which we all know but rarely articulate.

First, a free press is a tap-root element of the wonderful society we call The United States of America.

Second, a free press is, in itself, not a guarantee that the obligations of our profession to the people will be fully discharged. We must be a responsible press as well as a free one; a law-abiding, dependable and fair press.

These are the qualities that bring us respect, and the word "respect" goes to the heart of it all.

Without respectability there is no credibility; and without credibility, all else—even the exciting technological developments we have just seen on film—will lose meaning.

For technology is only a means to an end—and the end that we are seeking demands freedom, responsibility, dependability, respectability, credibility.

These words are not going to lose their meaning. They represent the highest ideals of our profession—they give the only real meaning to our business.

The great and responsible journalists of this country will see to it that they remain our ideals . . . that these words continue to mean what they say.

There is just too much at stake.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Feel welcome in San Diego. While there is much to be done in our meeting, there is also much to be seen in our fine city. Enjoy your stay.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 319

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

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

H. RES. 319

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

Whereas Madam Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-

nam stated on September 17, 1970, that the policy of her government is "In case the United States Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, and the parties will engage at once in discussion on:

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

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

TAX ASSISTANCE FOR POW'S

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation updating and improving the provisions of H.R. 8068, a bill which I introduced amending the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from gross income the entire amount of the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict.

I first introduced this legislation on May 4, 1971, and since then have received some very constructive comments on the legislation from the Department of Defense. The bill I am introducing today takes account of these comments and suggestions.

A number of persons who have relatives who are prisoners of war have contacted me and expressed support for the bill. The Department of Defense was very warm in its endorsement of this proposal. I would like to quote portions of a letter which I received from the Department of the Navy's Office of Legislative Affairs on June 1, 1971:

The principal goal of this bill is to express deep-felt national concern for the well-being of imprisoned or missing servicemen. It would give special recognition by a grateful nation of the sacrifices that have been made and that are continuing to be made by these men.

With respect to the servicemen involved, there is simply no way that they can be financially compensated for the deprivation of human dignity and the mental and physical torture to which we know they are being subjected. Viewed in this light, it seems grossly unfair for the Government to insist on taxing their income while they are enduring unspearable hardship. It is unfeeling and parsimonious for the United States to insist on the payment of income tax on a portion of the military pay of any service member in captivity. The forgiveness of the residual income tax is in part a token gesture to these men and their families in recognition of the very great sacrifices which they are making on behalf of this nation.

Enactment of this bill will provide tangible evidence of this nation's concern for a group of Americans who are undergoing ghastly experiences as a result of having faithfully served our country.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this bill can receive the early consideration of the Ways and Means Committee on which I serve.

The amended bill is printed below:

H.R. 9900

A bill to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the entire amount of the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and of civilian employees who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain combat pay of members of the Armed Forces) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) PRISONERS OF WAR, ETC.—

"(1) MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Gross income does not include compensation received for active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States for any month during any part of which such member is in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of title 37, United States Code) during the Vietnam conflict, other than a period with respect to which it is officially determined under section 552(c) of such title 37 that he is officially absent from his post of duty without authority.

"(2) CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.—Gross income does not include compensation received for active service as an employee for any month during any part of which such employee is in a missing status during the Vietnam conflict. For purpose of this paragraph, the terms 'active service', 'employee', and 'missing status' have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 5561 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(3) PERIOD OF CONFLICT.—For purposes of this subsection, the Vietnam conflict began February 28, 1961, and ends on the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of the termination of combatant activities in Vietnam."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending on or after February 28, 1961. If refund or credit of any overpayment resulting from the application of the amendment made by the first section of this Act (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) is prevented, at any time before the expiration of the one-year period which begins on the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of the termination of combatant activities in Vietnam, by the operation of any law or rule of law, such refund or credit of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed before the expiration of such one-year period.

WILL NO ONE RID US OF THIS
MEDDLESOME WAR?

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Oak Park Forrester, a

community newspaper published in Oak Forest, Ill., recently took the Illinois State Legislature to task for failing to approve a bill introduced by Representative Robert Mann prohibiting the involuntary conscription of Illinois boys to serve in undeclared wars.

This is the second time the State legislature has rejected the Mann bill, in spite of widespread popular support among the people of Illinois. Apparently, the State legislatures are taking a lesson from the U.S. Congress in how to ignore the will of the American people who are fed up with the longest war in our history. The article follows:

MANN WITHOUT A WAR

Some 13 house Republicans in Illinois kept a reasonable bill from reaching the floor of the General Assembly.

The Mann bill sponsored by a State Rep. from the University of Chicago area would permit Illinois servicemen to refuse to serve in wars not declared by Congress. It would direct the state attorney general to file suit in behalf of such servicemen to test the constitutionality of the war. Massachusetts already has this law on its books and a final judgment by the U.S. Supreme Court may be needed before the law is allowed to operate.

A poll showed that 71% of the people of this country want to get out of Indochina by the end of this year.

Poll after poll and test after test show that this politicians' war has absolutely no support. The Republicans had a chance to get us out in 1968 when Nixon, with his much-vaunted plan to end the war, arrived in power.

Instead he has enlarged the war and adopted this ugly, illegal, monstrous horror as his own special exercise in keeping the country in an emotional uproar.

Politicians lied us into this war. Politicians lied us from getting out. But they don't die. If the 13 Republicans who voted to prevent this bill from reaching the floor think they have done a service they are gravely mistaken. And the 54,000 dead Americans can attest to their immortality.

DOD CAN SAVE MONEY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a resident of my district, Mr. George T. Nickolas of 4426 El Rancho Drive, Davenport, Iowa, has suggested two cost-reduction proposals, worthy of note. He suggested that the armed services reduce the number of identification cards from 12 to three for active duty, Reserve, and retired military personnel. The services currently have a DD Form 2 with the individual service seal designating the card as belonging to a specific service branch. Mr. Nickolas suggests that one card be printed for active duty, one card for retired, and one card for Reserves; the card could carry the Defense Department seal instead of the seal of the branch of service. The identification of the branch could be typed in beside the man's rank or grade—that is, USN, USAF, USMC, or USA. This is already

done on the cards for officers to note whether they are Regular or Reserve officers.

This suggestion would save money and space by reducing the number of different cards that must be stocked, and decrease the number of printing setups required to print the cards, allowing for more economical printing runs for the same types of cards.

Mr. Nickolas suggests that the change should be implemented after present stocks of cards are exhausted and thus maximize the savings to the Government.

The second suggestion he has made is to decrease the number of retirement guides and handbooks that the various military departments publish. The U.S. Navy publishes NAVPERS 15891B, "Navy Guide for Retired Personnel and Their Families"; the U.S. Army publishes DA PAM 600-5, "Handbook on Retirement Services for Army Personnel and Their Families"; and the U.S. Air Force publishes AFP 211-1-12, "Air Force Pamphlet, Personal Affairs, Air Force Guide for Retired Personnel." These books are duplication of information to retired servicemen. Mr. Nickolas recommends that these publications, and any that might exist for the U.S. Marine retired personnel, be combined into one Department of Defense pamphlet with a section or chapter for each of the services for information which might be peculiar to one or more of the services. He claims that one or two paragraphs might list all the information which is peculiar to one service—for example, information on the U.S. Soldiers' Home. A close review of the three publications indicates that they are almost identical to the word. The Government should only print one book on retirement benefits, a Department of Defense pamphlet, thus reducing the number of publications printed and stocked. Printing one retirement guide pamphlet would reduce the number of printing setups that are required; reduce the number of publications required to be maintained in various publication storage centers; provide for a larger production run of the one pamphlet and thus permit a more economical run of one issue and reduce the per book cost; require less work on revisions—one book revised in lieu of the present three or more publications; cut down on personnel required to update and revise the book; and result in a general overall cost saving.

The above effort would be another step in the program of standardization that is needed for continued unification of services of the various military services to achieve cost savings. Service identification numbers can be applied to the DOD pamphlet similar to those applied to the DOD pamphlet titled, "Uniformed Services Health Benefits Program," which lists the following service identification numbers: DOD PA-3A; DA PAM 360-505; NAVPERS 15203B; AFP 168-1; NAVMC 2601; CG-144; PHS-CCPM Pam-15; and ESSA CO-3-Rev-69. Mr. Nickolas believes that the cost savings on the printing of one guide

would be thousands of dollars in printing cost and an unestimated amount in personnel savings, storage space savings, and so forth.

These suggestions, when adopted, should save the various military departments money which can be utilized for other vital items for national defense. It is time that we draw a line on the expense of tradition when it serves no useful purpose. These suggestions point up the fact that careful examination of

our practices should be made to find more ways of reducing unnecessary duplication of efforts by the services. Three identification cards in lieu of 12 is a reasonable cost-reduction savings. An individual would have to examine the present identification cards very closely to note that the seal was different and that an A or an N appeared after the DD Form 2 designation. The unification of the retirement pamphlets into one DOD publication is only good business

sense and should be adopted as soon as possible to maximize the saving to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nickolas is a distinguished constituent whose views should receive prompt consideration. Currently, he serves as national president of the State Commanders and Adjutants Association of the Disabled American Veterans. His experience and background certainly makes his views significant.

SENATE—Tuesday, July 20, 1971

(Legislative day of Monday, July 19, 1971)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. LAWTON CHILES, a Senator from the State of Florida.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and God of glory, who watches over Thy people at work, at rest, and in all the changing scenes of life, bestow upon all Thy servants here the gifts of understanding, patience, and perseverance. May all their ways be ordered by Thy higher wisdom and according to Thy law. In this confused and troubled world keep our vision clear and our purpose pure as we strive for that new day when all men live in decency, dignity, and honor.

O Lord, guide the President, the Congress, the judiciary, all diplomats, leaders of our Armed Forces, managers of industry and labor, all teachers and students. Bring us together in a unity of high endeavor which transcends all lesser loyalties and forges us into one nation strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. And to Thee we shall ascribe all honor and glory. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. LAWTON CHILES, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CHILES thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of

the proceedings of Monday, July 19, 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.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 260 and 262.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN THE PERMANENT STATUTORY CEILING FOR NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS AND MATTERS RELATED TO NATIONAL GUARD APPROPRIATIONS

The bill (S. 2296) to amend sections 107 and 709 of title 32, United States Code, relating to appropriations for the National Guard and to National Guard technicians, respectively, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2296

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 107 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the catchline and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 107. Availability of appropriation";

(2) striking out all of subsection (a);

(3) striking out "apportioned appropriations" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "appropriations for the National Guard"; and

(4) redesignating subsections (b) and (c), as subsections (a) and (b), respectively.

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1 of such title is amended by striking out

"107. Apportionment of appropriations."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "107. Availability of appropriations."

Sec. 2. Subsection (h) of section 709 of title 32, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) In no event shall the number of technicians employed under this section at any one time exceed 53,100, except that the number of technicians so employed may not exceed 49,200 during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 92-267), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends (1) that the statutory ceiling for technicians be retained in the form of permanent law; (2) that the statutory ceiling for technicians be raised from 42,500 to 49,200 in fiscal year 1972 and to 53,100 in fiscal year 1973 and beyond; and (3) that the obsolete apportionment provisions which have been suspended for over 15 years, for National Guard appropriations under section 107 of title 32 be eliminated.

BACKGROUND

The employment of National Guard technicians has been authorized since the National Defense Act of 1916. The authority was codified in title 32, United States Code, in 1956. The purpose of employing technicians is to provide support in the administration and training of the National Guard military organization and for the day-to-day maintenance and repair of equipment which cannot be accomplished during normal military training periods. Until 1968 the technicians were State employees paid from Federal funds, 95 percent of whom held dual status as members of the National Guard. The National Guard Technicians Act of 1968, Public Law 90-486, converted National Guard technicians to Federal employees with the resultant advantages of the Federal retirement system and other benefits available to Federal employees.

The act of 1968 recognized the military nature of the National Guard technician program and State characteristics of its operation by designating State adjutants general to employ and supervise technicians as Federal employees. The act also established an employment ceiling of 42,500 and made National Guard military membership a prerequisite for employment for approximately 95 percent of the technicians. This made a matter of law what had been the practice for many years. In other words, about 90 percent of the technicians serve in a dual