EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TWO CANADIANS PAY "DEBT" TO AMERICA

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to call the attention of the House of Representatives to an article which appeared in one of the newspapers covering the area which I represent. The story speaks for itself.

Although the brothers involved here do not reside within the 38th District of New York, I felt that the refreshing attitude which these two young men display is worthy of special note by all Members, and I urge them to take a few minutes to read it:

TWO CANADIANS PAY "DEBT" TO AMERICA

(By H. Katherine Smith)

Donald J. Giroux and his brother, Richard J., both Canadian citizens, enlisted in the United States Army and served in Vietnam because they believe they owe this country much.

Born in Ottawa, they moved to Western New York in boyhood. Their father, Maurice Giroux, came here to join the staff of the Buffalo Aeronautical Corp. Currently, he is associated with Bethlehem Steel Co.

Donald and Richard Giroux are graduates of St. Mary's High School of Lancaster. Both earned the Army rank of Spec 5. Both were helicopter repair crew chiefs. The two are making the most of the opportunity offered by the GI Education Bill as students of electronics. Richard is studying in Columbus, Ohio, where he and his wife make their home. Donald is a student at Erie Community College, which he terms "one of the best schools for electronics in the entire country."

Donald Giroux served in Vietnam from July, 1967, until August of the following year. His brother was there during much of that time but the two were unable to meet. Richard crashed in a helicopter and was burned severely. He still is 30 per cent disabled.

In addition to repairing helicopters, Donald Giroux served as door gunner on a copter. He was a member of the 117th Assault Helicopter Company.

"The military ought to be allowed to run this war—not the politicians," Donald told this writer. "We had to get special permission to recover a craft downed in Cambodia. Again, special permission had to be obtained to fire on certain bunkers that we suspected were occupied by the enemy. That's no way to win a war."

In Vietnam, Donald Giroux worked 15 hours a day for a seven-day week. During his service there he lost 40 pounds.

He flew over most of South Vietnam. He deems the country beautiful and took many photos that prove it. In Thailand, where he enjoyed an R and R leave, he also took many photographs. After his return to the United States, he finished serving his three-year term of enlistment at Ft. Sill, Okla.

Although U.S. citizenship would be easily obtainable, the veteran continues a Canadian citizen.

"Canadians are more subdued—less prone to violence—than Americans," he said. "I am proud of the land of my birth."

In August, he will marry Mary Paula Marracino of West Seneca. She is a graduate of West Seneca Senior High School.

Sports and travel interest Donald Giroux. Recently, he visited Nova Scotia. He also spent a summer touring England where he met a number of his mother's relatives.

At St. Mary's High School he played hockey and football. He enjoys watching sports car races and is the proud owner of a classic 1956 Mercedes 190 S.L.

STUDENT "INCENTIVE" EXPERIMENT IS DANGEROUS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my friend and constituent, columnist Herbert B. Berkowitz of Arlington, Va., has made available to me a copy of his column in the Manchester, N.H. Union Leader of July 13, 1971, which cites the plan presently underway to pay would-be school dropouts in the District of Columbia to go to school, as a dangerous experiment.

As I believe all who read this RECORD will benefit from Mr. Berkowitz' comments, I insert the full text of his article at this point in the RECORD:

SUMMER SCHOOL "FUN MONEY" SCHEME PERVERTS EDUCATION TRADITIONS: STUDENT "INCENTIVE" EXPERIMENT IS DANGEROUS

(By Herbert B. Berkowitz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Abuse of government funds by the social charlatans has become so commonplace that it hardly raises an eyebrow anymore.

This is particularly true here in the nation's capital, where social wonderworkers seem to outnumber cars.

It is in this spirit that the federally funded D.C. Model Cities Commission has been able to so pervert the tradition of free public education that education has become secondary, if not altogether extraneous.

Whatever the reasons, graduates of the D.C. public school system generally are as ill-equipped academically as many in the country. The drop-out rate is painfully high, and the number of students advanced a grade just to remove them from students very much their juniors is astounding.

Not a few employers in the Washington area have been taken aback to find that the high school graduates they just hired can barely read.

The remedy the D.C. Model Cities Commission has come up with is seemingly obvious:

Give those students who would normally drop out, and those who are absent too often to benefit from school, the incentive they need to stay.

As a result, some 1,000 youngsters will receive $40 a week just to attend summer school this year.

The D.C. program is just an experiment. But we all know what too often happens with social experiments.

At least one nationally prominent educator, Dr. Edward T. Ladd of Emory University's Division of Educational Studies, already has suggested that public schools everywhere provide these "alternatitive incentives." Where it will end is anybody's guess.

An experiment this year in the nation's capital could be a model plan nationwide next year.

The D.C. program, according to commission staff planner Thomas Wooden, originated in the "community." The students chosen for the program are from model cities neighborhoods only, and they were supposedly selected based on need.

The funds are federal model cities funds. And according to commission officials, the expenditure has been approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FRIGHTENING PROSPECT

We sympathize with program officials, but their approach to a very difficult problem is the worst possible. The possibility that the D.C. experiment will be copied is frightening indeed.

Having to go through a summer without pockets full of spending money admittedly might be a real drag, but hundreds of thousands of teenagers have dragged by before. Some even got part time jobs, after school or on weekends—which seems to require an effort not to be expected of D.C. students.

Others have learned to go without.

Certainly the D.C. students too could work part time or do without.

Let's remember, the plan the commission is talking about is federally funded. Taxpayers everywhere have a stake. Forty dollars a week to bribe some underachievers to attend summer school may sound like a good idea to the "community," to the commission, to HEW, and to the lucky students who will be pulling in the easy money, but the move is a hard one to take as a taxpayer already consuming hundreds of similarly well-intended social betterment programs that are leading nowhere.

To put what the Model Cities Commission is talking about in another light, it should be noted, and not too lightly, that the typical family of four on public assistance receives less than $200 per month for the entire family, for everything.

The commission wants to give 1,000 students $40 a week in fun money.

If this is what the tradition of free public education has degenerated to, we are all in trouble. This plan, and others like it, can only fail.

They may put money in the pockets of potential dropouts, and may even keep them in school, but when the students get out and open their palms to the real world, they will find out the hard way about something for nothing.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a land of progress and prosperity, it is often easy to assume an "out of sight, out of mind" attitude about matters which are not consistently brought to our attention. The fact exists that today more than 1,550 American servicemen are listed as prisoners or missing in Southeast Asia. The wives, children, and parents of these men have not forgotten, and I would hope that my colleagues in Congress and our countrymen across America will not neglect the fact, that all men are not free for as long as one of our number is enslaved. I insert the name of one of the missing.

Lt. Comdr. John Darlington Peace III, U.S. Navy, 613862, Akron, Ohio. Married and the father of one child. A 1957 graduate—with distinction—of the U.S. Naval Academy. Officially listed as miss-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ing December 31, 1967. As of today, Lieutenant Commander Peace has been missing in action in Southeast Asia for 1,303 days.

VOTING RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN BILL FRENZEL TOGETHER WITH LEGISLATION HE HAS INTRODUCED

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that to be credible any governmental institution must be visible. It is essential that the electorate have as much information concerning its elected officials as is possible.

For this reason, I am today submitting a copy of my voting record for this session through June 30 together with a resume of bills which I have sponsored:

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY BILL FRENZEL

(January 22 to June 30, 1971)

ENVIRONMENT

1. H. Res. 191. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment. To the Committee on Rules, February 3, 1971.

2. H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution; designation of the 3rd week of April of each year as "Earth Week." To the Committee on the Judiciary, February 4, 1971.

3. H.J. Res. 349. A joint resolution to establish a joint committee on the Environment. Referred to Committee on Rules, February 18, 1971.

4. H.R. 5075. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens' suits and class actions in the United States District Courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards. Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, February 25, 1971.

5. H.R. 5446. A bill to consent to the Interstate Environment Compact. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary, March 3, 1971.

6. H.R. 5973. A bill to establish an Environmental Financing Authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Public Works, March 11, 1971.

7. H.R. 8642. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for more effective control of aircraft noise. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, May 20, 1971.

8. H.R. 9385. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to insure the procurement and use by the Federal Government of products manufactured from recycled materials. Referred to Committee on Government Operations, June 23, 1971.

9. H.R. 9386. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured or used by the Federal Government or the District of Columbia. June 23, 1971.

WATER POLLUTION

1. H.R. 4360. A bill to amend the Act of August 3, 1968 to protect the ecology of estuarine areas by regulating dumping of waste materials. Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, February 17, 1971.

2. H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the pollution of waters all over the world and the necessity for coordinated international action to prevent such pollution. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3. H.R. 5050. A bill to regulate the discharge of wastes in territorial and international waters. Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, February 10, 1971.

4. H.R. 4719. A bill to prohibit the discharge into any of the navigable waters of the United States or into international waters of any military material or other refuse without a certification by the Environmental Protection Agency approving such discharge. Referred to Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, February 22, 1971.

5. H.R. 5223. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish standards which must be met by all synthetic detergents and to ban from detergents all phosphates and those synthetics which fail to meet the standards by June 30, 1971. Referred to Committee on Public Works, March 1, 1971.

6. H.R. 5961. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. Referred to Committee on Public Works, March 11, 1971.

7. H.R. 5965. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Public Works, March 11, 1971.

8. H.R. 5969. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. Referred to the Committee on Public Works, March 11, 1971.

9. H.R. 6487. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes. Clean Lakes Act of 1971. Referred to Committee on Public Works March 22, 1971.

10. H.R. 7539. A bill to amend section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to allow the imposition by a State of more restrictive standards relating to the discharge into the navigable waters of the United States of radioactive materials. Referred to Committee on Atomic Energy, April 20, 1971.

SOLID WASTES

1. H.R. 5451. A bill to discourage the production of one-way containers for carbonated and/or malt beverages so as to reduce litter, reduce the cost of solid waste management, and to conserve natural resources. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, March 3, 1971.

2. H.R. 6652. A bill to encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and to provide for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing. Referred to Committee on Ways and Means, March 22, 1971.

CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

1. H.R. 4262. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. .22 Caliber ammunition. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, February 10, 1971.

2. H.R. 5778. A bill to authorize insurance in connection with loans for the preservation of residential historic properties. Referred to Committee on Banking and Currency, March 9, 1971.

3. H.R. 7134. A bill providing for the conveyance of certain real property to the State of Minnesota for park and recreation purposes. Fort Snelling. Referred to Committee on Government Operations, April 1, 1971.

4. H.R. 8060. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 as to provide for the regulation of the broadcasting of certain major sporting events in the public interest. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, May 4, 1971.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

1. H.R. 4541. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office and Bureau of Consumer Protection. Referred to Committee on Government Operations, February 18, 1971.

TAX LEGISLATION

1. H.R. 4219. A bill to give all unmarried individuals tax benefits of income splitting. Referred to Committee on Ways and Means, February 10, 1971.

2. H.J. Res. 662. To create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms. May 25. 1971.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION AND REFORM

1. H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, to the Committee on the Judiciary, January 22, 1971.

2. H.R. 3135. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year, to the Committee on Government Operations, February 1, 1971.

3. H.R. 3994. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates. February 9, 1971.

4. H.R. 4188. A bill to restore balance in the Federal system of government. Revenue sharing. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, February 10, 1971.

5. H.R. 6141. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia and elected mayors, an elected city council, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia, March 16, 1971.

6. H.R. 8853. A bill to provide Federal revenues to State and local governments and afford them broad discretion in carrying out community development activities and to help States and localities to improve their decision making and management capabilities. Referred to Committee on Banking and Currency, June 2, 1971.

7. H.J. Res. 717. Joint resolution to limit the tenure of office of Senators and Representatives, and to provide an age limit for Senators and Representatives. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, June 16, 1971.

8. H. Res. 499. A resolution to provide for equitable and effective minority staffing on House standing committees. Referred to the Committee on Rules, June 22, 1971.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

1. H.J. Res. 325. Joint resolution; equal rights for ladies; constitutional amendment. February 10, 1971.

2. H.R. 5640. A bill to protect the political rights and privacy of individuals and organizations and to define the authority of the Armed Forces to collect, distribute, and store information about civilian political activity. Freedom from Surveillance Act of 1971. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services, March 4, 1971.

3. H.R. 5693. A bill to amend Title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the United States Government except in conformity with the provisions of Title 18. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, March 8, 1971.

4. H.R. 6361. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, March 18, 1971.

5. H.R. 7665. A bill to amend Title 28,

United States Code, to prohibit Federal judges from receiving compensation other than for the performance of their judicial duties, except in certain instances, and to provide for the disclosure of certain financial information. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, April 22, 1971.

6. H.R. 8602. A bill to amend Title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies. Referred to Committee on Government Operations, May 20, 1971.

CRIME AND JUDICIAL REFORM

1. H.R. 6471. A bill to prohibit assaults on State law enforcement officers, firemen, and judicial officers. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary, March 22, 1971.

2. H.R. 7351. A bill to amend Title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary, April 7, 1971.

EDUCATION

1. H.R. 3610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, February 4, 1971.

2. H.R. 5099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for gifts or contributions made to any institution of higher education, to be cited as, "The Higher Education Gift Incentive Act of 1971." Referred to Committee on Ways and Means, February 25, 1971.

3. H.R. 6233. A bill to authorize a White House Conference on Education. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor March 17, 1971.

4. H.R. 7344. A bill to provide a comprehensive child development program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Referred to Committee on Education and Labor, April 7, 1971.

5. H.R. 7397. A bill to provide a comprehensive child development program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, April 7, 1971.

6. H. Res. 427. A resolution to provide for two additional student congressional interns for Members of the House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and the Delegate from the District of Columbia. Referred to Committee on House Administration, May 5, 1971.

7. H.R. 8937. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, to provide for administration of programs of Indian education by a National Board of Indian Education in the United States Office of Education, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, June 4, 1971.

FOREIGN RELATIONS/DEFENSE

1. H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution to create an Atlantic Union delegation. Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 17, 1971.

2. H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that our NATO allies should contribute more to the cost of their own defense. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 3, 1971.

3. H. Con Res. 252. A concurrent resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, April 1, 1971.

4. H. Con Res. 258. A concurrent resolution urging review of the United Nations Charter. Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs, April 5, 1971.

5. H.R. 8660. A bill to provide a procedure for the exercise of Congressional and Executive powers over the use of any Armed Forces of the United States in military hostilities, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services, May 24, 1971.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND AID TO DISADVANTAGED

1. H.J. Res. 120. A resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging. Referred to the Committee on Rules, January 22, 1971.

2. H. Con Res. 181. A concurrent resolution to declare the sense of the U.S. Congress with respect to the Federal administration of Indian Affairs. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, February 23, 1971.

3. H.R. 6020. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to authorize a family assistance plan providing basic benefits to low-income families with children with incentive for employment and training to improve the capacity for employment of members of such families, to achieve more uniform treatment of recipients under the Federal-State public assistance programs and otherwise improve such programs, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Ways and Means, March 15, 1971.

4. H.R. 6021. A bill to amend Title II of the Social Security Act to provide increases in benefits, to improve computation methods, to raise the earnings base under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Ways and Means, March 15, 1971.

SOVIET JEWRY

1. H.R. 6385. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, March 18, 1971.

2. H. Con Res. 221. A concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies concerning the rights of Soviet Jewry. Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 22, 1971.

3. H.R. 6698. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, March 24, 1971.

4. H. Res. 460. A resolution calling upon the Voice of America to broadcast in the Yiddish language to Soviet Jewry. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, June 2, 1971.

POW/MIA

1. H.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 21, 1971, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, January 22, 1971.

2. H. Con Res. 113. A concurrent resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Viet Nam and the National Liberation Front. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 3, 1971.

BUSINESS/JOBS

1. H.R. 5063. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, February 25, 1971.

2. H.R. 6371. A bill to amend the Small Business Act by striking out "$2,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof $3,100,000,000. Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, March 8, 1971.

3. H.R. 6688. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research, educational, and assistance programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, March 24, 1971.

4. H.R. 7414. A bill to amend the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to make municipal governments eligible for technical services under the Act, to extend the Act through fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, April 7, 1971.

HEALTH

1. H.R. 4413. A bill to amend Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend economic and military assistance to countries which fail to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced in such country from entering the United States unlawfully. Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 17, 1971.

2. H.R. 6019. A bill to amend Title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited samples of cigarettes. Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, March 15, 1971.

3. H.R. 6808. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations requiring certain modes of public transportation in interstate commerce to reserve some seating capacity for passengers who do not smoke. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 25, 1971.

4. H.R. 7120. A bill to establish the Office of Drug Abuse Control within the Executive Office of the President. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, April 1, 1971.

5. H.R. 7765. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for new health manpower educational initiatives, increase the level of financial assistance to health professions schools and other institutions training health personnel, improve the distribution and increase the supply of health personnel, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, April 27, 1971.

6. H.R. 8093. A bill to amend Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit foreign assistance from being provided to foreign countries which do not act to prevent narcotic drugs from unlawfully entering the United States. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, May 5, 1971.

7. H.R. 8742. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the development and operation of treatment programs for certain drug abusers who are confined to or released from correctional institutions and facilities. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, May 26, 1971.

8. H.R. 8861. A bill to establish drug abuse control organizations in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services, June 2, 1971.

9. H.R. 9123. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require employers to make an approved basic health care plan available to their employees, to provide a family health insurance plan for low-income families not covered by an employer's basic health care plan, to facilitate provision of health services to beneficiaries of the family health insurance plan by health maintenance organizations, by prohibiting State law interference with such organizations providing such services, and for other purposes. Referred to Committee on Ways and Means, June 15, 1971.

10. H.R. 9213. A bill to provide comprehensive treatment for servicemen and veterans who suffer from abuse of, or dependency on, narcotic drugs, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services, June 16, 1971.

11. H.R. 9231. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to move amphetamines and certain other stimulant substances from Schedule III of such Act to

Schedule II. Referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, June 17, 1971.

12. H.R. 9426. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to intentionally promote or facilitate illegal drug trafficking by possession, sale, or distribution, of certain paraphernalia, and further to make it unlawful for a person to possess an instrument or device for the purpose of unlawfully using a controlled substance himself. Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, June 24, 1971.

TRANSPORTATION

1. H. Res. 324. A resolution to make mass transportation a national priority. Referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 17, 1971.

2. H.R. 9088. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the railroad and airline transportation industries, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, June 14, 1971.

URBAN AFFAIRS/HOUSING

1. H.J. Res. 165. A joint resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs. Referred to the Committee on Rules, January 29, 1971.

2. H.R. 9331. A bill to consolidate, simplify, and improve laws relating to housing and housing assistance. Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, June 22, 1971.

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD, 92D CONG., 1ST SESS. (HON. BILL FRENZEL)

Roll No.	Date	Page in Daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote Yea	Nay	Present
1	Jan. 21, 1971	H1	Call by States	Present			428
2	Jan. 21, 1971	H2	Election of Speaker	Ford			
3	Jan. 21, 1971	H6	Call of the House	Present			396
4	Jan. 21, 1971	H6	Call of the House	Present			381
5	Jan. 22, 1971	H57	Call of the House	Present			373
6	Jan. 22, 1971	H60	Call of the House	Present			375
7	Jan. 22, 1971	H66	H. Res. 5 (on prev. question)	Nay	134	254	
8	Jan. 22, 1971	H68	H. Res. 5 (on prev. question)	Nay	213	174	
9	Jan. 22, 1971	H69	H. Res. 5 (on amendment)	Yea	234	153	
10	Jan. 22, 1971	H70	H. Res. 5 (on agree to res.)	Nay	226	156	1
11	Feb. 2, 1971	H 362	Call of the House	Present			320
12	Feb. 4, 1971	H 428	Call of the House	Present			306
13	Feb. 4, 1971	H 434	H. Res. 193 (on prev. question)	Nay	259	32	42
14	Mar. 2, 1971	H 1100	H. Res. 264 (on agree to res.)	Not voting	292	63	
15	Mar. 3, 1971	H 1144	Call of the House	Present			364
16	Mar. 3, 1971	H 1173	H.R. 4690 (on passage)	Yea	228	162	
17	Mar. 10, 1971	H 1379	Call of the House	Present			369
18	Mar. 10, 1971	H 1391	H.R. 4246 (on passage)	Yea	382	19	
19	Mar. 10, 1971	H 1398	H.R. 5432 (on passage)	Yea	393	5	
20	Mar. 16, 1971	H 1585	H.R. 4690 (agree to con. rept.)	Yea	360	3	1
21	Mar. 16, 1971	H1589	H.J. Res. 465 (on passage)	Yea	355		
22	Mar. 17, 1971	H1630	Call of the House	Present			351
23	Mar. 17, 1971	H1630	Call of the House	Present			321
24	Mar. 18, 1971	H1715	Call of the House	Present			384
25	Mar. 18, 1971	H1748	H.J. Res. 468 (Yates amendment)	Yea	216	203	
26	Mar. 23, 1971	H1819	Call of the House	Present			378
27	Mar. 23, 1971	H1856	H.J. Res. 223 (agree to Joint resolution)	Yea	401	19	
28	Mar. 24, 1971	H1937	H. Res. 339 (on agree to res.)	Yea	366	26	
29	Mar. 24, 1971	H1959	H.R. 7 (on passage)	Nay	269	127	
1 30	Mar. 03, 1971	H1173	H.R. 4690 (Patman amendment)	Nay	180	212	
1 31	Mar. 18, 1971	H1748	H.J. Res. 468 (agree to amendments)	Yea	217	204	
32	Mar. 29, 1971	H2072	H. Res. 349 (consideration of)	Yea	324	6	
33	Mar. 29, 1971	H2077	Call in committee	Present			332
1 34	Mar. 29, 1971	H2077	S.J. Res. 55 (on amendment)	Nay	143	183	
35	Mar. 30, 1971	H2123	Call in committee	Present			371
36	Mar. 31, 1971	H2221	Call of the House	Present			355
1 37	Mar. 31, 1971	H2249	H.R. 6531 (on amendment)	Nay	62	331	
1 38	Mar. 31, 1971	H2258	H.R. 6531 (on amendment)	Yea	198	200	
39	Apr. 1, 1971	H2332	Call of the House	Present			372
40	Apr. 1, 1971	H2343	Call in committee	Present			367
1 41	Apr. 1, 1971	H2345	H.R. 6531 (on amendment)	Yea	132	242	
1 42	Apr. 1, 1971	H2359	H.R. 6531 (on amendment)	Nay	122	260	
1 43	Apr. 1, 1971	H2370	H.R. 6531 (on amendment)	Nay	96	278	
1 44	Apr. 1, 1971	H2371	H.R. 6531 (on amendment)	Yea	170	200	1
45	Apr. 1, 1971	H2388	H.R. 6531 (on passage)	Yea	293	99	2
46	Apr. 6, 1971	H2463	Call of the House	Absent			346
47	Apr. 6, 1971	H2478	Call in committee	Present			336
48	Apr. 6, 1971	H2492	H. Res. 356 (on agree to res.)	Nay	182	177	
49	Apr. 6, 1971	H2495	Call in committee	Present			311
1 50	Apr. 6, 1971	H2502	H.R. 5981 (on pref. motion)	Yea	193	115	
51	Apr. 7, 1971	H2560	Call in committee	Present			364
1 52	Apr. 7, 1971	H2588	H.R. 7016 (on amendment)	Nay	188	191	1
1 53	Apr. 7, 1971	H2605	H.R. 7016 (Conte amendment)	Yea	149	206	
54	Apr. 7, 1971	H2611	H.R. 7016 (on passage)	Yea	355	7	
55	Apr. 19, 1971	H2661	H.R. 1535 (susp. rules and pass)	Yea	192	84	
56	Apr. 20, 1971	H2697	Call of the House	Present			340
57	Apr. 20, 1971	H2708	Call in committee	Present			344
58	Apr. 20, 1971	H2711	H.R. 4724 (on passage)	Yea	360	11	
59	Apr. 21, 1971	H2755	Call of the House	Absent			357
60	Apr. 21, 1971	H2756	Call of the House	Absent			334
61	Apr. 21, 1971	H2761	Call of the House	Absent			352
62	Apr. 21, 1971	H2762	Call of the House	Absent			336
63	Apr. 21, 1971	H2762	Call of the House	Absent			336
64	Apr. 21, 1971	H2771	Call in committee	Absent			318
65	Apr. 22, 1971	H2883	Call of the House	Present			367
66	Apr. 22, 1971	H2897	H.R. 5376 (motion to recommit)	Nay	128	262	
67	Apr. 22, 1971	H2898	H.R. 5376 (Tiernan amendment)	Yea	319	68	
68	Apr. 27, 1971	H2985	Call of the House	Present			361
69	Apr. 27, 1971	H2991	H.R. 2598 (motion to recommit)	Nay	76	303	
70	Apr. 27, 1971	H2998	H.R. 6417 (on passage)	Nay	178	200	
71	Apr. 28, 1971	H3138	Call of the House	Present			365
72	Apr. 28, 1971	H3159	H.R. 6444 (on passage)	Yea	379		
73	Apr. 29, 1971	H3204	Call of the House	Present			361
74	Apr. 29, 1971	H3223	H. Res. 274 (on amendment)	Nay	257	129	
75	Apr. 29, 1971	H3224	H. Res. 274 (motion to recommit)	Nay	104	275	
76	Apr. 29, 1971	H3225	H. Res. 274 (on agree to res.)	Yea	300	75	
77	May 3, 1971	H3301	Call of the House	Present			307
78	May 3, 1971	H3315	H.R. 6283 (motion to suspend)	Yea	301	20	
79	May 4, 1971	H3449	S. 531 (on passage)	Not voting	241	124	
80	May 5, 1971	H3486	H. Res. 422 (on agree to res.)	Yea	380		1
81	May 5, 1971	H3490	H. Res. 423 (on agree to res.)	Yea	381		
82	May 5, 1971	H3496	H.R. 4604 (on passage)	Yea	383		
83	May 6, 1971	H3571	Call of the House	Present			318
84	May 6, 1971	H3576	H. Res. 412 (on agree to Res.)	Nay	156	172	
85	May 10, 1971	H3660	H.R. 5638 (on passage)	Yea	312		
86	May 11, 1971	H3734	Call of the House	Present			369
1 87	May 11, 1971	H3772	H.R. 8190 (Giaimo amendment)	Yea	170	219	
88	May 12, 1971	H3836	Call of the House	Present			381

MEMBER'S INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD, 92D CONG., 1ST SESS. (HON. BILL FRENZEL)—Continued

Roll No.	Date	Page in Daily Record	Description	Member's response	Total vote Yea	Nay	Present
[1] 89	May 12, 1971	H3855	H.S. 8190 (Boland amendment)	Nay	201	195	2
90	May 12, 1971	H3861	H.S. 8190 (Boland amendment)	Nay	201	197	
91	May 17, 1971	H3955	H.R. 7271 (motion to suspend)	Yea	262	67	
92	May 17, 1971	H3959	H.R. 5257 (motion to suspend)	Yea	332		
93	May 17, 1971	H3973	H.R. 56 (motion to suspend)	Yea	305	18	
94	May 17, 1971	H3977	H.R. 5060 (motion to suspend)	Yea	307	8	
95	May 17, 1971	H3980	H.R. 2587 (motion to suspend)	Yea	293	10	
96	May 18, 1971	H4036	Call of the House	Present			362
97	May 18, 1971	H4038	Call of the House	Present			365
98	May 18, 1971	H4047	H. Res. 437 (on prev. question)	Nay	182	210	
99	May 18, 1971	H4048	H. Res. 437 (on amendment)	Yea	210	177	
100	May 18, 1971	H4048	H. Res. 437 (on agree to res.)	Yea	350	34	
101	May 18, 1971	H4050	Call of the House	Present			311
102	May 18, 1971	H4093	S.J. Res. 100 (on 3d reading)	Yea	265	93	
103	May 19, 1971	H4107	Call of the House	Present			348
104	May 20, 1971	H4202	H.R. 8190 (on agree to report)	Yea	264	28	
105	May 20, 1971	H4204	H.R. 8190 (on motion to concur)	Nay	118	156	
106	May 24, 1971	H4240	H. Res. 415 (on agree to res.)	Yea	201	88	
107	May 25, 1971	H4290	Call of the House	Present			321
108	May 25, 1971	H4319	H. Res. 411 (on agree to res.)	Nay	131	224	
109	May 26, 1971	H4379	Call of the House	Absent			323
110	May 26, 1971	H4398	H. Res. 155 (on agree to res.)	Nay	128	218	
111	June 1, 1971	H4462	Call in committee	Present			276
112	June 2, 1971	H4498	Call of the House	Present			370
[1] 113	June 2, 1971	H4530	H.R. 3613 (Esch amendment)	Yea	182	204	
114	June 2, 1971	H4538	H.R. 3613 (motion to recommit)	Yea	184	202	
115	June 2, 1971	H4538	H.R. 3613 (on passage)	Nay	245	141	
116	June 3, 1971	H4587	H. Res. 452 (on agree to res.)	Yea	357	4	
117	June 3, 1971	H4627	H.R. 7109 (on passage)	Nay	303	64	
118	June 4, 1971	H4704	Call in committee	Present			285
119	June 4, 1971	H4714	H.R. 8825 (on passage)	Yea	259	26	3
120	June 7, 1971	H4757	H.R. 8011 (motion to suspend)	Not voting	309		
121	June 7, 1971	H4762	H.R. 1161 (motion to suspend)	Not voting	298	13	
122	June 7, 1971	H4784	H.R. 7960 (on passage)	Not voting	319	8	
123	June 8, 1971	H4859	Call of the House	Absent			368
124	June 8, 1971	H4862	H. Res. 465 (on agree to res.)	Not voting	336	41	
125	June 9, 1971	H4896	Call of the House	Absent			368
126	June 9, 1971	H4913	H.J. Res. 617 (motion to recomm.)	Not voting	166	215	
127	June 9, 1971	H4914	H.J. Res. 617 (on passage)	Not voting	225	158	
128	June 10, 1971	H4988	Call of the House	Present			357
129	June 10, 1971	H4999	H. Res. 471 (on prev. question)	Nay	213	166	
130	June 10, 1971	H5020	H.R. 8866 (on passage)	Yea	229	128	
131	June 14, 1971	H5085	H.R. 8794 (on passage)	Yea	311	1	
132	June 15, 1971	H5161	Call of the House	Present			365
133	June 15, 1971	H5165	Call of the House	Present			338
134	June 15, 1971	H5180	S. 575 (on agree to conf. rep.)	Yea	275	104	
135	June 16, 1971	H5185	Call in committee	Present			341
136	June 16, 1971	H5267	Call in committee	Present			384
[1] 137	June 16, 1971	H5284	H.R. 8687 (Leggett amendment)	Nay	129	267	
[1] 138	June 16, 1971	H5293	H.R. 8687 (Pike amendment)	Nay	97	307	
[1] 139	June 16, 1971	H5297	H.R. 8687 (Stafford amendment)	Yea	135	258	
[1] 140	June 16, 1971	H5300	H.R. 8687 (Aspin amendment)	Yea	118	278	
141	June 17, 1971	H5338	On motion to adjourn	Nay	30	369	2
142	June 17, 1971	H5339	H.R. 7016 (preferential motion)	Yea	228	182	1
[1] 143	June 17, 1971	H5398	H.R. 8687 (Mink amendment)	Nay	82	327	
[1] 144	June 17, 1971	H5399	H.R. 8687 (Nedzi amendment)	Yea	158	255	
[1] 145	June 17, 1971	H5410	H.R. 8687 (Pepper amendment)	Not voting	147	237	
146	June 17, 1971	H5414	H.R. 8687 (on passage)	Not voting	331	58	1
147	June 18, 1971	H5449	H. Res. 434 (on agree to res.)	NVA [2]	183	119	
148	June 18, 1971	H5454	H.R. 7736 (on passage)	Not voting	299		
149	June 21, 1971	H5510	H.R. 5237 (on passage)	Yea	340	8	
150	June 21, 1971	H5517	S. 1538 (suspend rules, pass)	Yea	336	24	
151	June 21, 1971	H5519	H.R. 3146 (suspend rules, pass)	Yea	361	2	
152	June 21, 1971	H5536	H. Res. 487 (on prev. question)	Yea	200	172	
153	June 22, 1971	H5586	Call in committee	Present			368
154	June 22, 1971	H5608	Call in committee	Present			381
155	June 22, 1971	H5630	Call in committee	Present			397
[1] 156	June 22, 1971	H5716	H.R. 1 (Ullman amendment)	Nay	187	234	
157	June 22, 1971	H5717	H.R. 1 (on passage)	Yea	288	132	
158	June 23, 1971	H5738	Call of House	Present			393
[1] 159	June 23, 1971	H5774	H.R. 9270 (on amendment)	Yea	214	198	
[1] 160	June 23, 1971	H5804	H.R. 9270 (on amendment)	Yea	129	278	

CUMULATIVE VOTING RECORD THIS SESSION (THROUGH ROLL NO. 160)

	Yeas/nays	Quorum calls	Recorded tellers	Grand totals
Number of calls or votes	76	57	25	158
Present responses (yea, nay, present, present-paired for or against)	65	47	24	136
Absenses (absent, not voting, not voting paired for or against)	11	10	1	22
Voting percentage (presence)	85.5	82.4	96.0	86.0

[1] Indicates recorded teller vote.

[2] Not voting (paired against).

SCHOOL JUSTICE, VIOLENCE, AND DESPAIR

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, seldom does a Member of this body rise to make an appeal on behalf of justice to one individual. Seldom is such an appeal necessary in the legislative halls of this Nation for justice is normally dispensed in the courts and administrative bodies of our Federal, State, local or military governments.

But occasionally, perhaps more often than we would prefer to admit, the normal bureaucratic and judicial processes fail us. Then the only recourse is let the people know that such a failure has occurred and warn them against similar failures in the future.

Such is the case of Brad Humphrey.

Brad Humphrey is a fairly typical American teenager who committed one major "crime." His "crime" was that he tried to work within the Establishment to settle a grievance and the Establishment

failed to work. You and I would not characterize such an action to be a "crime," but an ever-growing segment of the youth in this Nation would so characterize it.

We see daily evidence of more teenagers, who have grown disenchanted with the failure of a society and its institutions to meet and fill their basic needs. And we see ever more evidence of these same youth—often the brightest and best of their generation—dropping out of society. These dropouts may go into a drug culture or commune. More often they simply retreat within themselves, try for a simple job that is now impossible to obtain, and stop communicating in any meaningful way with their friends and parents.

But Brad Humphrey, disillusioned by the incredibly inept ability of the Establishment to respond fairly to a just grievance, has dropped out in a different fashion—he simply left the country that treated him so shabbily to seek other societies where basic justice can be obtained.

I want to insert Brad Humphrey's story, written in his own words, at the conclusion of my remarks, but first let me give you a brief description of his experience.

Brad was attending an overseas high school that is financed in large part by State Department funds. He was a star athlete and popular student, so much so that his friends asked him to run for class president. He did so and won handily on the first ballot, getting a majority of votes in a three-way election. But the student election committee made up of the sister and backers of the chief runnerup, ruled this a primary election and called for a runoff election. The runnerup in the first election was announced the winner in the runoff election—in which the votes were counted by the same election committee— despite results of a subsequent poll of students showing that Brad had won it as well.

Student supporters of Brad urged him to back a demonstration against such tactics, but Brad insisted on going through channels—in this case, an appeal to the student court. However, the first elected court was declared unconstitutional by the same election committee, which then reformed the court so that it was composed largely of backers of Brad's opponent and members of the same election committee. Moreover, under special rules of this court, Brad would need four votes to win and only two votes to lose. Also, he was informed that he would have to waive all rights of appeal. Finally, he was not permitted to argue and present his own case—his opponent's campaign manager was to have that privilege.

Let me ask you, as ladies and gentlemen who have all run in political campaigns, would you ever make an election challenge under these circumstances?

Brad chose not to. School officials labeled him a "bad sport" for failing to go before this "stacked" court; and Brad's subsequent appeals to the State Department, indeed to the White House, have all resulted in the same conclusion: "You should have appealed to the student court." Yes, Brad has even sought and received the very able assistance of Members of Congress in this case. But always, the congressional inquiry ends with the same form letter from the State Department—undoubtedly written by the same person in all instances—saying that he should have appealed to the student court and that they have no jurisdiction over the school.

Is it any wonder that we are turning off the cream of our younger generation? Is it any wonder that our students are attacking our schools, the administrators and teachers who enforce these rules? Is it any wonder that our youth—fed up with the redtape of Government and the futility of Congress to unravel it—should drop out?

This is not a case of national prominence. A just decision at this time—more than a year after the fact—would not change anything. But I am devoting my time and this space in our RECORD to review the case, because I believe it reflects a wider malady that is sweeping across our younger generation. And I only hope that we have the wisdom and foresight to do something before we have lost our future leaders.

Without objection, I insert Brad Humphrey's own story, in somewhat abbreviated form, following these remarks:

A STUDENT'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT REGARDING SCHOOL JUSTICE, VIOLENCE, AND DESPAIR

FAIRFAX, VA.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At Nebraska, you assured us, "Those who have believed the system could not be moved, I urge you to try it . . . the door is open."

Would that apply to my case? I have tried every other possibility from the local School Board to the U.S. Congress. In addition to the national issue involved, my good name is at stake. Yet, I have been unable to get a fair hearing and judgment. I have refused all offers of help from demonstrations.

Would it be possible to ask one of your advisors on schools and education to glance through these few pages and determine if a national problem is involved that is worthy of more careful consideration?

Sincerely yours,

BRAD HUMPHREY,
Brad (with the assistance of Susan, Galen and Bob) Humphrey.

A U.S. GOVERNMENT SUPPORTED HIGH SCHOOL

Many, many parents of my friends in three States and one overseas country have told me that the situation involved in my case is neither new, nor atypical. But it is rather extreme, and it involves a school that is not typical. It has a much closer connection to the U.S. Government than most high schools. This school is located in Thailand. It is heavily subsidized by U.S. tax money, run by American educators under U.S. State Department guidance, and accredited in the States in order to make certain that the thousands of U.S. dependent children in Southeast Asia receive a good education.

THE BASIC FACTS

In a high school election for the sophomore class presidency these were the results:

For me	137
First opponent	89
Second opponent	36
Total	125

The school constitution governing elections read:

ARTICLE XIII. ELECTIONS

Section 1. "All candidates for the Student Council, Class Offices, or Homeroom Offices shall be elected by a *simple majority* of the votes cast by the respective constituencies at the respective elections. In the event that a simple majority is *not achieved* by any one candidate, *a run-off* shall be held between the two leading candidates."

According to the Constitution, clearly I had won the presidency.

THE FIRST BALLOT RESULTS CONCEALED

The four Student Council Officers (the Student Election Committee) and the administrative election supervisor, Director of Activities Mr. G. Wright, did not reveal the results of the election's first ballot.

Rather, they held a run-off between my first opponent and me on the day following the first ballot.

THE SECOND BALLOT

In violation of all the rules, my opponent's sister collected the ballots. (She was on the Election Committee, a Student Council Officer.)

Results:

For my opponent	156
For me	116

This was a landslide defeat of 40 votes just 24 hours after I had defeated this opponent by 46 votes.

To obtain such a result, my opponent would have had to—

1. Keep all 89 of his first ballot votes;
2. Take all 36 of the 3rd entry's first ballot votes;
3. Get all 12 of the new votes cast on the 2nd ballot; and
4. Get 19 of those who voted for me in the 1st ballot to switch.

Statistically, practically, and politically, for all of these prerequisites to have occurred is impossible or highly improbable.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S REACTION

By chance I learned of my victory on the first ballot. I asked the Director about it, about my opponent's sister collecting the ballots, and about the surprising vote switch in 24 hours.

He lectured me on sportsmanship. I went to Dean J. Wartgow. He lectured me on Sportsmanship, I went to Dr. R. Durmas, the Principal, and finally to the Superintendent, Dr. S. Phillips . . . he also lectured.

STUDENT SURVEY

I conducted a survey of the sophomores to see how they remembered voting on both ballots. According to their memories, I won on the second ballot too. My parents would not approve revealing publicly the evidence of fraud on the second ballot. They feared a dangerous despondency on the part of a student who might be wrongly suspected. I agreed; but I took the survey to the school administration officials. They would not look at it nor conduct their own.

(Homeroom teachers had supervised, collected and turned in my survey results to the office. My opponent helped me tabulate the results until he saw it was not going in his favor. I still have the survey results on the original questionnaire papers.)

TOTAL REPRESSION

My survey of the sophomore class caused talk on the campus.

(1) The Student Council Officers, (the Election Committee) and the "School Authorities", issued a denunciation of my survey. In a memo to the Sophomore Class, they stated, "It is the position of the Student Council Election Committee and *school authorities* that the election was conducted fairly and impartially. . . ."

(2) We tried to get the case up before the Student Council, but the Student Council

Officers (the Election Committee) would not let it be discussed.

(3) We tried to get the issue into the school paper. Not a word was allowed in until four months later, after I had left school and promised to bring the issue back to Congress.

OUTSIDE THE SYSTEM

1. Friends appeared offering help through the underground press, but that meant dirty talk, and I did not approve.

2. The softball team (I was J.V. Captain) offered to support me "all the way". That meant demonstration, and I did not agree.

INSIDE THE BIGGER SYSTEM

I wrote to the ex-Student Council President, who had written the constitution the previous school year. He responded:

"DEAR BRAD: Clearly the Student Council Officers have violated the Constitution . . . It seems to me to be very bluntly and flagrantly a violation of the Constitution . . .

"(Signed) Mr. KWONGPING HO."

I took the letter to the school Superintendent. He refused to read it.

I went to a downtown law firm. They said the case was a scandal, but that a school constitution had no status in court. We discussed a release to the public press.

THE STUDENT SUPREME COURT

The School Constitution called for a Student Supreme Court, but one had not been elected. There were to be five judges; four were to be elected and the fifth was to be the Student Council Vice President. The Vice President was one of my opponents on the case since she was also a member of the Election Committee. Still, in desperation, I asked that a court be elected so I could take my case before it.

My best friend was elected as one of the court judges. The student council officers immediately had the court declared unconstitutional. Through control of the nominations they selected and elected a bench of judges considered unfriendly to my efforts. One was one of my defeated opponents; one was the son of an administrative officer, and they insisted that the Vice President be allowed to remain on the court as the chairman even though I had shamed them into deciding that she could not vote.

Finally, they made up a special set of Supreme Court rules for me. Here were the most oppressive items:

Article II, Section 1, Clause 2: The plaintiff shall sign an affidavit (including) the promise to accept in good faith the court's decision. (I had to sign an oath not to appeal a bad decision.)

Article III, Section 2, Clause 4: A ⅘ majority vote shall constitute a Court decision." (I had to get four votes to win, but two would defeat me.)

Still, I did not think that the student judges would dare decide against me and still try to live on the campus. So I prepared my court or case brief in multiple copies and took it to the Vice President, the Student Court Chairman. She refused it saying that the Director of Activities was handling the case. (He was my chief opponent on the case. He had supervised the improper election, and he had helped my election opponent with his campaign.)

PEACEFUL STUDENT AID

Some of the more daring and secure students agreed to act as my lawyers. Meanwhile, I was trying to persuade the school administration that my opponents should not sit on the bench in judgment of their own acts. Also, the local English language press carried a headline story of the case. They saw it as a case of probable impropriety on the part of the school. (*Bangkok World*, Dec. 6, 1969)

The school Principal called my student lawyers and I into his office and threatened us all with suspension if we did not go immediately to the packed court for a secret hearing of the case, and I still had to sign the oath against an appeal.

I released my lawyers and refused to go to the obviously intended whitewash.

VIOLENCE, WITHDRAWAL, OR WHAT?

My father consulted the school Superintendent about the unfair court. For after the four months of hopeless struggle, I mentioned to dad that I would most likely be incited to spontaneous violence against one of the administrative officers quite soon. Dad asked the Superintendent not to let my opponents sit on the court. The Superintendent said that it was unfair to them if they were not allowed to sit. With that, dad let me return to the States and to a state-side high school.

It was very difficult to leave home (my family), a lovely girl friend, and all of my boy friends in the mid-year of school at the age of sixteen. But despite the fact that I was a top student and athlete, I understand now that there are times when a student *must* either use violence or else drop out of a school. In the absence of justice and truth from the administrative officers, there are no other alternatives.

THE SCHOOL BOARD

After I left school, my brother visited key school board members and I wrote to them. They would not discuss the issue. They just got angry. The Chairman, Mr. J. M. Ahrens of the Bank of America, wrote me a long letter lecturing me on how I should have gone to court because I had a perfectly good right of appeal. I sent him the Supreme Court rules made up for my case depriving me of the right of any appeal. He ignored it.

(In fairness to the school board members, one can't blame them much. Each had children in the school. The children of any school board members who questioned the administrators would simply have "had it." It is not the major wrong to the student that is so destructive, it is the daily, petty insults, deprivation of little honors, and pressure to give in to the bigger wrong that finally drives you to violence or withdrawal.)

THE EDUCATORS

While I was still in school, the administration fought the case by:

Publicly declaring there was nothing questionable about the case.

Publicly declaring that I was hurting the school by questioning the case.

Privately delaying my efforts to fight the case legally.

Privately whispering that I was a poor sport.

Privately whispering that if any election was to be questioned (and would be if I did not stop) it was the one for the presidency of the Jr. High School. My kid brother had won it. (Finally, he resigned in protest of the dishonesty in my opposition.)

I sent letters to the thirty or forty high school teachers to give them the facts of the case. Several whispered their support for me by around-about channels. One told her class that I should be assisted in my effort. One advised her class that she did not approve of such efforts. None of the others mentioned the case in class. Yet, soon after my letter, a sizable group of these teachers marched on the Superintendent's office in protest of a wrong to them.

Newsweek named a few professors who were seeking peaceful solutions to the troubles on the college campuses. I wrote to them. Professor Seabury of California answered. Of all of the scores of adults, he was the only educator and one of only three men who were willing *to go out of their way* to speak up regarding the issues. (The other two were a newspaper editor in Bangkok, Mr. Horgan, and a congressional staff official, Mr. Vagley.) (Some Congressmen and Senators have tried to help too; but this was more in the nature of routine business.)

THE STATE DEPARTMENT

In response to Professor Seabury, a Deputy Assistant Secretary, Mr. J. Richardson, and his assistant, looked at the evidence in the case. They expressed disbelief. We were allowed to talk with two officials from the Department of Overseas Schools, Dr. E. Mannino and Dr. G. Parsons. Both were on a first name basis with the Superintendent of the Bangkok school. That was not promising. In fact, one of the men was or seemed hostile toward us: but the other, Dr. Parsons, was jolly and friendly. He promised to investigate the case thoroughly. He took our list of questions about the wrongs in the case plus the proof of those wrongs. Guided by that list, he was to investigate. He went to Bangkok that weekend. It was the last we ever heard from him.

In response to a letter from my Congressman, the U.S. Ambassador in Bangkok, Hon. L. Unger, agreed to investigate the case.

THE EMBASSY "INVESTIGATION"

An Embassy official, Mr. M. Trout, not the Ambassador, collected letters of rebuttal from the four administrative officials of the Bangkok school, and letters from three members of the packed court. These letters contained character references for one another plus assertions that I had always been treated fairly and that I should have taken the case before their court.

They still refused to discuss any of the facts in the case, but they did surprise me with a new damaging assertion if I could not prove it false. Instead of the Director of Activities, sitting as advisor to the court over his own acts, the Superintendent said that he had agreed to let three teachers act as advisors. Fortunately, as usual with each of the school's new, quick defenses, it was easy to prove it false. According to the student government constitution, it would have been illegal to use teachers rather than administrative officials. (There were other administrative officers, i.e., in addition to the ones involved in covering up the wrongs in the case.)

The Ambassador sent these letters and asked my Congressman if that could close the "investigation." Later, I was tipped off from friends in Bangkok that the Embassy official who conducted that so-called investigation is on the school board. The school board had already helped cover up the wrongs.

THE SENATE AND CONGRESS

I sent my case documents to three of my congressional representatives. One asked several of his student assistants to study the documents to make certain the case was sound. All concluded that it was and wrote to the school asking for explanations. The Superintendent wrote back refusing to discuss the issues, but presented procedural defenses. In each case I provided documents that conclusively proved the defensive assertions to be knowingly false. I was surprised and disappointed to find that the staff officers of the congressmen accepted these obvious falsehoods philosophically. They seemed to feel that there was nothing more a Congressman could do. (In fairness, it was never the Congressman or Senator, himself, to whom I talked. It was always one of his chief staff members.)

EMBASSY COP-OUT

The staff officer for one of my congressmen, one of the tougher ones, did write back to the Ambassador notifying him that somehow his "investigation" had missed the point. With that, another Embassy official, Mr. G.

Newman, sent back the most extreme procedural defense of all. "In the Ambassador's absense," he wrote, "I feel I should tell you *this is not really an American school.*" (Underlines mine.)

THE U.S. NATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE SCHOOL

The school is the International School of Bangkok. It is a Thai school about to the same extent that the American Embassy is Thai simply because it is located in Thailand.

1. Thai children are not even allowed to attend the school.

2. Ninety per cent of the students are American.

3. Most of the teachers and main administrative officials are American.

4. The U.S. State Department provided over a million dollars for the schools new buildings.

5. About two million dollars of U.S. tax money goes to the school each year in tuition for U.S. dependent children.

6. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and House Committee on Foreign Affairs approve these overseas schools programs.

7. The House and Senate Appropriations Committees appropriate the funds.

8. The State Department administers the programs.

9. The House Committee on Education checks the school to make certain that the American children receive proper quality education for the money.

Here are two quotes that reveal the official connection between the school and the U.S. Government:

1. (From the caption under a picture in the school's 1970 Yearbook, page 255.)

"On campus, Dr. Phillips discusses ISB's bright future with U.S. State Department Representative for Schools, Mr. Mannino."

2. (From the School's newspaper):

Members of the House Education Committee confer with the Board of Directors of the Bangkok International School Association. The Committee is interested in the progress of American students in overseas schools and the quality of education they receive. (ISB Newspaper, Jan. 30, 1970)

The question that is highlighted by my case is this. What does quality education mean? Does it mean just proper standards of reading, writing, and math? Or does it include minimum standards of honesty by school administrators in student affairs, and minimum respect for democratic principles in student government, and an example of honesty when dealing with our top U.S. Government officials?

A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

We wrote to each member of one of the congressional committees. Only three members responded. One said the school is too remote. (It is not considered too remote for committee member trips to the school.) Another passed it off as insignificant: "Will it still matter ten years from now?" he asked. But a rather young, key staff member invited me in to present the evidence. He was properly incensed. His reaction was the most reassuring thing I had seen about the hope for America as it faces the "youth and school" problem. On behalf of a congressman he wrote to the State Department Director of Overseas Schools. Here are the outstanding items from his long, straight-forward letter:

1. "Humphrey should have been declared the sophomore class president. . . ." (from the first ballot majority vote).

2. "The 'general election' results . . . are questionable (in reference to the evidence of ballot-stuffing on the second ballot).

3. (The Supreme Court) "appeal procedures . . . were obviously biased . . . as to render their ultimate utilization predictable."

4. (He concluded his letter with the first show of *courage* that is, *self*-commitment, that any adult had shown.)

"If . . . responses are not pertinent to the question of the alleged unconstitutionality . . . I will become outspoken against a continuation of U.S. Government assistance to the school."

Finally, *it appeared,* there would be justice inside the system. I had proven that demonstrations are not necessary.

POWER POLITICS?

I sent the congressional letter to the Embassy in Bangkok because the cutting off of school funds alarmed me. If it came to that, it would hurt the students more than the wrong-doers. But I knew the letter would produce a serious response. for a change, from the Embassy. It did.

The Ambassador wired right back. The school Superintendent was flying to Washington immediately. He would talk to the Congressman and to me. The Superintendent accompanied by a State Department officer visited the congressional office at 3:30 p.m., March 4, 1971. I was invited into the office at 4:00 p.m.

VERDICT: The smiling faces of the Superintendent and the State Department officer told me the verdict. The congressional representative announced apologetically: "You probably should have stayed in school and gone to that court, Brad."

In my surprise, disgust, and anger, I was not able to think or say much, especially when I saw the State officer laughing. I did manage to ask if they meant that I should have signed that oath against an appeal. The congressional officer said, "No, I wouldn't have done that." "Then how could I have gone to that court?" I asked. There was no answer.

Soon, the Superintendent and the State official announced that they were leaving. The congressional official asked my brother and I to stay a moment. "YOU MUST FIGHT ON" he insisted. We left amazed and totally disgusted with the American system. What had happened?

THE ANSWER BY RUMOR

We have received an answer by rumor only, from Bangkok.

1. After the Embassy white-washed the first investigation, they had to make certain there was not a real one. Just one or two men were involved in the cover-up.

2. The message they brought back in order to persuade Congress not to probe further was that it would embarrass Thai-American relations. They were seizing on the far-out pretense that the school is a Thai school. In order to make certain I did not rebutt the pretense successfully, they classified it.

After two years of struggle, the system, at least short of the very top, has beaten me. According to the rumor, those who had done wrong are also laughing at Bangkok cocktail parties about how they also "handled" Congress.

THE POINT

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In closing, I want to admit that I am not nearly as objective about this case as these pages may sound to me on rereading them. I was depressed to the depths when I first learned that they had cheated me. I was then stunned to despondency when I realized that school officials including two Ph.D's would try to ruin my name rather than admit the mistake. (It would have been easy for them at first before they got so deeply involved in the cover-up.) Of course, I am over the shock now, but I am nonetheless disillusioned. Rather, I am almost completely disillusioned by what the State Department officials have done to continue the cover-up. I now understand perfectly well why it is that some of the better students often become the drop-outs or the leaders of demonstrations. But those are not the more important points.

The real point involved is honesty and integrity in the schools. Students, soon to be American adults, are taught *by example,* that cheating, dishonesty and deception pay. In school student-government, they learn that democracy is a mockery. In general, they become disillusioned with high principles and America. The results are with us now, and growing. But the trend can be reversed. Judging from my contacts with students from almost every state in the U.S.A. over this case, if we can win justice *without demonstrations* in just one case, they will be surprised but they will see and believe that we can do it in others.

If there is a door to student justice at the White House, have I adequately exhausted other possibilities to justify entrance into that door for consideration of this case?

Again,

Sincerely yours,

BRADFORD HUMPHREY.

ADDENDUM

On this day, June 15, 1971, I have given up all hope that I shall ever receive a full hearing in this matter. A letter from the Vice President, dated May 7, 1971, indicates that he has relied on the same letter writer in the State Department to draft his reply. A subsequent meeting in the White House with one of Mr. Robert Finch's summer interns, at which I was represented by my brother, resulted in the intern berating the school officials for even permitting student self-governance to the extent they had. These were my "hearings" and the above letter to the President no longer has any meaning.

Instead, I am addressing this letter to anyone who possesses the courage, the sense of principle, and the knowledge of an available approach to anyone of appropriate authority, who could arrange a fair and honest hearing.

Sincerely,

BRAD HUMPHREY.

BICYCLE USE SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined in sponsoring legislation which would allow States and communities to use the highway trust fund moneys for the development of bicycle lanes or paths. The bill would also provide that such funds could be used for the construction of bicycle shelters and parking facilities and for bicycle traffic control devices.

In my own State of California there are many areas in which bicycle traffic is almost as important as automobile traffic—and, I might add, contribute a good deal less to air and noise pollution. If encouraged, I am sure they could become a major mode of transportation in many areas of the country and not just another form of recreation.

I have noted with approval a recent statement by Secretary of Transportation Volpe in which he, too, encouraged the use of bicycles as a serious mode of transportation. This bill would assist Secretary Volpe in his proposal.

EMERGENCY PUBLIC INTEREST PROTECTION ACT ENACTMENT URGED BY CONGRESSMAN MAYNE

HON. WILEY MAYNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to have the opportunity to appear before the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics today and to testify on behalf of the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act, with certain amendments. In view of the urgency of the need for congressional action to meet the crises arising from current and impending transportation stoppages, I include in the RECORD my remarks in the subcommittee hearings:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILEY MAYNE

Mr. Chairman and Members of this distinguished subcommittee, I sincerely appreciate your affording me this opportunity to appear before you and testify on behalf of the earliest possible reporting and enactment into law of "The Emergency Public Interest Protection Act."

I cosponsored the introduction of this legislative proposal, requested by President Nixon, in the 91st Congress. On the opening day of the 92nd Congress, I reintroduced the language of that bill, updated for this Congress, as H.R. 901. President Nixon renewed his request for this legislation, with slight modifications, before the present Congress, and I joined in cosponsoring H.R. 3639 and H.R. 4116, identical to H.R. 3596 which was introduced by this Subcommittee's parent Committee chairman, Congressman Staggers, with cosponsorship by ranking minority member Congressman Springer. I am pleased that the Subcommittee is holding hearings on this legislation, and I urge this Subcommittee to expedite its consideration and enactment as soon as possible.

The nation is again faced with actual and potential disputes between labor and management in practically every segment of the transportation sector of our economy. Transportation stoppages have vicious effects upon the whole economy, not only of a region directly affected but also of the entire nation. Nothing so dismays me, and my constituents, as to see bountiful harvests of corn and soy beans piled high in the middle of Iowa streets, exposed to deterioration, as local, regional or national transportation labor disputes prevent the normal flow of commerce. I am sure it is equally frustrating to feed-deficient areas that they cannot obtain delivery while abundant supplies are spoiling in the great feed-grain producing areas of the land. Who would not be dismayed by the sight of fresh produce—fruit, milk, eggs, vegetables, rotting despite the efforts to can, dry or freeze all that can reasonably be processed, for failure of our transportation system to do the job, while millions in our cities face climbing prices and in some cases an actual insufficiency of food. Billions, in welfare payments, food stamps, strikes checks and unemployment benefits, mean little if there is no food to buy.

Iowans are not easily discouraged. The Iowa farmer may seem a die-hard pessimist as he grumbles about prices, and most particularly about the weather—and certainly there is indeed much to grumble about in both cases—but come spring, the real nature of the Iowa farmer as an incurable optimist shines through as the farmer once again prepares the soil and plants anew. Our Iowa businessmen do not easily give up, either. It takes a lot of hardship to force an Iowan to admit he is licked—but gentlemen, many Iowans, operating firms big and small, have been forced by the series of transportation stoppages in recent years into abrupt cutbacks in their business operations and with increasing frequency to bankruptcy.

We have a number of small plants in Northwest Iowa who have built up their businesses through developing a good quality product, and a market for that product; with many orders and the labor force and capital goods to meet those orders. During the so-called local truckers' strike in Chicago, they could not get parts or raw materials needed for production or to assure delivery. Many Northwest Iowans called me during the Chicago truck strike and during the various railroad strikes which paralyzed our Northwest Iowa economy to a very great extent. They were desperate for materials and were being forced to lay-off employees or to close their doors. Many survived only through massive lay-offs in the end, or were forced into bankruptcy or into forced fire-sales to big outside corporations. Each dislocation of transportation channels through strikes and lockouts has taken its toll in the economy of Northwest Iowa.

Much has been said about the reasons for the deterioration of American railroads and the plight in which they are today—but in my mind the greatest factor in more and more Americans turning from railroads to trucking—especially their own trucks, as evidenced in the substantial increase in farm-to-market trucking by farmers, for example—has been the increasing inability of farmers and businessmen to have confidence in railroads delivering the goods on schedule because of the danger that delivery will be disrupted by still another labor-management dispute. It is not good economics and may in time produce a sort of anarchy within our transportation system, but many businesses feel forced to acquire and operate their own trucks to insure reliability of transportation for their raw materials and products, even though those trucks are used perhaps only a few hours or days each week or only occasionally during the year.

It is ridiculous for this nation to tolerate continued transportation disputes so disruptive and injurious to our national interests, and indeed detrimental to the short and long-run interests of transportation labor and transportation management alike. I do not contend the "Emergency Public Interest Protection Act of 1971" offers an immediate panacea, but it does in my estimate provide our best hope for legislative remedies capable of enactment during this session of the Congress.

We have seen that the emergency strike provisions of the Railway Labor Act which now govern railroad and airline disputes do not effectively protect the national interest in obtaining minimum dislocation of transportation. The "Emergency Public Interest Protection Act of 1971" abolishes the emergency strike provisions of the Railway Labor Act which now govern railroad and airline disputes and instead builds upon the solid foundation of the Taft-Hartley Act, providing additional procedures for transportation industries including railroad, airline, maritime, longshore and trucking, where existing procedures have too often failed to induce the parties to resolve their differences.

This legislative proposal strives for procedures which both reduce the number of disputes reaching critical proportions and offer the Government greater flexibility in dealing with those labor-management disputes that persevere despite settlement pressures. The proposed procedures hopefully will discourage parties from thinking that they might profit from governmental intervention. The procedures should also ensure that governmental action, when unavoidable, is not precipitous and is not more than the minimum essential to protection of the public interest.

The President would have three major new procedures or options for dealing with transportation disputes not settled within the 80-day "cooling-off" period authorized by the Taft-Hartley Act. These include extending the "cooling-off" period for up to 30 days, the appointment of a special board of three impartial persons to determine under what conditions partial operation of the affected transportation industry is possible and feasible, and the appointment of an impartial panel to select and make binding the most reasonable final offer submitted by a party to the dispute. These are most workable and most likely to promote a favorable climate for the continuance of collective bargaining.

As Under Secretary of Labor Laurence H. Silberman stated in an address on March 18th before the Industrial Relations Research Association in New York City, the bill would allow only one of these three alternative procedures—extended cooling-off; partial operation; or final offer selection—to be chosen. "No pyramiding would be allowed." I submit that the bill would be substantially improved by giving the government even greater flexibility in dealing with emergency disputes, by enabling the President to use one, two, or all three of the options, in such order as he may choose and without use of any one option being a prerequisite to the use of one or both of the other options. Certainly the President should not be forced to use the final offer selection alternative immediately upon expiration of the 80 day cooling-off period just because his choosing either the additional 30 day cooling off period or the partial operation alternative would foreclose his utilizing the final offer selection alternative when the other two options prove unsuccessful. All three options should be kept open by amending Page 4, line 16 of the bill to delete ", but only one,". In any case, the possibility of the President choosing to exercise his option for final offer selection should remain despite his previously resorting to the additional cooling off period or the partial operation alternative. Otherwise failure of those two options to accomplish settlement may result in major transportation stoppages through strikes and lockouts, with the Congress again having to step in to legislate on an ad hoc basis. That's no way to run a railroad or a country. Usually the legislative action merely postpones a strike or lockout deadline, and within weeks another strike over the same issues which precipitated the last one looms as a distinct possibility.

The American people can not, and will not, any longer tolerate government by crisis—and they should not be asked to do so.

Gentlemen, I further submit that the "Emergency Public Interest Protection Act of 1971" would be improved if amended to authorize the same procedures in the cases of *regional emergencies* caused by strikes or lockouts in the transportation industry as would be authorized in national emergencies. The Chicago truck strike was principally in Chicago and a few other truck terminal cities last year, and was not a national strike—yet this strike had adverse affects throughout the nation and forced many businesses throughout the middle west into dire straits, some into bankruptcy. I am especially concerned in view of recent decisions regarding so-called "selective strikes", which conceivably could paralyze substantial areas of this nation without falling under the definition of "national emergency disputes" as limited by N.L.R.B. rulings and court decisions.

Mr. Chairman, the latest "Analysis of

Work Stoppages" available from the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics is for the calendar year 1969—yet in that year 38,300 workers were idled for 117,400 man-days through 11 major railroad transportation work stoppages. 18,900 workers lost 346,800 man-days during 73 strikes involving local and suburban transit and interurban highway passenger transportation. 13,400 workers did not work for 139,500 man-days in motor freight transportation and warehousing because of 73 disputes in that segment of the transportation industry. 56,300 employees lost 561,500 man-days in 14 major air transportation strikes. 14,100 workers in water transportation were idled by 33 disputes in that field, losing 1,936,000 man-days. 1,100 workers engaged in transportation services lost 9,200 man-days in 1969 through 9 strikes in that industry. I am sure the statistics for 1970 and 1971, when finally compiled and published, will show even further loss of man-days in the transportation industry, a loss to our national economy and to the individual workers and employers involved that to a considerable extent could have been avoided had the "Emergency Public Interest Protection Act" before the Committee been enacted earlier. These statistics do not take into account the millions of Americans idled because of inability of their employers to obtain raw materials and parts necessary for continuation of manufacturing processes employing them, or by the inability of their employers to move products to would-be customers because of transportation stoppages.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Paul Beck of Sioux City, Iowa, a resident of the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa which I have the honor to represent in this Congress, and the Chairman of the Board of Sioux Transportation Company, has been a serious student and observer of the transportation stoppage crisis. He has prepared a statement for this Subcommittee which I respectfully request be made part of the record of these hearings and be considered by the Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, the eleven States which make up America's heartland—Arkansas, Colorado, my own Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Texas—joined in establishing the "Mid-America Governors' Transportation Council. The Council has taken responsibility in transportation matters of concern to its members. Collectively, the States represented by the Council have 34.4% of the nation's railroad mileage, 27.8% of its public airports, and 34% of its surfaced roads and streets mileage. The Council was established in recognition of the common interest in, and concern with, transportation as a major factor in the economic future of the member Mid-America States.

John P. Doyle, Chairman of the Mid-America Governors' Transportation Council, a widely recognized expert in the field of transportation, had hoped to be able to appear and present detailed testimony analyzing the legislation before the Committee. He is unable to attend these hearings, and has asked that I submit to the Subcommittee and insert a copy of the resolution of the Mid-America Governors' Transportation Council. I herewith respectfully request that the Council's resolution be inserted in the record of the hearings and that the views expressed by the Council be given the Subcommittee's consideration.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, in closing I believe the "Emergency Public Interest Protection Act" with the amendments I suggested would greatly support and strengthen free collective bargaining in this nation. It provides an effective approach which will provide for a minimum of government interference with free collective bargaining and yet provide a range of options which the President could pursue in protecting the Nation's health and safety. I urge that the Subcommittee take prompt and favorable action on this legislation, assigning it highest priority.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 901, H.R. 3639, AND H.R. 4116 BY PAUL BECK, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, SIOUX TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, INC., SIOUX CITY, IOWA, SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 27, 1971

Gentlemen: I want to thank the Honorable Wiley Mayne and you for making it possible for me to make this statement to you. The matter of strikes by labor unions in general and more specifically unions controlling all of the transportation industry has become the nation's greatest deterrent to progress, and the prime reason for the continued higher inflation in the face of a deepening depression.

Congress itself must accept the principal blame for the attitudes that prevail in organized labor, first by their falling into the trap set by President Johnson, the 41% Congressional salary increase, which set the pattern for the unreasonable demands of the unions, and second, by failing up to this time to enact strong meaningful, effective legislation to curtail the power of organized labor. This, gentlemen, is the opportunity you face right now, the opportunity to correct your past mistakes, the opportunity to save the economy of the nation and the welfare of the working man from the devastation created by big unions to the economy of the nation.

The recent admission by Paul W. McCracken, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, that it would be "irresponsible" for the administration to reach its original economic growth goals for 1971, only points out the cost of Congress' failure to accept its responsibility to put effective restraints on excessive union demands.

What is generally known by every one, but is very rarely ever spoken aloud, is the fact that excessive union demands are usually backed up by union violence, which is either frequently overlooked by local law enforcement agencies, or if the culprits are apprehended, dragged on interminably through the courts, with punishment eventually watered down or actually eliminated. But never, or very rarely is any action taken against a union, and damages collected. H.R. 901 or H.R. 3639, or H.R. 4116, should be amended to provide that any act of violence committed during a labor dispute should be accepted by any court, as prima facia evidence as being committed by the union and damages should be collected from the union, because most acts of violence are planned, and some are committed by the officers of the unions involved, while all the time they publicly deny any connection with the violence.

These bills, H.R. 901, H.R. 3639, and H.R. 4116 are all basically good bills as far as they go, but I strongly feel that the bill that is finally adopted should contain another amendment and that is to incorporate Senator Jack Miller's S. 3852 introduced May 19, 1970 into this bill to make it apply on a regional basis. The disastrous truck strike of last year makes such an amendment an absolute necessity as the entire country suffered losses going into the billions of dollars in this strike even though the strike was principally in Chicago and a few other truck terminal cities. This Chicago strike was felt adversely nationwide and as the result, businesses as far away as Winston-Salem, North Carolina and other distant places were forced into bankruptcy. We damn near became a casualty of that strike ourselves, and haven't yet recovered from its effects.

One other amendment that should be put into the bill that you adopt, is to make all unions subject to the anti-trust laws. With the bigness of many unions, the multibillion dollar resources they control, they pose a greater threat to the American Economy and the American way of life than does any monopoly of business. The working man is aware of what the union bosses are doing to him by taking as much money out of his pocket by inflation and dues as the new contracts are putting in, plus the time he is losing during strikes promoted by the union bosses, (our Chicago drivers lost nearly $7000 each in the 3 month Chicago strike), plus the added taxes he is paying on his income and everything he buys and I am sure that in most cities that the union bosses can't and don't control the vote of their members, and their members, your constituents, would be glad to have you come out publicly in support of controls on their union bosses. Some politicians might lose some financial backing by some unions, but the rank and file would still support the man who will try to save the nation, and the jobs that support the nation. This has been proven in areas where the unions have spent millions to defeat a candidate, only to lose the election.

H.R. 901, H.R. 3639 and H.R. 4116 are particularly important because of the fact they relate to transportation, the one service that really effects the costs of every last item that everyone uses, and this is the reason that is so important to get a bill with the above provisions enacted into law, now!

I sincerely hope you will favorably consider the suggestions I have made and I want to again thank you for permitting me to be a part of this record.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL BECK.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the trend of several years in transportation labor disputes has been to substitute congressional action for collective bargaining; and,

Whereas the Congress is ill-equipped to resolve specific labor disputes on an ad hoc basis, in the heat of the controversy, with fairness and objectivity to all concerned, especially to the general public; and,

Whereas the national economy and the interest of the member states of this Council are irreparably damaged by transportation work stoppages; therefore,

Be it resolved: That the Mid-America Governors' Transportation Council considers imperative the enactment of permanent legislation to prevent interruptions of interstate transportation service incident to strikes or lock-outs in the transportation industry by mandating some form of compulsory arbitration; and further,

That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each member of the Congressional delegation of the member states; to the Secretary of Transportation; to the Secretary of Labor; and to the President of the United States.

VILLAGE OF MAPLEWOOD, MINN., GOES ON RECORD AGAINST CONTINUING WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, since 1966 I have expressed my opposition to U.S. armed intervention in Indochina and have urged the withdrawal of our forces from that area. It is gratifying to me

that my position is receiving wide support from the people of the Fourth District. I am pleased to include in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the minutes of the Village Council of the Village of Maplewood, a very large community in our district, which has officially requested our Government "to bring the war in Southeast Asia to a conclusion with all due haste." The portion of the minutes follows:

REGULAR VILLAGE COUNCIL MEETING

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the Village Council of the Village of Maplewood, Minnesota, was duly called and held in the Council Chambers in said Village on the 15th day of July, 1971, at 7:34 P.M.

The following members were present: Mayor Axdahl, Councilwoman Olson, Councilmen Greavu, Haugan and Wiegert.

The following members were absent: None.

Mayor Axdahl introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption: 71–7–134:

Whereas, the United States has been involved in a war in South East Asia for over a decade; and

Whereas, continuation of this war levies an awesome burden on the United States society and economy.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, we the Council of Maplewood, Minnesota, a Village of over 25,000, urge the Commander-in-Chief to do all possible to bring the war in South East Asia to a conclusion with all due haste, to conserve lives and to redirect the money and talents there being consumed to solution of our critical domestic problems.

Seconded by Councilman Wiegert. Ayes—all.

State of Minnesota, County of Ramsey, Village of Maplewood,

I, the undersigned, being the duly qualified and appointed Clerk of the Village of Maplewood, Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the attached and foregoing extract of minutes of a regular meeting of the Village of Maplewood, held on the 15th day of July, 1971, with the original on file in my office, and the same is a full, true and complete transcript therefrom insofar as the same relates to the war in South East Asia.

Witness my hand as such Clerk and the corporate seal of the Village this 19th day of July, 1971.

LUCILLE E. ———,
Village Clerk, Village of Maplewood, Minn.

GET THE GUNS OFF THE STREETS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the toll continues to climb. Over the week-end, more people were shot and killed, more people were shot and wounded—shot with hand guns. Others were frightened or intimidated or robbed by criminals brandishing hand guns, imbued with a false sense of bravado by the piece of lethal metal in their hands.

The need for effective hand gun legislation has never been more immediate. I urge my colleagues to take note of the growing number of hand gun victims and to take note of the growing determination on the part of citizens to see Congress take action on this matter.

WMAL–TV, channel 7 in Washington, has been broadcasting a series of editorials calling for hand gun control. They point out that Congress has the power to do it. The transcript of the first in the series follows:

GET THE GUNS OFF THE STREETS

A Navy Commander and his 19-year-old son are shot dead at a traffic light near their home in Annandale. Gunned down in front of their family after an outing to celebrate this nation. A Silver Spring man, who survived World War Two, is shot dead in front of his mother. Gunned down in a cheap hold-up in the land of freedom. Near the U.S. Capitol, two coeds are raped repeatedly at gunpoint. After an outing to a waterfront landmark, a Prince Georges County wife is raped and murdered. What these violent crimes have in common is that they were all committed with the aid of guns. This community is living in a shadow of terror, created by the fear that any life may be interrupted by a senseless shooting. *The menace is the gun on the street.* With a gun, any punk finds himself with power of life-and-death over the unprotected citizen. *Let's get the guns off the streets.* Congress has the power to do it. You, the people, can make Congress act right now. As broadcasters serving this community, we will continuously and aggressively fight to "Get the guns off the streets." Starting today and continuing daily, we will report crimes committed with the aid of a gun. Each day we will urge you, the citizens of this community, to write a member of Congress demanding that Congress "Get the guns off the streets." We'll give the name and address of a member of Congress each day. For example, if you live in Virginia, you can write Senator William B. Spong Jr., U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. Tell him to get the guns off the streets.

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS POLICY STATEMENT ON THE UNDERSEA LONG-RANGE MISSILE SYSTEM (ULMS)

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, Dr. Herbert Scoville appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee to testify concerning the Department of Defense budget. The testimony he submitted included a position paper on ULMS approved by the executive committee of the Federation of American Scientists, and by its strategic weapons committee.

Mr. Speaker, the ULMS idea is a good one. It must not become another compulsive reaction to an exaggerated or imaginary threat which never materializes or appears in an unanticipated form. The federation's recommendations are good ones:

(1) The commencement of a construction and deployment program for ULMS is not required at this time by any foreseeable risk to the U.S. POLARIS–POSEIDON deterrent force. To do so now might only result in expensive outlays for a system optimized against the wrong threat.

(2) Research and development should be continued on advanced missile submarine systems on a broad front so that the U.S. would be able to deal with any specific threat if it should develop. This should include small, as well as large, submarines. The proposed $110 million FY 1972 budget item for ULMS should be reviewed in detail to see if it is warranted in the light of the lack of requirement to construct new submarines in the near future.

An alert and frugal Congress will heed these recommendations.

The complete statement follows:

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS POLICY STATEMENT ON THE UNDERSEA LONG-RANGE MISSILE SYSTEM (ULMS)

(Prepared for Submission to the Senate Armed Services Committee, May 3, 1971)

In Fiscal 1971, the Defense Department funded $45 million for the development of a new Undersea Long Range Missile System, ULMS. $110 million is in the FY 1972 budget for this same project, which is to provide the option to augment or eventually modernize the sea-based portion of our missile forces. The $110 million is slated to be primarily for continued technical trade-off studies, preliminary submarine and facilities design, and design work on the power plant and navigation, guidance, fire control and launcher systems. Since ULMS will be a new strategic system which, when developed and deployed, could eventually cost tens of billions of dollars, it is important to evaluate this program before commitments are made which would prove difficult to retract.

I. NATURE OF THE DETERRENT

At the present time, U.S. strategic security depends on maintaining a secure deterrent force which is capable of producing unacceptable damage in retaliation after any possible first strike. This deterrent now consists of the invulnerable POLARIS fleet of 41 submarines—656 missiles, supported by 1,054 ICBMS in hardened silos and about 500 intercontinental bombers. While the ICBMs and bombers cannot now be destroyed in a first strike, they could appear to become vulnerable in the future as the Soviets deploy accurate MIRVs on their missile forces. Therefore the sea based force is the cornerstone of our deterrent. There is no foreseeable threat to POLARIS short of a large nationwide Soviet ABM, and this would be countered by the replacement of the POLARIS missile by POSEIDON to provide a total of more than 5,000 warheads. A sufficiently restrictive ABM limitation agreement at SALT could, of course, completely eliminate this risk.

II. POSSIBLE LONG-RANGE THREATS TO POLARIS

At the moment, the precise nature of the potential long term threat to POLARIS is unknown since there is no foreseeable technology which could neutralize this deterrent force. However, if a danger arises, it could come from two general developments, ABMs and ASW. For an ABM to be able to cope with POSEIDON, it would have to be able to deal with a minimum of several thousand warheads which could be concentrated on a few Soviet targets. It would be a tremendous problem for the defense to overcome such simple saturation tactics. Other countermeasures would undoubtedly also be effective.

In principle, the ABM might be designed to destroy the POSEIDON missile and its warheads shortly after launch and before the individual warheads had time to separate. But this, too, presents awesome problems since the defense interceptor would have to destroy its targets within a few minutes of their launch and as far away as 2,500 miles from the Soviet Union. Even if technically feasible, such a system would be extraordinarily expensive and would require long lead times for development and deployment, thus providing ample opportunities to develop countermeasures.

The problems in creating an ASW system which could neutralize the POLARIS-POSEIDON system appear extremely difficult for the Soviets. These submarines can operate over millions of square miles of open ocean on all sides of the Soviet Union. It might be feasible for the Russians to locate and track a single submarine and destroy it coincident with a coordinated attack on the U.S. continent. But it seems an almost inconceivable task, with foreseeable technology, to destroy about 30 submarines simultaneously; this is the number which might be found on station at one time. The United States has over many years spent tens of billions of dollars on ASW and does not even approach such a capability. The Soviets are well behind the U.S. in this field and have for geographic reasons alone a much more difficult task. The Russians do not control the land masses adjacent to many ocean areas, thus complicating tremendously the deployment of a detection and tracking system.

Even if by some technological breakthrough it were possible to make the oceans transparent so that submarines could be continuously located, and this is most unlikely, it would be necessary to have some mechanism for destroying all the submarines at a given moment. After all, the atmosphere is transparent to radar, but no one has any idea of how to destroy bombers on air alert or how to build an ABM system which could provide protection to the populations. For the Soviets to deploy attack submarines or surface craft so that they could destroy all these U.S. submarines at a specific instant would seem virtually impossible. A wide variety of countermeasures against such tactics would be available to U.S. forces. Furthermore, the Soviets cannot rely on killing POLARIS submarines with ballistic missiles since the subs could, at normal crusing speeds, move out of the lethal area around the aiming point during the time of flight of the missile. All these factors combine to lead to the inescapable conclusion that our POLARIS deterrent fleet will not be threatened in the coming decade and probably not in the next as well. The Soviets might develop a partially effective ASW defense in the restricted waters in the neighborhood of the U.S.S.R., but not in the open oceans. The United States would have ample warning to take counteraction if it saw such a capability developing.

III. ULMS DESIGN OPTIONS

Nevertheless, since the SLBM force is the cornerstone of the U.S. deterrent, and since submarine missiles tend to stabilize the strategic balance, it is prudent to carry out research on new submarine systems which might have decreased vulnerability in the event that such technological breakthroughs occurred in the distant future. However, at the moment, the nature of the threat is still unknown so it would certainly be premature to build any actual submarines. We do not even know whether the new system should be designed to overcome ABM or ASW or both. The design criteria could vary radically for one or the other. For example, if it were ABM, then the number of missiles and warheads and their inflight invulnerability to nuclear explosions are the critical factors. If it were ASW, multiplicity of submarines, quietness, reduced acoustic reflectivity and the ability to operate over wider ocean areas and at great depths and rest on the bottom appear most important. These latter factors argue for smaller, perhaps faster submarines, with fewer but longer range, lower payload missiles, while the former argue for bigger submarines with many large payload missiles. Even if the decision were that the ULMS design should be optimized against an ASW threat, which would seem likely since there are other ways of dealing with ABMs than building new submarines, there will be many trade-offs depending on the nature of the developing ASW threat, which is presently only a speculation in the eyes of U.S. planners.

IV. RECOMMENDED ULMS PROGRAM

Clearly it is premature to freeze on an ULMS design in the near future. The potential threat neither requires such speed nor permits firm decisions on the nature of the system. The administration proposal for trade-off studies would seem to recognize this, but the budgeting of $110 million for FY 1972 and the reference to submarine and facility design might indicate a freezing on the nature of the system which would not be warranted at this time. This fear is further supported by Secretary Laird's statements over the past year on the need to make "tough" and "expensive" decisions within the next 12 months. There are reports that ULMS will be one and a half times as large as POLARIS and carry 50% more large missiles with MIRVs. It is hoped that the Navy is not prematurely extending its outdated and costly philosophy of large battleships and large carriers to large submarines. ULMS could become another example of rushing into costly programs to react to an imaginary threat just because more advanced submarine technology is available. Instead of deploying new submarines, we should prosecute research and development on a broad front, small submarines as well as large, so that if a threat should actually develop we would be in a better position to deal with it instead of one which never arises. Any new longer range missile should be compatible with existing platforms in the event that no new model submarine is required.

V. SUMMARY

(1) The commencement of a construction and deployment program for ULMS is not required at this time by any foreseeable risk to the U.S. POLARIS-POSEIDON deterrent force. To do so now might only result in expensive outlays for a system optimized against the wrong threat.

(2) Research and development should be continued on advanced missile submarine systems on a broad front so that the U.S. would be able to deal with any specific threat if it should develop. This should include small, as well as large submarines. The proposed $110 million FY 1972 budget item for ULMS should be reviewed in detail to see if it is warranted in the light of the lack of requirement to construct new submarines in the near future.

THE MEANING OF THE FOURTH OF JULY

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, in these days when all we hear is what is wrong with our country, I thought that the following article, dealing with negative criticism. would provide some real "food for thought." I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues this editorial which appeared July 1, 1971 in the Anchor newspaper of the diocese of Fall River, Mass.:

FOURTH OF JULY

Most people are quite happy to greet holidays because they mean an added day from work or a welcomed long weekend. The forthcoming Fourth of July holiday is no exception. There will be, of course, the accompanying accidents and tragedies that follow in the wake of these. And that is a most unfortunate aspect of every holiday.

But this Fourth of July weekend should be a time when Americans rededicate themselves to the service of their country. It is not a matter of an unreasonable and unreasoning defense of everything that the United States has ever done. But it is a matter of accepting—and happily—that we are citizens of this country, that it has been and is a great nation, that each citizen has the obligation of strengthening the nation in the good that it sets out to do.

Negative criticism, a tearing down of the nation, the desire to overturn its institutions, these are the actions not only of a poor citizen but of an unthinking person. Let destruction have its way and all that is left will be a vacuum. And into this vacuum will flow disorder and confusion and chaos. And one who seeks after disorder and confusion and chaos is a sick person, indeed.

EFFECTS OF INSECTICIDES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, one cannot study the subject of DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons long before coming across the name of Charles Wurster, a professor of environmental sciences at the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

For a number of years Dr. Wurster has attempted to bring to public attention the problems associated with an endless use of insecticides. He recently summarized the work he and other scientists have done in this field in a paper on the "Effects of Insecticides" which was presented a few weeks ago at an international conference in Finland.

In that paper Dr. Wurster discusses the properties of chlorinated hydrocarbons, their effects on birds, fish, and humans, their human health implications and the alternative available to their use—namely, integrated control techniques.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Wurster concludes that—

The current excessive dependence on insecticides, especially persistent chlorinated hydrocarbons, seems filled with troubles for Man.

He explains why in this excellent paper which ought to be reviewed by all those concerned about the degradation of our environment:

EFFECTS OF INSECTICIDES

INTRODUCTION

World opinion has been awakening to a variety of man-made environmental problems during the past few years, and few of these have received more public debate than "the pesticide problem." Strong emotions are evoked in people when they get the idea that they or other animals are being poisoned, regardless of whether the threat is real or imagined. "The pesticide problem" is by no means a single problem, but instead consists of a host of individual and highly diverse problems depending on the pesticide and circumstances involved. In considering the

effects of pesticides on non-target organisms, I propose to organize my remarks into several categories, touching only on those aspects of pesticides that seem most important, and omitting much that appears less critical in my view.

The word "pesticide" is generally applied to any chemical that is used to kill pests, but I shall restrict myself to insecticides. The various herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides, and nematocides, certainly introduce problems of their own, but it is my impression that they are generally less serious and widespread than are the insecticide problems. In any event, I cannot discuss these other pesticides with any real competence, and will therefore leave their consideration to others (Moore, 1967).

NONPERSISTENT INSECTICIDES

The insecticides can roughly be divided into two large groups—those that are stable (persistent) and those that are not. The non-persistent insecticides currently in use are mainly organophosphates and carbamates (O'Brien, 1967). Being chemically unstable, they do not retain their original identity and associated biological activity sufficiently long to permit them to be transported to distant regions. Most of them break down rapidly into non-toxic products. The effects of these non-persistent insecticides are therefore primarily restricted to the treated areas, and their residues do not accumulate extensively in the biosphere.

This is not to suggest that organophosphates and carbamates do not pose problems, however. Some of the organophosphates, such as Parathion, Systox, and TEPP, are extremely toxic, making them potentially hazardous to farm personnel and other non-target organisms that may be present in the vicinity of the application (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1969). Other organophosphates, including Malathion, Chlorthion, Dibrom, Ronnel, and Dipterex, have lower acute toxicities to vertebrates than has DDT, and DDT is not an especially toxic material when compared with most pesticides.

Another major problem with some non-persistent insecticides in common with many other insecticides, is their tendency to be disruptive within insect communities, often aggravating, rather than alleviating, insect control problems (Bosch, 1970; Huffaker, 1971). By destroying beneficial insects that are natural enemies of the pests, and by eliminating the susceptible individuals, use of insecticides may generate outbreaks of insecticide-resistant, injurious insects that are far worse than those which existed prior to the treatment. The solution to most of the problems with non-persistent insecticides involves careful regulation and wise usage when necessary, rather than a complete prohibition of their use.

However severe the effects of non-persistent insecticides may be, they are principally restricted to the vicinity and time of application. They cannot become a world problem by contaminating or affecting non-target organisms in areas that are remote in distance or in time from the treated areas. In this regard they contrast dramatically with the persistent insecticides, and I will therefore accord primary attention to the latter in this paper.

PERSISTENT CHLORINATED HYDROCARBON INSECTICIDES

Stability or persistence confers an entirely new dimension on an insecticide because its unintended effects can, and sometimes do, extend thousands of miles and many years beyond the area and time of application, thereby involving a wide variety of non-target organisms. The persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon (CH) or organochlorine insecticides have thus become one of the world's most serious pollution problems, involving many nonagricultural interests and values. This family of insecticides includes DDT, Aldrin, Dieldrin, Isodrin, Endrin, Chlordane, Telodrin, Heptachlor, Strobane, Toxaphene, Mirex, and a few others.

Of this group, DDT has been by far the most widely manufactured and applied; nearly 3 thousand million (10^9) pounds (1.36×10^9 kg) of DDT has been produced in the United States alone since 1944 (Fig 1, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1970). Production was 123 million pounds (55.8×10^6 kg) in 1969 (the latest year for which data are available), which is just under the average rate of 145 million pounds (65.8×10^6 kg) produced annually during the 1960s. The world's largest DDT manufacturing plant, and now the only one in the United States, is that of the Montrose Chemical Corporation in Los Angeles. The data in Fig. 1 further show that, except in one year (1967), more DDT has been and continues to be produced annually in the United States than the total for Aldrin, Chlordane, Dieldrin, Endrin, Heptachlor, Strobane, and Toxaphene, combined. Although we read that DDT is being "restricted" and "phased out" in many countries, it continues to be used in greater quantities than any other insecticide.

As we continue to add to the 3 thousand million (10^9) pounds of DDT already released into the environment, and with some unknown fraction of it still circulating in the biosphere, it should hardly be surprising that DDT poses by far the most serious of our persistent pesticide problems. I believe that DDT has had a greater impact on non-target organisms and ecosystems than has any other pesticide, and possibly a greater one than all other pesticides combined. For these reasons, and to bring the issue up to date and correct misinformation, I shall discuss the CH insecticide problem in some detail, with primary emphasis on DDT (C. F. Wurster, 1969*a*). The polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), a mixture of CH compounds of industrial origin (used as plasticizers, flame retardants, insulating fluids, adhesives, etc.) that are widespread in Nature and exhibit environmental behavior which is similar to that of the persistent insecticides, may also represent a serious environmental hazard (Peakall & Lincer, 1970). The PCBs are another example of the large-scale release of a material into the environment before adequate research on their potential environmental impact had been performed.

Properties of the chlorinated hydrocarbons

To appreciate the environmental behaviour of the CHs, along with the associated hazards which they pose to various non-target organisms, it is necessary to understand their properties. Their behaviour results from the combination of the following four properties:

1. *Mobility.* CHs unfortunately do not remain where they are applied. By various mechanisms they enter the air and surface waters, to be dispersed over great distances within world circulation patterns (C. F. Wurster, 1969*a*).

Although these materials have very low vapour pressures, volatilization is an important mechanism whereby they pass into the air (Edwards, 1966). Codistillation with water facilitates their passage into air from wet surfaces (Bowman *et al.*, 1964), and CHs adsorbed to particulates, especially soil particles, and existing as suspensions, are also dispersed to remote regions by the winds (Risebrough *et al.*, 1968).

Exceptionally low water solubilities do not prevent these compounds from being transported in very dilute solution by flowing water, but the transport capacity of water is greatly increased by the tendency of CHs to form suspensions in water and to adsorb to particulates, all of which pass downstream within watersheds (Bowman *et al.*, 1964; Edwards, 1966).

These dispersal mechanisms transport CHs to most parts of the world after they have been released into the environment, thus explaining their presence in remote, untreated regions such as Antarctica (Peterle, 1969; C. F. Wurster, 1969*a*).

2. *Persistence.* The persistence of the CHs varies with the compound and the conditions DDT is slowly converted to DDD, then to other metabolites, and eventually to the non-toxic DDA, by various conditions and organisms (O'Brien, 1967). DDT is also converted to DDE, which is very stable though not very toxic, but which shows a variety of environmentally important enzyme effects. DDE is the most widespread of all CHs in the environment. DDT, DDD, and DDE, are commonly called "DDT residues", and these biologically active materials remain in the biosphere for many years and probably decades after their use (Edwards, 1966; Nash & Woolson, 1967).

In the environment, Aldrin and Isodrin are gradually converted into Dieldrin and Endrin, respectively, both of which are very persistent (Nash & Woolson, 1967). Mirex appears to be unusually stable (Valin *et al.*, 1968).

3. *Solubility Characteristics.* Being typical non-polar organic compounds, CHs have extremely low solubilities in water, but high solubilities in lipids or fatty tissues. Water is saturated with DDT at only 1.2 parts per thousand million (10^9) (ppb), Mirex is evidentally still less soluble; Aldrin and Dieldrin have somewhat higher (but still very low) solubilities of 27 and 186 ppb, respectively (Park & Bruce, 1968; C. F. Wurster, 1969*a*). Since all living organisms contain lipids, CHs are much more soluble in living tissues than in water, and the partition coefficient strongly favours accumulation and retention of CHs by the tissues of living organisms.

The solubility properties explain why CHs are not "lost" by dilution in the inorganic components of the environment—the water, air, and soil. Instead, CH residues, especially DDT, have become nearly universal in animal tissues in most regions of the world. Birds, fish, and mammals, including Man, are almost invariably contaminated.

4. *Broad Biological Activity.* The toxicity and biological activity of the CHs are by no means limited to the target species of insect, but instead can affect a great variety of animals, including all classes of vertebrates; furthermore, they can operate by several different mechanisms. They are nerve poisons—an effect that can be lethal (O'Brien, 1967). In addition, most are inducers of hepatic enzyme systems and inhibitors of certain other enzymes (Conney, 1967; Kupfer, 1967; Peakall, 1970*b*). DDT and Aldrin have oestrogenic activity (Welch *et al.*, 1969), and several CHs inhibit photosynthesis, possibly by inhibiting electron transport (C. F. Wurster, 1968; Menzel *et al.*, 1970). DDT, Aldrin, Dieldrin, Heptachlor, Strobane, and Mirex, are carcinogenic in rodents (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1969), and DDT has shown mutagenic activity as well (M. S. Legator, in preparation). Although effects are by no means predictable, contamination of non-target organisms with compounds that have such a broad spectrum of biological activity clearly carries the potential for affecting those organisms. The realization of that potential is the major topic of this paper.

Biological concentration

When CHs are absorbed into food-chains, they tend to remain in them because of their solubility characteristics. Each organism feeds on many organisms from the

next-lower trophic level; food organisms are metabolized and excreted, but the CHs are retained, thus leading to a higher concentration of CHs in the predator organism than was present in the food organism. Concentrations of CHs thereby increase with each step in the food-chain, reaching the highest values in carnivores at the ends of long food-chains. This biological or trophic concentration causes CHs to reach levels that are many thousands or even millions of times higher in organisms than are found in the surrounding inorganic environment (Woodwell *et al.*, 1967; Korschgen, 1970). Analyses of soil, water, or air, showing only minute quantities of CHs to be present, can therefore be misleading indicators of environmental quality, because they ignore the importance of these highly efficient biological concentrating mechanisms. Analyses of predatory organisms that are high in the food-chain are a more relevant measure of environmental contamination with CHs.

Significance of these properties

In summary, the CHs can travel great distances from application sites, are sufficiently stable to retain their identity for years, are accumulated by non-target organisms because of their solubility characteristics, reach the highest levels of contamination in carnivores, and are hazardous to these organisms because they have a broad spectrum of biological activity. CHs are therefore inherently uncontrollable materials after they have been released into the environment. Few major, widespread environmental pollutants combine these properties.

Effects on birds

It has long been known that CHs can cause extensive mortality among birds. Bird mortality following attempts to control Dutch elm disease with DDT has been documented on numerous occasions (D. H. Wurster *et al.*, 1965), and other CHs, especially Dieldrin, have frequently killed birds following their use (Rudd, 1964; Stickel *et al.*, 1969). Rather than being restricted only to treated areas, mortality of certain raptors has sometimes resulted from general environmental contamination with CHs. Deaths of Bald Eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) from Dieldrin poisoning in the United States is an example (Mulhern *et al.*, 1970). It is hard to know just how extensive direct mortality among carnivorous birds from general environmental contamination might be; it may be far more important than is immediately obvious. The available evidence suggests, however, that the sublethal effects of CHs on avian reproduction have a greater overall impact on bird populations than does acutely lethal direct mortality, even though a bird-kill may seem more spectacular.

The effects of DDT residues on avian reproduction have only recently become well understood, and the many years of research that developed this knowledge make a fascinating and alarming science detective story (C. F. Wurster, 1969*b*; Peakall, 1970*a*). By 1967 it had become clear that extensive and widespread declines in populations of many species of carnivorous birds and DDT contamination of these birds were correlated, but only in the past four years have cause-effect relationships been confirmed and mechanisms of action partially clarified.

DDT contamination inhibits avian reproduction by causing the birds to lay abnormally thin-shelled eggs, which break prematurely in the nest and therefore do not produce chicks (Peakall, 1970*a*). Additional symptoms include late ovulation and nesting, abnormal behaviour, hatching failure, and failure to lay eggs. The thinning of the eggshells may be caused by inhibition of carbonic anhydrase, an enzyme that is essential to the formation of calcium carbonate eggshells in the shell gland of the oviduct (Peakall, 1970*b*). DDE, the most widespread CH pollutant that was considered to be *innocuous for many years, is an inhibitor of this enzyme*. This explanation has recently been challenged, however (Dvorchik *et al.*, 1971). Jefferies & French (1971) recently suggested that the thin eggshells result from a hypothyroidal condition caused in the birds by DDT.

DDT residues, as well as most other CHs, are inducers of hepatic hydroxylating enzymes that metabolize steroids, including sex hormones (Conney, 1967; Kupfer, 1967; Peakall, 1970*b*). Enzyme induction by DDT thus reduces the level of circulating endogenous estradiol, which is partially responsible for various secondary sex characteristics and breeding behaviour in female birds (Peakall, 1970*a*, 1970*b*); this apparently explains the additional symptoms mentioned above. Evidently by simultaneously affecting different *organs* in different ways, contamination with DDT residues can reduce the reproductive success in wild bird populations to only a small fraction of what is normal.

Abnormally thin-shelled eggs have become commonplace among populations of many species of carnivorous birds in recent years (Blus, 1970; Ratcliffe, 1970; Cade *et al.*, 1971). Controlled experiments have shown that the levels of contamination with DDT residues regularly found in wild populations cause the thin-shelled eggs and other symptoms of reproductive failure that have now become typical of those populations (Wiemeyer & Porter, 1970). As a consequence of these phenomena, DDT has suppressed or even extirpated some populations of many species of birds of prey and sea-birds in the United States, including the Bald Eagle, Peregrine Falcon, Prairie Falcon, Sharp-shinned Hawk, Cooper's Hawk, Marsh Hawk, Black-crowned Night Heron, Double-crested Cormorant, Osprey, Common Murre, Brown Pelican, Ashy Petrel, and Common Egret.

The role of CHs other than DDT in avian reproduction is less clear, partly because they are much less widespread in the environment and partly because they have been studied less. Various evidence does not indicate that complacency about them is justified, however. Dieldrin also causes birds to lay thin-shelled eggs (Lehner & Egbert, 1969); it inhibits carbonic anhydrase (Verrett & Desmond, 1959), is a powerful hepatic enzyme inducer (Peakall, 1970*b*), and was evidently the major factor in the low reproductive success of the Golden Eagle in Scotland (Ratcliffe, 1970). Since Dieldrin is very widespread in Nature, it is presumably a contributor to the above problems.

Effects on fish

CHs have long been known to be highly toxic to fish. Widespread mortality of Salmon (*Salmo salar*) resulted from spraying of the coniferous forests of New Brunswick with DDT in the 1950s (C. F. Wurster, 1969*a*), and large, spectacular fish-kills resulted from the application of Dieldrin to the Florida salt-marsh and the discharge of Endrin into the Mississippi River (Harrington & Bidlingmayer, 1958). As with birds, however, it is probable that acutely lethal effects of CHs on fish are less important to fish populations than are the less obvious sublethal effects.

CH has inhibited reproduction in fish, but the mechanism is quite different from that which inhibits avian reproduction. Macek (1968*a*) showed, by controlled experiments, that concentrations of DDT in the diet that are sublethal to adult fish may be lethal to fry after they hatch from contaminated eggs. The DDT is passed into the egg-yolk; the embryo develops and hatches and, after hatching, at the stage of final yolk-sac absorption, the fry will die if the concentration of DDT in the yolk is sufficiently high. This form of reproduction failure has occurred several times in Nature, has sometimes been severe, and is probably more widespread than published accounts indicate. Reproduction of Lake Trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) in Lake George and other New York lakes has failed completely for the past dozen years, with 100 per cent mortality of the fry occurring annually (Burdick *et al.* 1964). Similar, though less severe, fry mortality has involved in Coho Salmon (*Oneorhynchus kisutch*) in Lake Michigan (Johnson & Pecor, 1969), trout (several salmonids in Alberta and New Zealand, and Spotted Sea-trout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*) in the Gulf of Mexico (Butler *et al.*, 1970). Since the concentrations of DDT at which fry mortality has been shown to occur both under controlled and field conditions are now being approached or equalled in some freshwater and marine fisheries. It is hard to escape the conclusion that these fisheries are threatened by contamination with DDT (Risebrough, 1969). Unfortunately, few data are available on the possible effects of CHs on the reproduction of marine fish, so it is hard to know what might be happening to marine fishery resources.

CHs have other sublethal effects on fish. A few ppb of DDT in the water upset the temperature-regulating mechanism of young Salmon (Anderson & Peterson, 1969), and controlled experiments by Macek (1968*b*) showed that the stresses of falling temperature and starvation killed most Brook Trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) that were subjected to sublethal amounts of DDT, whereas very few of the control fish died. DDT-induced susceptibility to stress presumably explains the delayed salmon mortality in New Brunswick that coincided with colder weather several months after the DDT application and initial fish-kill (C. F. Wurster, 1969*a*). Sublethal exposure to Toxaphene and DDT also affects the behaviour of fish (Anderson & Peterson, 1969).

Chlorinated hydrocarbons and photosynthesis

Recent studies have shown that a few ppb of DDT, Dieldrin, Endrin, or PCBs, in the water, decreases photosynthesis, as measured by ^{14}C uptake, in certain species of marine phytoplankton—an effect that could result from inhibition of electron transport by these material (C. F. Wurster, 1968; Menzel *et al.*, 1970). I do not, however, subscribe to the theory frequently advanced in the public media that these findings indicate that DDT will ultimately eliminate oxygen production in the oceans, thereby greatly diminishing the oxygen supply in the atmosphere.

This effect of CHs on Algae appears to be highly selective, affecting certain susceptible species and not others. Selective poisoning of some algal species in areas near sites of CH application could lead to an undesirable imbalance within the flora, and a bloom of the resistant species might then occur. An alteration in species composition of phytoplankton communities could have profound ecological consequences, but too little research has yet been done on these phenomena to draw any conclusions.

Effects on ecosystems

Many of the activities of Man tend to simplify ecosystems by reducing species-diversity. An agricultural ecosystem generally contains fewer species of organisms than the ecosystem it replaced, and the same is usually true of cities, towns, and the human environment generally. Fire, ionizing radiation, a variety of pollutants including pesticides, and other forms of human disturbance, all tend to degrade and simplify the structure of ecosystems in a somewhat similar manner. They tend to favour small, rapidly reproducing ordganisms that are low in the food-chain at the expense of larger but more slowly reproducing carnivores that are higher

in the food pyramid. These processes have been articulated with unusual clarity by Woodwell (1970).

The effects of persistent CHs on ecosystems are beter understood than are those of most other pollutants. For a variety of reasons, their maximum impact tends to involve organisms that are high in the food-chain (Moore, 1967; Harrison *et al.*, 1970). Biological concentration subjects predators to the greatest dosages of CHs, and by virtue of their fewer numbers and slow rates of reproduction the predators are less capable of sustaining increased mortality than are the smaller, more rapidly reproducing organisms further down in the food pyramid. The latter can quickly develop populations that are resistant to CHs, whereas the predators cannot afford the mortality that is always the price of resistance.

The effects of CHs on predators is apparent in a number of instances (Moore, 1967). The large predatory fish are diminished by decreases in reproductive success, and declines in populations of carnivorous birds for the same reason are even more obvious. Perturbations among other components of the ecosystem inevitably follow decreases of predators.

Losses of predators and parasites following the use of insecticides is especially marked among insect communities, a phenomenon that has been well documented (Ripper, 1956). Phytophagous (plant-eating) insects are well equipped for chemical warfare, but entomophagous (insect-eating) insects are not so endowed (Krieger *et al.*, 1971). Losses of predatory and parasitic insects frequently cause enormous outbreaks of phytophagous insects, an effect that may be highly detrimental to agriculture (Huffaker, 1971). The strategy of attempting to control insects by inflicting mortality with broad-spectrum, persistent poisons would appear to be counterproductive over the long term because it is ultimately beneficial to populations of phytophagous insects and other herbivores, and deleterious to many higher, non-target organisms—thus degrading the structure, diversity, and stability, of ecosystems.

HUMAN HEALTH IMPLICATIONS OF CHLORINATED HYDROCARBON INSECTICIDES

Apparently all human beings carry residues of DDT in their tissues, and most of them contain Dieldrin and other CH residues as well (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1969). What is the significance of these residues to human health? After several decades of using these materials there is still no adequate answer to this question.

Humans are very poor experimental animals. They tend not to volunteer for experiments that terminate with their sacrifice and dissection; yet such experiments must be done to evaluate the biological effects of a chemical or drug. Laboratory animals therefore "volunteer" their services in these experiments, and most of our knowledge of these subjects depends on their dedication and self-sacrifice. Mice and rats are not men, but their similarities to Man are greater than their dissimilarities. In actual practice, the correlation between findings in laboratory animals and those in Man is quite high. Results in animals therefore indicate the *probability* that Man would react similarly. Often we have no choice but to accept results on experimental animals, and prudence dictates that we base our actions on these experiments where experimentation with human subjects is inadequate or lacking. Studies on laboratory animals suggest at least four areas in which human populations may be affected by current levels of exposure to CHs, especially to DDT residues.

Behavioural effects

CHs are nerve toxins (O'Brien, 1967). At concentrations well below those producing obvious toxic symptoms, a variety of behavioural changes are known to occur in experimental animals (Desi, *et al.*, 1966; Anderson & Peterson, 1969; C. F. Wurster, 1969*a*). At the concentrations of CHs which are present in the tissues of the general human population, such effects would be extremely difficult to detect, especially in the absence of controls, in the presence of a host of other variables, and with inadequate testing procedures. We do not know whether or not a threshold exists—a concentration of CH above which effects occur but below which they do not. Nevertheless, until better evidence is available, we should assume that behavioural changes in laboratory animals are indicative of comparable effects within the human population. Such changes could be of great importance to human society, but they have not been studied. The absence of knowledge, however, is not evidence of safety.

Hepatic enzyme induction

Most CHs are enzyme inducers, i.e. they induce a substantial increase in the synthesis of relatively non-specific hepatic enzymes that hydroxylate steroid hormones and various other substrates (Conney, 1967; Kupfer, 1967; U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1969; Peakall, 1970*b*). The effect has been noted in experimental animals at dietary levels of a few parts per million—concentrations that are legally permissible in some human foods in the United States. Enzymes induced by DDT have reduced the concentration of endogenous oestrogen in the blood of birds—an effect that causes a variety of behavioural and reproductive changes (Peakall, 1970*a*, 1970*b*). Induction of these enzymes has been shown to occur in men who had been occupationally exposed to DDT and Endrin (Jager, 1970; Poland *et al.*, 1970). In Man it is possible that these enzymes can reduce the level of circulating steroid hormones sufficiently to affect behaviour and other parameters that are influenced by these steroids, and to affect various drug interactions—including the function of oral contraceptives containing steroids—and other biochemical processes. Furthermore, it is not known whether there is a threshold concentration for CHs below which these effects would not occur. But, once again, the absence of knowledge is no indication of safety, and animal experimentation suggests that hepatic enzyme induction by CHs, especially by DDT residues, may be a human health hazard.

Cancer

The evaluation of chemicals, drugs, and pesticides, for carcinogenic activity in humans, presents numerous inherent difficulties. These include (1) the inability to use human subjects, necessitating the employment of laboratory animals as substitutes, (2) the presence of cancer from numerous other, usually unidentified, causes within the human population, and (3) the difficulty of testing at environmental exposure-levels and attaining statistical significance when those levels might produce only a single tumour in thousands of individuals. Detection of carcinogenesis at environmental concentrations would require enormous and unmanageable numbers of animals to demonstrate a statistically significant increase in the frequency of tumour induction (Epstein, 1970). Nevertheless, induction of cancer in the general population at a rate of 1 in 10,000 individuals would involve about 20,000 persons in the United States alone—a number that would clearly be of major public-health significance.

Some technique must be employed to increase the sensitivity of the testing procedure so that smaller, more practical numbers of test animals can be used. One way of doing so is to increase dosage levels, thereby also increasing the incidence or frequency of tumour formation. There is no evidence that an increase in dosage converts non-carcinogenic materials into carcinogens. Carcinogenesis is a specific, relatively rare biological event and the ability to induce it is possessed by few chemicals. The standard procedure for evaluating carcinogenesis involves high dosage-levels with both positive and negative controls in laboratory animals, usually rodents (Epstein, 1970). This procedure shows a remarkable degree of concurrence. . . between chemical carcinogenesis in animals and that in Man where it has been studied closely (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1969). In the absence of better techniques, prudent public policy should be based on results obtained in this way.

Four different laboratory experiments on mice, rats, and trout, have shown an elevated rate of carcinogenesis by DDT, while Aldrin, Dieldrin, Mirex, Strobane, and Heptachlor, proved carcinogenic to mice (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1969). Carcinogenicity thus appears to be rather common among CH insecticides. Cancer induction in these animals indicates a high probability, but not a certainty, that these chemicals are also carcinogenic to humans. Evidence is lacking that there is a threshold or safe tolerance-level for carcinogens, above which they cause cancer and below which they do not. The frequency or incidence of cancer induction by such chemicals may fall to zero only at a zero concentration of the chemical concerned. In the United States the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act prohibits the presence of carcinogenic additives in human foods, but the federal government has not enforced this law adequately.

A further suggestion that DDT and Dieldrin are human carcinogens is found in two studies showing that victims of terminal cancer contain substantially elevated concentrations of DDT and Dieldrin residues in their adipose tissues, as compared with the general population (Casarett *et al.*, 1968; Radomski *et al.*, 1968). These elevated CH levels did not correlate with, and are therefore not explainable by, the loss of weight in these people prior to death. The presence of these elevated CH residues does not prove that they caused the cancers, but the findings are certainly consistent with the hypothesis that they did, and also with the results obtained with test animals.

One must conclude, based on the standard procedures for evaluating carcinogenesis, that these CHs represent a significant cancer hazard in the human environment.

Mutagenesis

Genetic toxicity of a chemical can manifest itself as carcinogenesis, mutagenesis, or teratogenesis, depending on the location and maturity of the damaged cell, and often two or three of these phenomena may be caused by the same chemical (Legator, 1970). In addition to being a carcinogen, DDT has been shown to be a mutagen as well, as indicated by recent studies by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration using the dominant lethal test in rats (M.S. Legator, in preparation). The argument regarding mutagenesis is similar to that for carcinogenesis: mutagenesis in rats indicates a high probability, though not a certainty, that DDT is a human mutagen. The present level of contamination of human tissues with DDT could mean that future generations of human beings will be burdened by an increased incidence of genetic defects.

The ubiquity of CH residues in the human environment, together with the above-

cited evidence of genetic toxicity at least of the most prevalent of these chemicals, rather strongly suggests that Man has, during the past quarter-century, increased the burden of genetically toxic agents throughout the entire human population of the Earth. But although thousands or millions of people may be affected, a cause-effect relationship may remain unproven for many years, if, in fact, it can ever be proven. The logistic difficulties of such experimentation with humans may be insurmountable.

Several studies of the physiological effects of DDT, Aldrin, Dieldrin, and Endrin, have involved human subjects (Jager, 1970; Hayes *et al.*, 1971). These studies are deficient in experimental design, failed to study the most relevant parameters, and were more concerned with levels of CH storage than with physiological or biochemical effects. They establish only that under current environmental conditions, excluding accidents and suicides, members of the general population are not dying of acute CH insecticide poisoning, nor are they suffering overt, toxic symptoms. Long-term, chronic effects were inadequately studied.

To be more specific, the investigations by Hayes *et al.* (1971) and those conducted in the Shell laboratories (Jager, 1970) had only men in their samples; women, children, and infants, were not studied. The small numbers of men involved were completely inadequate to evaluate biological events (such as carcinogenesis or mutagenesis) that may occur once in many thousands of individuals. Periods of exposure were too short to detect biological effects involving induction periods that may be many years or decades. Emphasis was given to reviewing the men's attendance records at work, and many of the other simple blood and other routine tests performed were largely irrelevant. When 2 of 22 men who were being fed high dosages of DDT became severely ill after months of this diet, they were dropped from the experiment and excluded from the data with the conclusion that "at no time was there any objective finding to indicate a relationship between illness and DDT storage" (Hayes *et al.*, 1971).

It is unlikely that these tests on men could have detected behavioural changes, hepatic enzyme induction, carcinogenesis, mutagenesis, or other effects that might be anticipated in Man because they occurred in experiments with laboratory animals. The authors concluded, nevertheless, that exposure to these CH insecticides involved no ill-effects on human health—a conclusion that has been widely quoted by the pesticide industry. It seems remarkable that, although hundreds of millions of people have been exposed to these substances for more than two decades, their effects have been so inadequately tested by such primitive studies on such a small number of men!

INSECT CONTROL WITH CHLORINATED HYDROCARBONS

The introduction of the CH insecticides during and shortly after World War II was accompanied by the optimistic belief by some people that these "miracle" substances would eliminate our insect pest problems. These dreams proved naive. Although the control of insect populations is a fundamentally ecological problem, these materials were developed and introduced by chemists and medical authorities with almost no ecological sophistication (Smith & Bosch, 1967). The CH insecticides are ecologically crude, powerful, and highly disruptive poisons within insect communities, so it is hardly surprising that problems soon appeared among populations of such rapidly reproducing and adaptive organisms.

The following are among the more serious problems that have occurred following the use of these materials in an attempt to control insect populations.

1. *Resistance.* When a high rate of mortality is inflicted by a poison on an insect population, a few insects survive because they have certain traits (detoxifying enzymes, behavioural mechanisms, less permeable cuticles than the others, etc.) that protect them from the poison (Brown, 1961). These survivors repopulate the region, and so the protective traits become more prevalent. Repeated insecticide applications further the process, resulting in heavy selection for those traits with survival value. The population soon consists of insects that can no longer be killed by the original insecticide at the original dosage. Insect resistance to CHs is now widespread, rendering these insecticides far less effective than they once were.

2. *Pest Resurgence.* Even in the "monocultures" of modern agriculture, insects live in complex communities containing hundreds of different species (Smith & Bosch, 1967). Most of these species are maintained under biological control, so that only a very few achieve pest status, do economic damage, and require human intervention. The potential pest species are phytophagous (plant-eating) ones, and primary among their control agents are the entomophagous insects—the insect parasites and predators of other insects.

Most CH insecticides destroy phytophagous and entomophagous insects alike because they are broad-spectrum, highly toxic poisons to all arthropods (Ripper, 1956). The entomophagous insects cannot recover, for lack of food or hosts, until after recovery of the phytophagous insects, which may vigorously rebound with an ample food-supply (the crop), less intraspecific competition, and the absence of biotic pressure from their natural enemies. The pest insects may thus resurge to much greater proportions and numbers than were present before the insecticide was applied, thereby making the pest problem worse and creating the apparent need for more insecticide (Ripper, 1956; Smith & Bosch, 1967; Huffaker, 1971).

3. *Creation of New Pests.* A phytophagous insect species that was not previously present at pest densities may be elevated to pest status by the resurgence in numbers that follows destruction of its natural enemies by broad-spectrum toxins such as the CH insecticides (Smith & Bosch, 1967).

In many instances, then, the use of certain insecticides aggravates the insect pest problems that they are intended to solve, or creates new ones. Without realizing what has happened to him, the farmer may find himself with nightmarish insect problems such as he has never known before. Farmers sometimes get "addicted" to this insecticide treadmill, just as a person becomes addicted to drugs. The farmer, the consumer, and the environment, all suffer while the insecticide manufacturer benefits. Since insect control is an ecological problem, it requires the employment of ecological principles and techniques to achieve a long-range, satisfactory solution for the agricultural community and the environment.

THE ALTERNATIVES: MODERN INTEGRATED CONTROL

In contrast with the purely chemical approach to insect pest problems, modern integrated control employs an ecological approach to pest management by combining and integrating biological, chemical, and other effective measures into a single, unified pest-management system. Insecticides are used only when and where necessary, and in a manner that is least disruptive to beneficial regulating agents in the environment (Smith & Bosch, 1967). Crop yields and farmers' profits are thereby generally increased, and environmental damage is minimized or eliminated. Integrated control is not a dream for the distant future, but is already available in many instances and can readily be developed in most other cases (Bosch, 1970; Huffaker, 1971). Most CH insecticides are incompatible with integrated control and, in fact, they destroy its operation.

Modern agriculture must adopt effective, economical, and ecologically sound, integrated insect pest management systems to avoid the numerous shortcomings, hazards, and high costs, of complete reliance on insecticides. An increasingly hungry and polluted world can ill afford to continue on its present course; if it does, the adaptable insects will be the ultimate winners.

CHOICES FOR THE FUTURE

The current excessive dependence on insecticides, especially persistent CHs, seems filled with troubles for Man. CH residues, particularly those of DDT, are diminishing the richness and diversity of the human environment by causing widespread declines in populations of many species of carnivorous birds—in some cases to very low levels or extinction. These residues threaten freshwater and marine fisheries by inhibiting the reproductive success of the larger predatory fish, thereby threatening an important source of proteins. They exhibit genetic toxicity to experimental animals, and are therefore probably adding to the existing burden of cancer and mutations within human populations. And finally, these materials are frequently counterproductive in achieving their intended objective of controlling insect populations.

Man can choose to continue these trends by maintaining current pesticide practices, with further deterioration indicated. Or he can choose to reverse them by adopting ecologically sound insect pest management using modern integrated control systems. These choices may seem simple, but they are less simple than they appear. It will not be easy to reverse the momentum of current policies, to adopt existing knowledge, to seek new knowledge via imaginative and unbiased research, and to reeducate a whole new generation of people who believe that insecticides represent the only approach to insect control. The adoption of new approaches will be resisted by many, and will be actively opposed by powerful economic interests; the faint-hearted will not prevail over these forces. Ecological pest-control without environmentally dangerous materials is essential, however, if we are to preserve the integrity of the biosphere as we know it.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. and Peterson, M. (1969). DDT: sublethal effects on Brook Trout nervous system. Science, 164, pp. 440–1.

Blus, L. J. (1970). Measurements of Brown Pelican eggshells from Florida and South Carolina. BioScience, 20, pp. 867–9.

Bosch, R. Van Den (1970). Pesticides: prescribing for the ecosystem. Environment, 12 (3), pp. 20–5.

Bowman, M. C., Acree, F., Lofgren, C. S. and Beroza M. (1964). Chlorinated insecticides: fate in aqueous suspensions containing mosquito larvae. Science, 146, pp. 1480–1.

Brown, A. W. A. (1961). The challenge of insecticide resistance. Bull. Entomol. Soc. Am., 7, pp. 6–19.

Burdick, G. E., Harris, E. J., Dean, H. J., Walker, T. M., Skea, J. and Colby, D. (1964). The accumulation of DDT in Lake Trout and the effect on reproduction. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc., 93, pp. 127–36.

Butler, P. A., Childress, R. and Wilson, A. J. (1970). The association of DDT residues with losses in marine productivity. Food and Agriculture Organization (U.N.) Technical Conference on Marine Pollution and Its Ef-

fects on Living Resources and Fishing, 9–18 December 1970, Rome, Italy. FIR: MP/70/E–76, 11 Nov. 1970, 13 pp.

Cade, T. J., Lincer, J. L., White, Roseneau, D. G. and Swartz, L. G. (1971). DDE residues and eggshell changes in Alaskan falcons and hawks. Science, 172, pp. 955–7. Documentation is not exhaustive, but is intended to guide the reader to important papers, reviews, or recent sources in which additional references will be found.

Casarett, L. J., Fryer, G. C., Yauger, W. L. & Klemmer, H. W. (1968). Organochlorine pesticide residues in human tissue—Hawaii. Arch. Environ. Health, 17, pp. 306–11.

Conney, A. H. (1967). Pharmacological implications of microsomal enzyme induction. Pharmacol. Rev., 19, pp. 317–66.

Desi, I., Farkas, I. & Kemeny, T. (1966). Changes of central nervous function in response to DDT administration. Acta Physiol. Acad. Scient. Hungaricae, 30 pp. 275–82.

Dvorchik, B. H., Istin, M. & Maren, T. H. (1971). Does DDT inhibit carbonic anhydrase? Science, 172, pp. 728–9.

Edwards, C. A. (1966). Insecticide residues in soils. Residue Rev., 13, pp. 83–132.

Epstein, S. S. (1970). Control of chemical pollutants. Nature, London, 228, pp. 816–9.

Harrison, H. L., Loucks, O. L., Mitchell, J. W., Parkhurst, D. F., Tracy, C. R., Watts, D. G. & Yannacone, V. J. (1970). Systems studies of DDT transport. Science, 170, pp. 503–8.

Harrington, R. W. & Bidlingmayer, W. L. (1958). Effects of Dieldrin on fishes and invertebrates of a salt marsh, J. Wildl. Mgmt., 22, pp. 76–82.

Hayes, W. J., Dale, W. E. & Pirkle, C. I. (1971). Evidence of safety of long-term, high, oral doses of DDT for Man. Arch. Environ. Health, 22, pp. 119–35.

Huffaker, C. B. (Ed.) (1971). Biological Control. Plenum Press, New York: 468 pp.

Jager, K. W. (1970). Aldrin, Dieldrin, Endrin and Telodrin: an Epidemiological and Toxicological Study of Long-term Occupational Exposure. Elsevier, Amsterdam: 234 pp.

Jefferies, D. J. & French, M. C. (1971). Hyper- and hypothyroidism in pigeons fed DDT: an explanation for the thin eggshell phenomenon. Environ. Pollut., 1, pp. 235–42.

Johnson, H. E. & Pecor, C. (1969). Coho Salmon mortality and DDT in Lake Michigan. Trans. 34th North Amer. Wildl. Nat. Res. Conf., March 3–5, Washington, D.C.

Korschgen, L. J. (1970). Soil-food-chain-pesticide wildlife relationships in Aldrin-treated fields. J. Wildl. Mgmt., 34, pp. 186–99.

Krieger, R. I., Feeny, P. P. & Wilkinson, C. F. (1971). Detoxication enzymes in the guts of caterpillars: an evolutionary answer to plant defenses? Science, 172, pp. 579–81.

Kupfer, D. (1967). Effects of some pesticides and related compounds on steroid function and metabolism. Residue Rev., 19, pp. 11–30.

Legator, M. S. (1970). Mutagenic effects of environmental intrusions. Assoc. Food & Drug Offic. U.S., 34 pp. 3–5.

Lehner, P. N. & Egbert, A. (1969). Dieldrin and eggshell thickness in ducks. Nature, London, 224, pp. 1218–9.

Macek, K. J. (1968a). Reproduction in Brook Trout. (Salvelinus fontinalis) fed sublethal concentrations of DDT. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada, 25, pp. 1787–96.

Macek, K. J. (1968b). Growth and resistance to stress in Brook Trout fed sublethal levels of DDT. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada, 25, pp. 2443–51.

Menzel, D. W., Anderson, J. & Randtke, A. (1970). Marine phytoplankton vary in their response to cholorinated hydrocarbons. Science, 167, pp. 1724–6.

Moore, N. W. (1967). A synopsis of the pesticide problem. Adv. Ecol. Res., 4, pp. 75–129.

Mulhern, B. M., Reichel, W. L., Locke, L. N., Lamont, T. G., Belisle, A., Cromartie, E, Bagley, G. E. & Prouty, R. M. (1970). Organochlorine residues and autopsy data from Bald Eagles, 1966–68. Pesticides Monitoring J., 4, pp. 141–4.

Nash, R. G. & Woolson, E. A. (1967). Persistence of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides in soils. Science, 157, pp. 924–7.

O'Brien, R. D. (1967). Insecticides, Action and Metabolism. Academic Press, New York: 332 pp., illustr.

Park, K. S. & Bruce, W. N. (1968). The determination of the water solubility of Aldrin, Dieldrin, Heptachlor, and Heptachlor epoxide. J. Econ. Entomol., 61, pp. 770–4.

Peakall, D. B. (1970a). Pesticides and the reproduction of birds. Scientific Amer., 222 (4), pp. 72–8.

Peakall, D. B. (1970b). p,p'-DDT: effect on calcium metabolism and concentration of estradiol in the blood. Science, 168, pp. 592–4.

Peakall, D. B. & Lincer, J. L. (1970). Polychlorinated biphenyls: another long-life widespread chemical in the environment. BioScience, 20, pp. 958–64.

Peterle, T. J. (1969). DDT in Antarctic snow. Nature, London, 224, p. 620.

Poland, A., Smith, D., Kuntzman, R., Jacobson, M. & Conney, A. H. (1970). Effect of intensive occupational exposure to DDT on phenylbutazone and cortisol metabolism in human subjects. Clin. Pharmacol. Therap., 11, pp. 724–32.

Radomski, J. L., Deichmann, W. B. & Clizer, E. E. (1968). Pesticide concentrations in the liver, brain and adipose tissue of terminal hospital patients. Fd Cosmet. Toxicol, 6, pp. 209–20.

Ratcliffe, D. A. (1970). Changes attributable to pesticides in egg breakage frequency and eggshell thickness in some British birds. J. Appl. Ecol., 7, pp. 67–115.

Ripper, W. E. (1956). Effect of pesticides on balance of arthropod populations. Ann. Rev. Entomol., 1, pp. 403–38.

Risebrough, R. W. (1969). Chlorinated hydrocarbons in marine ecosystems. Pp. 5–23 in Chemical Fallout: Current Research on Persistent Pesticides, Ed. M. W. Miller & G. G. Berg. C. C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill.: 531 pp.

Risebrough, R. W., Huggett, R. J., Griffin, J. J. & Goldberg, E. D. (1968). Pesticides: Transatlantic movements in the Northeast Trades. Science, 1959, pp. 1233–6.

Rudd, R. L. (1964). Pesticides and the Living Landscape. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison: 320 pp.

Smith, R. F. & Bosch, R. Van Den (1967). Integrated control. Pp. 295–340 in Pest Control: Biological, Physical and Selected Chemical Methods, Ed. W. W. Kilgore & R. L. Doutt. Academic Press, New York: 477 pp., illustr.

Stickel, W. H., Stickel, L. F. & Spann, J. W. (1969). Tissue residues of Dieldrin in relation to mortality in birds and mammals. Pp. 174–204 in Chemical Fallout: Current Research on Persistent Pesticides, Ed. M. W. Miller & G. G. Berg. C. C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill.: 531 pp., illustr.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (1970). The Pesticide Review 1970. Agric. Stabiliz Conserv. Serv., Washington, D.C.: 46 pp.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare (1969). Report of the Secretary's Commission on Pesticides and Their Relationship to Environmental Health. E. M Mrak, Chairman, Parts I and II, Washington, D.C.: 677 pp.

Valin, C. C. Van, Andrews, A. K. & Eller, L. L. (1968). Some effects of Mirex on two warm-water fishes. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc., 97, pp 185–96.

Van Den Bosch, R. See Bosch, R. Van Den.

Verrett, M. J. & Desmond, A. H. (1959). Inhibition of carbonic anhydrase by chlorinated hydrocarbons. Pharmacologist, 1, p. 72.

Welch, R. M., Levin, W. & Conney, A. H. (1969). Estrogenic action of DDT and its analogs. Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol., 14, pp. 358–67.

Wiemeyer, S. N. & Porter, R. D. (1970). DDE thins eggshells of captive American Kestrels. Nature, London, 227, pp. 737–8.

Woodwell, G. M. (1970). Effects of pollution on the structure and physiology of ecosystems. Science, 168, pp. 429–33.

Woodwell, G. M., Wurster, C. F. & Isaacson, P. A. (1967). DDT residues in an East Coast estuary: a case of biological concentration of a persistent insecticide. Science, 156, pp. 821–4.

Wurster, C. F. (1968). DDT reduces photosynthesis by marine phytoplankton. Science, 159, pp. 1474–5.

Wurster, C. F. (1969a). Chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides and the world ecosystem. Biological Conservation, 1(2), pp. 123–9.

Wurster, C. F. (1969b). Chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides and avian reproduction: how are they related? pp. 368–89 in Chemical Fallout: Current Research on Persistent Pesticides, Ed. M. W. Miller & G. G. Berg. C. C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill.: 531 pp.

Wurster, D. H., Wurster, C. F. & Strickland, W. N. (1965). Bird mortality following DDT spray for Dutch elm disease. Ecology, 46, pp. 488–99.

J. EDGAR HOOVER LAUDED

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been under almost constant attack. The Agency's Director has also been subject to much abuse by his critics.

Because Mr. Hoover's career with the FBI has been one of hard work and devotion to duty, it disturbs me that, instead of bestowing gratitude on him for a life dedicated to public service, some are more inclined to criticize him without justification.

It was refreshing to note that the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States chose to honor J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI with a resolution of commendation.

The July 12, 1971, Washington Report carried an article on the presentation and, because of my high regard for Mr. Hoover and the FBI, I ask that the article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Report, July 12, 1971]

CHAMBER BOARD COMMENDS FBI, HOOVER FOR "UNIQUELY DEDICATED WORK"

The National Chamber's Board of Directors has by resolution commended the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its director, J. Edgar Hoover.

The action was prompted by growing attacks on the FBI which in some instances are aimed at the very existence of the organization.

In a rare instance during the Chamber's 59-year history, the Board has singled out one federal agency for "outstanding performance in discharging responsibilities as prescribed by law."

In expressing appreciation of the Chamber's "strong support," Mr. Hoover said it is "becoming increasingly obvious that law enforcement throughout our country is under most serious attack by forces bent on its destruction."

Alluding to FBI critics, he asserted it is "impossible to effectively do our job without making some enemies."

The Board also said:

Created in 1924, the FBI has developed a reputation for professionalism, integrity and effectiveness. It has established laboratories, investigative services and aided state and local police efforts, and generally raised the level of training throughout the police profession.

The FBI has made immeasurable contributions to the protection of society from both domestic and foreign enemies.

Over the past years, the FBI has generated the respect of the citizenry and the public should perceive a debt to the "uniquely dedicated and creative work of the FBI."

POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN KILLED IN LINE OF DUTY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years there has been a drastic increase in the number of police and fire officers who have given their lives in the line of duty. In 1970 there were 146 deaths of police officers, and 55 deaths of fire officers, and the figures for firefighters are only partial. This tragic increase needs to be dealt with, so that we can improve the quality of life in the towns, cities, and States, throughout our Nation.

As you well know, there are at present many bills before this House, that would help to reverse this trend. These bills in general would make it a Federal crime, to assault or interfere with a police or fire officer while he is carrying out his assigned duty. These bills are important, but we must also concern ourselves with the living, with the families, the wives, and children of these dead heroes.

Without the heads of their family, these widows and orphans face a life of extreme hardships. Pensions, insurance, and other death benefits, cover some of the costs that these families must face, but without their bread-winner, there are many other costs that become difficult to meet.

In order to help these families, I am today introducing a bill, that would allow the sons of police and fire officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty, to enter the service academies of the United States—if otherwise qualified—without the regular congressional appointment.

This bill, in helping the families of police and fire officers, would show the greatful recognition that we in Congress and throughout the entire United States have for these dedicated civil servants.

The bills follow:

H.R. 10103

A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for appointments to the service academies of sons of State and local policeman and firemen killed in line of duty

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4342(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after paragraph (9) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) 80 cadets selected in order of merit as established by competitive examinations from sons of State or local law enforcement officers and firemen who lost their lives in line of duty. The determination of any State or local agency that a law enforcement officer or fireman died in line of duty is binding upon the Secretary of the Army."

SEC. 2. Section 6954(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after paragraph (9) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) 80 cadets selected in order of merit as established by competitive examinations from sons of State or local law enforcement officers and firemen who lost their lives in line of duty. The determination of any State or local agency that a law enforcement officer or fireman died in line of duty is binding upon the Secretary of the Navy."

SEC. 3. Section 9342(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after paragraph (9) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) 80 cadets selected in order of merit as established by competitive examinations from sons of State or local law enforcement officers and firemen who lost their lives in line of duty. The determination of any State or local agency that a law enforcement officer or firemen died in line of duty is binding upon the Secretary of the Air Force."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to classes initially entering the service academies after 1971.

H.R. 10104

A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the appointment to the Merchant Marine Academy of sons of State and local law enforcement officers and firemen killed in line of duty

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 216(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1126(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, after 1971 the Secretary of Commerce shall each year appoint to the Academy in order of merit established by competitive examinations 80 qualified candidates from among sons of State and local law enforcement officers and firemen who died in line of duty and the determination by any State or local agency that a law enforcement officer or fireman died in line of duty shall be binding upon the Secretary."

THE BEAUTY OF THE OREGON DUNES

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I take a few brief moments to commend two perceptive and able young people in my congressional district.

I have recently introduced legislation to preserve the beauty of the Oregon Dunes, located on the Oregon coast, as a national recreation area. The subcommittee of the Interior Committee with jurisdiction has held field hearings on this bill and I am hopeful it will pass the House this year. It is important if this gorgeous area is to be saved.

But some of the beauty of the dunes has already been caught and preserved by two Reedsport high school students, Michael Lee and Michael Long. These two young men used the dunes as a science laboratory, studying and photographing botanical specimens. The resulting pictorial history of their study, developed into a book and featured in publications, testifies to the great natural beauty of the plantlife and the shifting moods of the unique dunelands.

I commend the two Michaels for their imaginative and delightful project. It is my hope to have their work available to show the subcommittee when it holds its Washington hearings on my bill after the August recess.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DENUNCIATION OF BLACK LEADERSHIP IN AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS), who is chairman of the congressional black caucus, in this special order.

Vice President AGNEW's gratuitous affront to the black leadership in America reflects a total lack of understanding of the needs and aspirations of the American people.

His remarks, made while en route to join the celebration of over 30 years of dictatorial rule by General Franco, are an affront to all those who have striven to make some reality out of "all men are created equal."

For the past 300 hundred years, there has been a great deal of rhetoric in this country about "equality." Yet, even today millions of Americans are denied a full life, for their skins are not white. Discrimination will not just fade away. It is no good thinking that, if we just keep ambling along at the same old pace, somehow the ills of our society will work themselves out. Ours is a fatal pace. This pace must be changed.

In the past few years, we have witnessed the emergence of black leaders who have sought to change that pace—not only for the sake of black Americans but for the sake of all Americans. Their efforts have been untiring; their dedication inspiring.

Yet the Vice President is unable to perceive the significance and contribution of these leaders. Rather, he degrades them.

More than just affront, the Vice President's words are indicative of the total insensitivity of this administration to the needs of black America and its quest for civil rights.

This insensitivity was evidenced by the nomination to the Supreme Court of two

men whose records demonstrated such a gross disregard for the cause of equality that the Senate—which generally exercises great tolerance of Presidential nominees—rejected them.

It was evidenced by the President's disavowal of what he terms "forced integration," a catch phrase which obscures the real issue—the continued bars which are raised to prevent blacks and other minority groups from obtaining housing in the white suburbs which surround our decaying, and increasingly black, urban areas.

It was evidenced by the administration's national campaign in 1970—a campaign based on feeding fear, hate, and prejudice, a campaign deliberately designed to widen the gaps between black and white, rich and poor, young and old.

And it is evidenced by this administration's total failure to use the full power of Government and the moral leadership of the White House to insure the civil rights of all Americans.

A century ago, President Lincoln was not absolutely sure that this Nation would accept in practice the concept of black-white equality. His Act of Emancipation was thus in some degree an act of faith. We are still redeeming Lincoln's act of faith. As a people—North as well as South—we are still learning by experience and suffering to live the truth of racial equality.

This administration has talked a good deal about its record in civil rights. More deeds, not talk, are what are needed. We must gather our strength, and our determination, to act boldly to lift from all of our citizens the hypocritical burdens of intolerance, bigotry, and discrimination.

It is time to unearth the buried truism that in this Nation all citizens have the inalienable right to live side by side with one another—equal in opportunity, equal under the law, equal in respect.

It is time to make a living, breathing force of the word "equality" and insure that its synonymity with the word "America" is not neglected.

"WANDERING WHEELS" COMPLETE 2,500 MILE TRIP

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, chalk up another wholesome achievement for our ingenious American youth.

An heroic and exciting youth project ended on the sands of Tybee Island, Savannah Beach, Ga., July 20 at noon, when 34 weary but enthusiastic young people completed the last leg of an ocean-to-ocean bicycle trip of 2,500 miles which began in San Diego, Calif., on June 14, 1971.

The "Wandering Wheels"—19 girls and 15 boys were from Taylor University, Upland, Ind. They chose to make their summer worthwhile by keeping busy and serving others through their Christian witnessing along the way. Trail Boss Bobby Canada stated their purpose:

For sharing and for growing in their relationships with Christ and with each other. A cross-country trip like this is a magnification of everyday life—a magnification physically, spiritually, and emotionally.

He continued:

Before we started it was a challenge. It has proved to be a real sharp learning experience.

The group's motto was "Teaching Christ Through Bikes." They held worship services along the route and threw their sleeping bags on the floor of a church meeting hall or high school gymnasium. They averaged 13 miles an hour for 7 hours a day.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1971

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate once again the week devoted to the Captive Nations.

On the 13th anniversary of legislation proclaiming our national will to remember these countries until they are again free, we have the somber but proud duty to recall and to reaffirm the dedication of the American people to the cause of peoples of east and central Europe who hope and strive for freedom despite years of subjugation.

Just 3 years ago we witnessed the brutal power of Soviet military forces crushing the enlightened and brave movement in Czechoslovakia seeking political and intellectual freedom. That was a setback in the struggle of all the east and central European peoples for independence and human dignity.

Especially tragic, Mr. Speaker, is the continued suppression of religion in the captive nations. We have today ample witness that renewed hostility to religion motivates the Soviet Union's persecution of its Jewish people.

Political freedom, intellectual liberty, and the opportunity to demonstrate faith in God have been denied. But the courage and perseverance of the eastern and central European peoples will continue to prevail. Persecution and terror, in whatever form, will not succeed in stamping out their will and their determination to achieve finally the freedom with which Americans and other peoples of the world are so blessed.

Americans believe in independence and self-determination for all nations of the world and not just for themselves.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, there are many thousands of citizens who through nativity or ancestry share the vibrant cultures and heritage of liberty of the peoples of Europe who must now live under the yoke of communism.

On this anniversary of our original dedication in Congress to the restoration of freedom in the Captive Nations, we pay tribute to the undaunted spirit of their peoples. We also affirm again our support and admiration for their unconquerable quest to win liberty.

I include below, Mr. Speaker, those eloquent words extracted from the legislation which originated this commemoration:

EXCERPTS FROM PUBLIC LAW 86-90 ADOPTED BY THE U.S. CONGRESS IN JULY 1959

Whereas the submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedoms 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 freedom, 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 constitute a powerful deterrent to war 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 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 similiar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world.

POLYGRAPH TESTS: INVASION OF PRIVACY

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times reports another invasion of one's right of privacy through the use of lie detector tests.

The Times story states that "polygraph interviews" have been administered to about 30 employees of a Manhattan department store. Although store officials maintain that this was only "an experimental step" and a "test of the test," and that participants were "volunteers," employees recognized the threat to privacy posed by such action. As one woman aptly put it:

It's like trying to prove you are innocent.

Two weeks ago, I introduced, with 17 other Congressmen, H.R. 9449, which would prohibit such unwarranted invasions of privacy. The bill was originally introduced in the Senate by Senator SAM ERVIN, and includes in its coverage both

Federal agencies and businesses engaged in interstate commerce. It would prohibit:

A job applicant from being required to take a polygraph test as a condition of employment, and

The denial of employment, the denial of promotion, or the discharge of an individual for his refusal to submit to such a test.

Polygraph tests undermine the individual's right against self-incrimination, as guaranteed by the fifth amendment. Furthermore, courts have refused in most jurisdictions to admit polygraph tests as evidence because of the unreliability. The tests' inaccuracy rate is 25 percent. Ten States now protect job applicants and employees from having to submit to polygraph tests.

I welcome cosponsorship of H.R. 9449.

The article from the New York Times appears below:

BONWIT TELLER TESTS USE OF LIE DETECTORS

(By Laurie Johnston)

"Polygraph interviews," or lie-detector tests, have been administered to about 30 employes of Bonwit Teller, the Fifth Avenue specialty store, as an "experimental step" in the fight against pilferage by store personnel.

The company said yesterday that most of those who took the tests were management-level "volunteers," although the men's department sales staff also participated, and that no further tests were planned "at this time."

But a majority of the sales people and stock clerks who commented on the tests—despite objections from some of their superiors—expressed indignation, ranging from "It's an outrageous invasion of privacy" to "I just might have some skeletons in my closet."

One young woman employe said that "I would refuse to take such a test—it would be like having to prove you were innocent."

A middle-aged salesman of women's shoes asked, "How would you feel if your employer showed that little faith in you?"

Several personnel executives of other department stores said it was the first use of "polygraph interviews," to their knowledge, in stores here.

Mrs. Marjorie Downey, administrative assistant to William Fine, the Bonwit Teller president, said any decision on whether the tests would be used more widely would have to await Mr. Fine's return from Europe. So far, she said, the store is mainly interested in "testing the test, not the employes."

QUERIED ON DRUGS

A polygraph test measures fluctuations in such physical reactions as blood pressure, pulse rate, respiration, perspiration, salivation and skin temperature, on the principle that the emotional stress of lying produces changes in these processes. A Bonwit employe said salespeople in the mens department had been asked "while the diodes were on their hands about their use of drugs.

Losses last year from "inventory shrinkage, or disappearance of stock, at the four Bonwit stores in the New York area have been reported at nearly $2-million, or about 4 per cent of total sales. This included shoplifting as well as pilferage and other internal thefts. About three-fifths was from the Manhattan store, at Fifth Avenue and 56th Street.

A few years ago such losses stood at about 1.5 per cent of total sales.

TEMPTATION AREAS

Mrs. Downey said much of this loss was from spots that were "temptation areas" for employes as well as shoppers—fitting rooms or counters with exposed merchandise—as well as from stock rooms.

John Ruel, director of employe relations at Bloomingdales, said that although "pilferage is an increasing problem, I'm a little surprised at this Bonwit thing—I didn't know it was that critical."

Joseph Douglas, executive personnel interviewer at Macy's, said he considered lie-detector tests "kind of an extreme measure" and a "probably unwarranted" practice.

Their use in connection with employment is now illegal in about 10 states, but a ban on them passed in Albany by the State Legislature was vetoed by Governor Rockefeller. The Retail Clerks International Association has obtained clauses against them in some labor contracts.

Bonwit sales personnel are not represented by a union and have no employes association.

THE WAY TO REALLY END WAR

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that there is no Member of this or the other body who wishes to see an end of war more than I. All of us long for the day when the sound of shots fired in anger is only a memory.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that unilateral disarmament is not the way, nor is what appears to be the present trend of simply allowing our own strategic armaments to deteriorate. This is a risk we cannot afford to take as long as world communism continues its policy of expansionism through the export of revolution, subversion, and outright aggression.

Peace without freedom is a hollow mockery. The peoples of Czechoslovakia or Hungary or Poland can tell you all about the kind of "peace" they have. I am sure that they would prefer war if it meant the end of the tyranny that now enslaves them.

I agree with those who say we should reorder our priorities. First priority must be given to ending the Communist threat to liberty. Then we can bring a true and lasting peace to the world.

Mr. Speaker, the eminent Washington corresponding emeritus of the Chicago Tribune, Walter Trohan, wrote a most excellent and perceptive column yesterday on this very subject. I ask unanimous consent to insert that column at this point in the RECORD.

The column follows:

10 STRATEGY STEPS TO DEAL WITH WAR

(By Walter Trohan)

SAN FRANCISCO—Disarmament is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but it cannot be merely wished into being. This point is made by Gen. Thomas A. Lane in his book, "America on Trial."

The volume is the finest defense this commentator has seen of the military establishment and places the blame for wars, including the one in Viet Nam, squarely where it belongs: on the shoulders of the politicians. Lane served on the staff of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the Pacific during World War II.

Lane makes one proud of the older generation of military men, whose first aim was to end the slaughter of men under their command. He has no praise for the new school of military men, who bootlick politicians for advancement and pay.

"The military services have in recent decades undergone a drastic transformation," Lane concludes. "Standards of professional conduct, which before World War II were firmly established, have since that war been abandoned. Instead of conceiving a responsibility for the military security of the nation, for the lives of men committed to battle, military leaders now conceive only an obligation to obey the ruling political administration. They have shed all traces of moral responsibility by blaming political leaders for the course of policy."

Lane blames politicians for the endless wars of the 20th century, for vacillation in Korea, and for the fiasco in Viet Nam. The general offers 10 stages of strategy. These are:

1. To recognize the war we are in and tell the truth about the known purposes, actions and intentions of the Communist enemy.

2. When we have identified the enemy we can prepare to handle him; he is not a people or a country but a clique of ruthless dictators.

3. Form an alliance with the Russian and Chinese peoples against their dictators.

4. Show them our commitment to freedom is honest and productive, and extend the hand of friendship.

5. Encourage them to recover their freedom.

6. Honor and comfort their exiles and supply assistance to the freedom underground.

7. Attack tyrants in the United Nations and condemn their rule.

8. With such encouragement the people will throw off the yoke of tyranny. Not even a Communist dictator can hold power for long against the people.

9. Only the hopelessness of freedom's cause behind the Iron Curtain demeaned the human spirit so as to make resistance to tyranny unthinkable. We must fight for the right.

10. The task of defeating the Communist dictators thru internal revolution, of restoring freedom in all lands, of banishing war and beating weapons into plowshares is neither big nor difficult if we change our own thinking.

In a foreword to Lane's book, Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, United States wartime supreme commander in China, says that it is generally accepted that a nation should never resort to military force unless all other available measures have failed.

But when President Kennedy resorted to force in Viet Nam "there should have been no vacillation—no halfway measures in the commitment to achieve victory" so that we would not be in the impasse in which the nation finds itself today and from which President Nixon is trying to extricate our forces.

GEORGE WILEY REPLIES TO ROY WILKENS ON THE FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been much dialog both pro and con surrounding passage of the welfare reform bill—commonly called the family assistance plan. When this legislation came before the House for consideration, the congressional black caucus is-

sued a statement discussing the detrimental effects inherent in the measure and the result it would have on the poor and blacks in our country.

Roy Wilkens, executive director of the NAACP, took exception with the position set forth by the black caucus. In an open letter to Wilkens, George Wiley, executive director of the National Welfare Rights Organization, has vividly documented the repressive nature of the welfare bill. Wiley endorses the black caucus' position and supports our effort in having attempted to block passage of this harmful legislation on the House floor. In his letter to Wilkens, he states:

The Congressional Black Caucus was responding to the voices of organized poor people across the nation who have condemned this legislation and were seeking its drastic modification or defeat.

Much of Wiley's letter contains an in-depth discussion of the negative features of the family assistance plan. Wiley concludes with a call for unity in an effort to work together for a real welfare reform measure.

I commend to my colleagues' attention Wiley's letter to Wilkens. The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO ROY WILKINS,
JULY 23, 1971

Mr. ROY WILKINS
Executive Director, NAACP,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WILKINS: I was deeply disappointed to read in your column of July 6th of your support for President Nixon's so-called Family Assistance Plan, and your attack on the Congressional Black Caucus for their determined effort to block this repressive legislation on the floor of the House of Representatives. The Congressional Black Caucus was responding to the voices of organized poor people across the nation who have condemned this legislation and were seeking its drastic modification or defeat.

The issue was not so much that the $2400 floor was inadequate, but that it actually undermined the present benefit levels of 70 to 90 percent of the welfare families who live in 46 states where combined benefits for welfare and food stamps were already above that level. 70 to 90% of welfare families could very likely suffer drastic cuts in their already meager subsistence allowances. It is a measure of the unity of organized poor people that recipients from the southern states that might have benefitted from this plan joined with their brothers and sisters in the rest of the country for its defeat.

In addition to the question of undermining benefit levels, the Nixon plan would have severely restricted the rights of recipients. Rights that poor people have fought for over the past five years. Rights that have permitted millions of Black people as well as whites and other minorities some measure of dignity that they had not previously been accorded. These restrictions of rights included an unconstitutional residency requirement, a partial bringing back of the onerous Man-in-the-House rule and greater difficulty in appealing if one is unfairly treated by the welfare administration. The Nixon plan also included enforced work provision which required able bodied recipients including mothers, to accept work, any work, at $1.20 an hour, just $48.00 a week, with no protection as to suitability, job safety standards or the like. There has not been such an onerous forced work requirement in the welfare system since slavery was abolished in 1863. In addition, current need would no longer be the basis for receiving benefits; therefore a person who lost his job could go as long as six to nine months before becoming eligible for Family Assistance.

It is for these reasons that the Congressional Black Caucus took the only course open to it—to oppose passage of the Family Assistance Plan since it was brought to the floor under a closed rule which prohibited amendments to directly correct the substantial defects. The strategy was to force Mills and the administration to withdraw the legislation and take it back to the drawing boards in order to secure Black Caucus and liberal support. This strategy was successful in forcing Mills to call a special committee meeting the day of the final vote which resulted in the addition of an amendment which would require states to maintain their present benefit levels unless there is a specific meeting of the State Legislature to make cuts. In the earlier version, benefits would automatically have been cut to $2400 in every state unless specific actions were taken to *maintain* them at the present level. The caucus might have won even greater concessions from Mills and the Administration had more liberals supported their position. As it was, 31 liberal Congressmen voted to defeat the Family Assistance Plan. The Black Caucus and their liberal allies served notice on the Administration, the liberals in the Senate, and the country that there is something wrong with the Nixon welfare proposal.

As one who has long respected your record in the civil rights field, I hope that voice might be added to those who cry out against the repressive bill and urge real reform since the issue affects so many of our people. For fully one quarter of our population must bear the indignity of our present welfare system. More than two-thirds of our population do not have adequate income to meet the basic necessities of life. It was to these needs that the Congressional Black Caucus spoke when they introduced the Adequate Income Act of 1971 that would insure a family of four a $6500 basic level of subsistence. As "unrealistic" as you say this proposal is, the most reliable surveys available, those of living costs made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal that this amount of money is the minimum necessary to sustain life in dignity and decency in the United States today. I am sure there are those who thought it was unrealistic when the NAACP started its campaign to strike down the doctrine of "separate but equal." Realism is to set your sights on what is needed and set a course to achieve that objective. What is needed today as never before is unity in the Black community. Unity around the goals of full citizenship which you and the NAACP have so ably championed for so many years. I hope we can all work together for a real welfare reform.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. WILEY,
Executive Director, NWRO.

TRIBUTE TO REV. MACK ANTHONY

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1971, a family and church-related saga of 140 years ended when Rev. Mack Anthony, native of Savannah and a retired United Methodist minister died at Valdosta, Ga. Reverend Anthony, his father, Rev. Bascom Anthony; and his grandfather, Rev. J. D. Anthony, served their church with distinction for an unbroken period of 140 years in the South Georgia Conference of the United Methodist Church. All three held high offices in the church in addition to their pastoral duties.

Reverend Anthony, age 70, was retired in 1963, having served as superintendent of the Macon Methodist Church for 6 years, and 4 years as pastor of the First United Methodist Church, Valdosta, Ga. Earlier pastorates were in Colquitt, Brooklet, Blackshear, Thomasville, Americus, Columbus, and Macon. He is survived by his widow and three sons.

A family history of such devotion to the church and society is rare and worthy of permanent record.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Captive Nations Week was established in July of 1959 by the enactment of a joint congressional resolution which was followed by a presidential proclamation. In the resolution and in the proclamation both Congress and the President were implementing the wholehearted wishes of the people of this Republic. For many years—for nearly two decades—a large number of nations in Europe had been trapped behind the Iron Curtain, had been robbed of their freedom, and were being enslaved under Communist totalitarianism. These nations constituted the Captive Nations.

These nations, having almost a third of Europe's population—some 100 million in all—and occupying areas in Central and Eastern Europe, extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea regions, had been living freely, under their independent status, before the last war. Most of them had regained their freedom and sovereign statehood after World War I, and all of them had become valued members of the world community of free nations. For a while, especially during the late 1930's many of them were living in fear of losing their freedom, and at times in terror, but perhaps none of them envisaged the sad fate that was to be theirs at the end of the last war.

Soon after the outbreak of that war the freedom of these nations was in jeopardy. One of them—Czechoslovakia—was already dismembered and had lost its independent existence before that war. In the course of that world catastrophe all these nations—Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, Poles, Hungarians, Bulgarians and Rumanians—were engulfed in the war. All of them, and numerous other nations, suffered immeasurably during the war under totalitarian tyrannies, both Communist and Nazi variety. But all of them went through the ordeal and hoped for their eventual freedom. At the end of the war, however, the onrushing Communist tide swept over their homelands and literally swallowed all these helpless peoples. This startling and

shocking event took western democracies by surprise; and their leaders were rudely shocked when the grasping hand of communism, supported by the overwhelming might of the Red Army, was out to cripple and choke off all vestiges of freedom and independence in all these countries, including East Germany, Poland, Albany, and Yugoslavia.

Since those tragic days more than a quarter of a century has gone by, and all these peoples—except those of Yugoslavia, who discarded the Soviet overlordship in 1948, but still live under their own brand of communism—remain enslaved under Communist tyranny. All their efforts to free themselves have been of no avail, and any move on their part to rise against Soviet-imposed tyranny has ended in veritable blood-baths, as in Hungary in 1956. The efforts of the free world leaders to bring about some betterment of the lot of these peoples have been fruitless, because Soviet authorities do not admit the validity of any negotiation on this matter. But the government of this Republic is still doing its utmost to secure the freedom of these people on a daily basis. It shows its strong intent on keeping the issue alive by observing annually the Captive Nations Week.

AMERICA'S DETERIORATING DEFENSE POSTURE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the facts concerning America's decline in strategic arms strength and military preparedness is shocking. Many Americans still hold the view that we possess military superiority, that we are able to defend ourselves and our allies from attack and coercion. The facts which are now unfolding, however, show that this superiority has been lost. It has been lost over a period of time because we have been unwilling to make the necessary sacrifices and implement the necessary programs. It has been lost because no one has told the American people the truth about our defense posture. Now, finally, the truth is becoming known.

In an important article in the Spring, 1971 issue of Modern Age, Anthony Harrigan, an expert on military matters, points out that—

Today—less than a decade after the Cuban missile crisis—the United States no longer is the first military power in the world . . . in terms of overall military capability the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States. Where the Soviets are now on a basis of parity with the U.S., they are moving ahead rapidly.

Mr. Harrigan notes that at the present rate of Soviet missile deployment, the U.S.S.R. should have 2,500 ICBM launchers by 1975. He states that—

Unless dramatic action is taken this year, the United States will still have only 1,054 missile launchers four years from now.

In addition, while the Soviets are expanding their missile submarine force at a rapid rate, no U.S. missile-firing submarines have been built in more than 2 years. None are definitely announced for the future.

Despite these facts, and others which Mr. Harrigan sets forth in this article, many in our own Government speak of SALT talk agreements as if we were superior to the Soviet Union, or at least on a parity with them. In his 1968 campaign Richard Nixon declared that:

Within a year the Soviet Union will catch the United States and, if we don't get a change in leadership and policy in Washington, will pass us in deliverable nuclear capacity.

Well, we did get a change and it appears that the Soviet Union has passed us.

Mr. Nixon also stated at that time that:

I do not believe that the United States can afford to accept the concept of parity . . . the Soviet Union's goal in the world . . . is still in an expansionist stage. Our goal in the world is defensive . . . . And at any kind of negotiation when one side wants to expand and the other side to defend, make sure that the side which is in the defensive position has more strength than the other side.

All those who somehow believe that the current SALT negotiations will produce a world situation in which the chances for peace and security will be improved, should consider the startling facts and figures in Mr. Harrigan's article.

I wish to insert this article into the RECORD at this time:

AMERICA'S DETERIORATING DEFENSE POSTURE

(By Anthony Harrigan)

The Armed Forces of the United States have been the shield of the Republic in the strife-torn years since the end of World War II. Nuclear armaments in the U.S. arsenal have deterred the Soviet Union from starting a third world war—a massive strike against the Western nations. The conventional armed forces of the United States have been busily employed in the quarter-century past in fighting limited wars against communist aggression and in checking Soviet and Red Chinese advances in many parts of the world. In the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 America's nuclear superiority and supremacy on the high seas prevented the Soviets from establishing domination over the free world.

Today, however—less than a decade after the Cuban missile crisis—the United States no longer is the first military power in the world. In a few areas such as the design of multiple warhead (MIRV) missiles the U.S. is technologically more advanced than the Soviet Union. But in terms of overall military capability the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States. Where the Soviets are now on a basis of parity with the U.S., they are moving ahead rapidly.

The American people have heard the facts from Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird and from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But the full significance of the erosion of American military strength seems to have escaped the public. In Congress the weight of opinion is on the side of reducing U.S. military expenditures. Those national legislators who press for dramatic action to restore America's strategic superiority are in a minority. The facts they recite fail to impress many key legislators and large and influential segments of public opinion.

Yet facts are facts. The most ominous of these relate to the comparative strength of U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces. In 1965 the Soviet Union's strategic missile force consisted of approximately 220 missile launchers. The missiles were comparable to the first generation of American ICBM's. At that time the U.S. missile force consisted of 880 ICBM's. We not only had the advanced land-based Minuteman missile but we had absolute supremacy in sea-based Polaris missiles.

Today the Soviets possess—in addition to their original 220 ICBM's—more than 800 missiles with the capabilities of the American Minuteman, plus 200 giant SS–9 missiles with a capability far exceeding anything in the U.S. arsenal. In terms of land-based missiles the Soviets have a 20 percent numerical advantage. Their megatonnage lead is on the order of 200 percent.

That is only part of the story; the United States has stabilized its missile force, whereas the Soviets are pushing ahead with construction of new land-based and sea-based missiles. At the present rate of Soviet missile deployment, the USSR should have 2,500 ICBM launchers by 1975. Unless dramatic action is taken this year, the United States will still have only 1,054 missile launchers four years from now. This dangerous imbalance is the result of the doctrine of nuclear "parity" developed by former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and continued under the Nixon administration under the guise of nuclear "sufficiency." Other nations, with no need to resort to euphemisms, will see this nuclear situation in terms of alarming U.S. weakness.

If the nuclear balance situation is gloomy now, it will be even less cheering in the future. Consider the situation with respect to missile-firing submarines. No U.S. missile-firing submarines have been built in more than two years. None are definitely announced for the future. The only significant change in the U.S. missile submarine force is in installation of advanced missiles in submarines conceived in the 1950's. There is talk and study of an ULM (underwater long-range missile) submarine class, but no firm plans for construction.

The Soviets, meanwhile, are expanding their missile submarine force at a rapid rate. Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., USN, Chief of Naval Operations, told the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers last fall that the Soviet strategic naval forces take the form of the modern "Yankee" class nuclear powered ballistic missile submarines similar to our Polaris boats. They currently have 13 of these submarines in operation and another 15 under construction, a clear indication of their desire to back up their land-based missile systems with a powerful strategic naval force.

Gen. John C. Meyer, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force and an expert in missiles, has cited the long-range effects of this submarine construction program, saying that if they continue at their present rate, the Soviets will match the U.S. sea-launched ballistic missile inventory by 1974 or 1975. The Soviets also are testing a new, longer range submarine-launched ballistic missile.

The situation with respect to manned bombers—another factor in strategic deterrence—is equally discouraging. In 1965, the United States had two and one-half times as many bombers as the Soviet Union, consisting of B-52's and B-58's. Today, the American bomber force has been reduced from about 750 to 450. All of the very fast B-58's have been retired from service. The proposed B-1 bomber, designed as a replacement, is receiving only token development funding. It is doubtful whether this weapons system will materialize. The FB-111 fighter-bomber, built on orders of former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara over service objections, has been a disaster. These bombers have been grounded because of severe technical difficulties. They cannot be considered part of the U.S. strategic deterrent. Meanwhile, the Soviets are developing a new variable sweep-wing bomber. Their

older bombers are being used in increasingly bold fashion in penetrating Atlantic and Pacific air defense zones.

Another element in strategic deterrence is aircraft and missile defense. A limited antiballistic missile defense was authorized by the Congress—after the most difficult of struggles, but the Soviets are well along on building a strong ABM defense system. While SALT talks were in progress last year, the Soviets started construction of giant ABM radar units. Dr. M. B. Schneider, writing in *Ordnance*, has reported that "about a half dozen are operational or nearly so." Dr. John S. Foster Jr., director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, has warned that these radars "can in the near future provide the same radar coverage which we will have some eight years from now if all the Safeguard ABM program is completed." Dr. Foster noted that the "vast network of Soviet radars and defense sites, whether antiaircraft or antimissile, has already complicated the problem of arms control of ABM to the point where it may not be practical." It is estimated that the Soviets have more than 1,000 surface to air missile sites. The United States has one-tenth this number of SAM's and no ABM radars operational today. Moreover, U.S. surface to air missiles are Bomarc and Army missiles developed in the 1950's. The Soviets have had wide experience with operational SAM's in both North Vietnam and in the Suez area.

The tactical fighter forces still have an important role in air defense against bombers armed with nuclear weapons. Here again, the United States is at a marked disadvantage. The Soviets have 3,600 jet aircraft. The United States tactical fighter strength is about 1,600 aircraft. Moreover, the Soviets have a qualitative edge. In the last decade, they introduced nine new fighter aircraft. In the same period, the U.S. failed to develop a single new aircraft for the air-to-air combat role. The new military realities are evident in Europe where the Soviet Air Force is now using the new supersonic strike version of the MIG-23 fighter in large numbers. This fighter, labeled "Foxbat" by the NATO command, is faster than comparable aircraft used by American forces. Its reported speed is Mach 3—three times the speed of sound—compared with a speed of Mach. 2.2 for the F–4 fighter.

All of these situations with respect to diminishing inventories of American weapons reflect an alarming decline in research and development—the elimination or cutback of defense programs leading to advanced weapons systems. Existing U.S. armaments date back to programs launched 10, 15, or 'even 20 years ago. In many cases, there is nothing in the mill to replace them. The studies undertaken during the McNamara years proved sterile. New weapons simply were not authorized. For example, the Soviet Union's new blue-water fleet is superbly equipped with surface-to-surface rockets. The United States has yet to develop such a naval missile, though the uniformed professionals have cited the need for years.

The deterioration of America's combat strength is especially apparent in the U.S. Navy. Failure to start a major naval construction program in the 1960's lead to today's sharp curtailment of U.S. naval strength.

During the sixties, the United States depended on warships built to fight the Japanese and the Germans in the 1940's. They were patched and repaired, but replacements were not authorized. These ships have reached the end of their useful lives and are being decommissioned in large numbers. Severe budget cuts in the last two years have forced decommissioning of other ships which still have combat capability. Adm. Zumwalt is on record as noting that "the budget cuts that have been taken in the last two years have been in the field of sea control forces. As a result we have, during the last two years, come down on the order of 35 percent of these forces. We can go no further without great risk."

Robert D. Heinl Jr., a leading authority on naval affairs, has said that the U.S. Navy in 1971 is likely to reach the point at which it was 1936 in numbers of ships in commission.

America's overseas presence in crisis situations is almost exclusively a naval presence. In the most recent Mid-East crisis, the practical symbol of U.S. intervention capability was the augmented carrier task force hurriedly assembled in the Mediterranean. But moves to strengthen the Navy's carrier forces are repeatedly frustrated. Work on another nuclear-powered aircraft carrier has been held up pending results of another study of carrier effectiveness. Such studies have contributed heavily to the current decline of U.S. military strength. They are "holder-uppers" in the language of the Pentagon. Indeed, prior to the last Mid-East crisis, there was widespread talk that the current level of 15 operational carriers could and should be reduced.

Control of the seas depends on a complex of naval weapons systems: carriers, submarines, destroyers, intelligence-gathering ships, mine sweepers, and service ships. The United States has need of new ships in all of these categories. The naval shipbuilding program is grossly inadequate to meet accumulated needs of many years. For example, under the fiscal year 1971 defense appropriations bill, only one new nuclear guided missile frigate was approved, only one fast combat support ship, only two general assault ships, and so forth. Great need exists for an entirely new class of fast, surface-to-surface missile armed, small destroyers. Nothing was done to provide such vessels. No funds were allocated even for research and development of the concept. Yet with the end of the draft in sight, the Navy's manpower situation will become critical in the mid-1970's and small, heavily armed ships will be more important than at any time in recent decades.

Throughout the 1960's, U.S. naval forces went unchallenged, except for a brief torpedo boat incursion in the Tonkin Gulf. In the 1970's, there may be many direct and indirect challenges. The Soviets have powerful naval forces in the Mediterranean. They have used them in daring and dangerous ways, including collision-course tactics with U.S. warships. Soviet naval vessels frequently operate in the Caribbean and apparently will have access to a base in the south Cuban port of Cienfuegos, regardless of rumblings from Washington. With the installation of a Marxist regime in Chile, it seems inevitable that the Soviet Navy shortly will have access to the port of Valparaiso. Thus the Soviets will be in position to menace the Panama Canal from both the Pacific and Atlantic.

To see Soviet naval growth and operations in perspective it is necessary to survey the decade past. In 1960 the Soviets were engaged in major naval construction. High seas operations were rare. The first Soviet exercises in the Norwegian Sea were held in 1961. The next year saw new operations by Soviet maritime aircraft and the Cuban crisis, in which the USSR learned a lesson in the importance of sea power. In 1963 a pattern of biannual naval exercises in the Iceland-Faroes Gap was established. The Soviet Navy introduced missile-carrying warships in 1964 and the Soviet Mediterranean Squadron was established. By 1965 the Soviets were holding numerous large exercises in the North Atlantic. The year 1966 marked the maturing of the Soviet high seas fleet. Adm. V. A. Kasatonov, first Deputy Commander in Chief of the Soviet Navy, said: "The USSR Navy flag can be seen in all parts of the world's oceans." In 1967 the Soviet fleet stepped up all its activities. A Soviet-built Komar rocket boat, operated by Egypt, sunk an Israeli destroyer, impressing on the world the power of new Soviet naval weapons. In 1968 the Soviets deployed their helicopter carriers in the Mediterranean for the first time. The next year saw large-scale relief of the Mediterranean forces by the Soviet Northern Fleet and deployment of a task force to the Caribbean. The fleet was being used to "show the flag" on a worldwide basis. In 1970 the Soviets conducted major naval maneuvers in the Atlantic and Pacific and vastly extended their Indian Ocean operations.

It is against this backdrop of Soviet military and naval activity in many parts of the world that the visible decline of U.S. strength must be viewed. In many areas, such as the Persian Gulf, the U.S. has only token forces. And many of the task units are aging vessels which compare unfavorably with the new, heavily armed Soviet fleet units in the same areas. For example, the Soviets have dispatched rocket-armed destroyers to the Persian Gulf where the commander of the U.S. Middle East Force flies his flag from an antique seaplane tender with no combat capability. The occasional U.S. destroyer in the area usually is an old gun ship built during World War II. In the 1950's American naval forces often could be buttressed by land-based air forces. But the United States has relinquished or been compelled to leave many key air bases throughout the world, such as Wheelus Air Base in Libya. Indeed America's tactical air power is locked out of North and Central Africa and the Middle East.

While the U.S. has retreated from air bases in Libya, Morocco and elsewhere, the Soviets bridging the zone between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean and providing a jumping-off point for Central and Southern Africa and Indian Ocean lands.

U.S. Rep. Michael A. Feighan of Ohio has summed up the character and importance of this Soviet Middle East bastion, noting:

In the Middle East the Soviets have established a vast complex of sophisticated weaponry scattered in a 50-mile belt extending from Alexandria, Egypt, southward 180 miles to the Gulf of Suez. Stationed here are the most advanced surface to air missiles manned by Soviet crews, amphibious equipment and 8-inch artillery.

The Soviet objective in this region seems comparable to the Japanese objective, prior to World War II, in creating secret naval and military bases in the South-Central Pacific mandated islands: a launching site for major operations. The Soviets are aiming at a new short route to the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, the strategic islands and rich lands of Southern Africa and the Pacific beyond. In short, they seek total domination of the virtually unprotected Indian Ocean world.

Today the Soviet Indian Ocean fleet consists of approximately 15 warships including missile-armed ships. At times this force has numbered as many as 30 vessels, however. The Soviet ships call at ports around the rim of this 28 million square mile ocean, showing the flag and impressing weak nations with the growing naval power of the Soviet Union. The Soviets enjoy repair and fueling facilities in India, whose navy has been given four Soviet submarines, and the strategic island of Mauritius has become another frequent and important port of call for the Soviet squadron.

Another aspect of the Indian Ocean situation that should be more widely understood in the United States is the movement of Soviet and East Bloc ships through the area. In 1969 more than 3,900 Soviet flag ships rounded the Cape of Good Hope en route to African, Middle Eastern and Asian ports. Soviet merchant vessels have to be regarded as an arm of the Soviet fleet. Many of these ships have a military potential or carry military goods to client states of the USSR.

While the Soviet Union is engaged in the same kind of naval buildup in the Indian Ocean that it carried out in the Mediterranean, the United States has not made any attempt to provide a counter force—except for an occasional fleet visit by ships from the 7th Fleet in the Pacific. More than a decade ago, Adm. Arleigh Burke, then Chief of Naval Operations, cited the strategic importance of the Indian Ocean. Adm. John McCain, Commander in Chief Pacific, also has stressed the U.S. security interest in the Indian Ocean in many speeches and writings. But the failure to modernize the U.S. Navy has resulted in inaction with respect to that vital global region. The wrong-headed approach of many foreign policy planners on African questions has resulted in the exclusion of land-based U.S. airpower from the area. Action in this area is long overdue. The influential Washington *Evening Star* noted last December "the necessity of our maintaining at least modest naval forces in the Indian Ocean on a permanent basis."

If the U.S. government acknowledges this necessity, it also will have to recognize the central importance of naval and air command and control facilities at the Cape of Good Hope. This is the one point from which all Soviet and East Bloc naval and merchant traffic in the Indian Ocean—entering from the Atlantic—can be kept under surveillance. Indeed the dimension of the growing Soviet naval threat suggests Soviet naval activities throughout the southern hemisphere, particularly in the South Atlantic and the Indian Ocean. Computerized ship and aircraft tracking facilities at the Cape of Good Hope are imperative, therefore. More than that, however, U.S. policy planners need a new awareness of the importance of turning the southern tip of the African continent into a counter-force bastion to the vast fortified base area that the Soviet Union is establishing between the Mediterranean and the Horn of Africa. Unless there is a counterforce region to the south, communist power seems destined to flow down the African continent and across the Indian Ocean. Perhaps the most significant item in the entire Soviet Middle East buildup is the fact that Soviet armed forces now are based on the island of Socotra 600 miles east of Aden. It is an ideal command center for Soviet forces aimed at South-Central Africa, Arabia and the Indian Ocean islands to the south and east. Soviet strategists are well aware of the colossal prizes in that global region, chiefly the enormous mineral wealth and industrial power located in Southern Africa. Indeed the African subcontinent—from the Congo to the Cape—is of vastly greater strategic and economic importance to the Western nations than the countries of Southeast Asia which are deficient in resources and industrial facilities.

The focus of military confrontation by the mid-1970's is likely to be the Indian Ocean world. Thus if U.S. interests are to be protected, it is essential that American defense planning be geared to the specific challenges likely to emerge in the Indian Ocean area.

First of all, the U.S. forces need military hardware for strategic deterrence: land and sea-based missiles, associated missile defense systems, and aircraft. Beyond that, however, the United States needs sea control, air control and ground control forces oriented towards the developing danger areas in the mid and late 1970's. Development of these forces has to be related to alliance systems and to the availability of bases. Given the enormous cost of new weapons and military manpower, not to speak of the difficult economic situation in the United States, it would be impractical today to suggest establishment of major U.S. bases in the Indian Ocean, although the proposed joint U.S.-British "austere naval communications facility" on the Diego Garcia atoll, 1,200 miles south of the Indian subcontinent in the British Indian Ocean territory, is a small step in the right direction. A more economical approach to military needs in this area would be a plan of cooperation with the free world powers in the area. The Malagasy Republic, on the island of Madagascar—250 miles east of the African continent, is well-located to provide a base to cover the western Indian Ocean. Under a special agreement, France has the right to maintain air and naval bases in the country. The French, because of their assistance to South Africa in obtaining armaments, also are welcome at the Simonstown naval base near Cape Town—the key base in Southern Africa. South Africa's new French-built submarines will be based at Simonstown. Durban, South Africa's major port, has facilities for major ship repairs and an excellent airfield for large jets. Use of Malagasy, French and South African air and naval facilities by U.S. forces seems the most economical and efficient way to build up an Indian Ocean counter-base to the Soviets in the decade ahead. The British make regular use of South African naval facilities. Since the closing of Suez in 1967, an average of one hundred Royal Navy warships have called at South African ports each year. If the United States adopted a more realistic policy towards defense of Africa, and reached an understanding for use of available defense facilities in the area—at least in emergency situations, the elements of a strong deterrent force in the Indian Ocean would be put together in effective manner.

Even as we prepare for new military challenges in remote global regions where the U.S. has not been involved in the past, our people must bear in mind the importance of the technological challenge posed by the Soviet Union. It is not enough for a nation to have a strong will to win or a grasp of global strategy; a country determined to remain free must appreciate the extent to which an effective defense depends on investment in research and engineering. There is not any technological plateau to which the United States can climb and rest comfortably thereafter. New advances in nucleonics, radar, surveillance systems, metallurgy—all have a direct bearing on America's national security. Nothing is more mistaken than the notion that the U.S. is safe against attack because it has a large stock of nuclear weapons. The element of surprise is still a key element in warfare—as much as it was at Pearl Harbor in 1941. And the enemies of freedom are constantly seeking technological means of gaining the advantage of surprise—the advantage of a first strike that would eliminate the possibility of a retaliatory strike by American forces. To deny the enemy the advantage of surprise means technological effort and vigilance on the part of the United States and this, in turn, means substantial, continuing investment in defense research and development.

To augment America's defenses in any way is extremely difficult these days. As Adm. Zumwalt has noted, "there is a tremendous disenchantment with the military, and a disinclination on the part of many of our countrymen to be concerned." There is no similar disenchantment on the part of the enemies of the United States. On the contrary, the Soviet Union's traditionally aggressive foreign policy is now wedded to the most aggressive military policy in the country's history. The Soviet leadership has set its sights on the acquisition of supremacy in every military field—on land, sea and air. The Kremlin is busily establishing a global military presence to advance both the Soviet political system and to secure national strategic objectives.

In the main the American people—or a very large segment of our population—do not want to hear about the Soviet Union's military buildup, its drive towards supremacy in all areas, any more than the French people in the late 1930's wanted to hear about Germany's rearmament. The American people seem tired of sustaining the defense effort—even though that effort has given them a generation free of direct enemy assault. The American people are preoccupied with social issues and with domestic expectations of one sort or another. They long to see an even more comfortable and strife-free existence at home. They respond to warnings about Soviet military expansionism with the counterstatement that there is not any real threat or that increasing Soviet military capabilities do not reflect dangerous intentions on the part of the USSR. It is very difficult to deal with such denials of reality or to reach those who persist in arguing that national danger is nonexistent. Thus defense budget levels are not in accord with national requirements. The capability of the U.S. armed forces to deal with threats to the nation is being reduced year by year.

The problem of maintaining a moderately strong defense establishment, let alone augmenting its strength to deal with new Soviet threats, may worsen in the year ahead as the Vietnam war winds down. In the past, the end of conflicts in which the U.S. has been engaged has produced hasty dismantling of essential armed forces. This was the case at the end of World Wars I and II. The U.S. Army may face the brunt of the demands for "economy" in defense spending. Certainly, the shape of the Army will have to change after the Vietnam war engagement is ended. But the Army must not be sacrificed. On the contrary, the Army will need to be re-equipped for missions elsewhere on America's strategic frontiers. For instance, U.S. forces in Europe have been allowed to run down, or have been cannibalized in order to support the effort in Southeast Asia. The deficiencies of the Army in Europe and elsewhere must be remedied.

No one can deny that it will be expensive to refashion the Army, to undertake new commitments in the Indian Ocean and elsewhere, and to provide new offensive and defensive nuclear systems. But since when has freedom been obtained at a cutrate price? The British people maintained their freedom in World War II only at a staggering price in national treasure, not to speak of lives. There is no suggestion that the British are sorry they paid the price. Today the captive peoples of Eastern and Central Europe unquestionably would be willing to pay any price to be free of the Soviet yoke. If the American people, possessing the greatest amount of wealth in the world, are unwilling to make the necessary financial sacrifice for their own safety and national survival, the freedom and security they now enjoy will elude them in the future. The American people are truly fortunate in that they can, with good management, afford *both* guns and butter—missiles and desirable public services.

The principal need today—even before military hardware—is to renew the American people's understanding of the vital importance of strong national security forces. These forces are not unreasonable burdens, as some citizens insist, but an opportunity to preserve freedom. Great peoples are willing—eager, in fact—to bear heavy burdens in order to ensure their freedom. In totalitarian countries ruling elites simply commit the nation. The people have no voice on defense issues. The American people, however, must understand the issues. They must acknowledge the need for a strong national defense and give their consent to expenditures for this purpose. It would be tragic beyond words if the American people, in their period of greatest prosperity and comfort, failed to understand the necessity of defense and refused to approve the essentials. Attempting a shortcut around a strong national defense would lead to the humiliation and destruction of the United States.

BIG BUS BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the July 26 issue of the New York Times carried an editorial concerning the big bus bill, H.R. 4354. The editorial is so eloquently written, that it would be presumptuous for me to comment further on it. I would merely insert it in the RECORD at this point, and call it to the attention of my colleagues, both here in the House, and in the other body:

AN INCH IS A TON

Almost since Congress began the interstate highway system in 1956, the trucking interests have been lobbying for a change in the law to permit wider trucks. A wider truck is also a heavier and therefore more profitable vehicle. But not even a highway built to interstate standards can sustain the wear and tear of heavier trucks pounding over its surface day after day. Inevitably they mean a shorter life for the highway and a bigger highway repair bill for the taxpayer. Thus, the plea for a wider truck limit is not an innocuous request. It is really a disguised raid on the public treasury by the trucking interests.

A wider truck can also mean a shorter life for ordinary motorists. Trucks create a visual hazard because they block a view of the road ahead. Their mass moving past smaller vehicles at high speed also creates a "blast effect" which can disrupt the motorist's control of his own car. These economic and safety arguments explain why limits on the width and weight of trucks and buses are written into Federal highway legislation.

Since the trucking lobby has repeatedly failed to get the law amended, its allies in the House Public Works Committee devised a bill covering only buses. Despite pious protestations on all sides that buses and nothing but buses are in the minds of the bill's sponsors, everyone well knows that the bus bill is only a dry run for a truck bill. The humble and politically popular bus passenger is, so to speak, carrying the legislative freight for the arrogant and unpopular trucker. Once buses have breached the existing limit and established a precedent, it will be much easier to enact a significantly wider limit for trucks.

Even if the bill were not a precedent-maker for something worse, it would be a bad bill on its own merits. Heavy buses also wear out the highways, obstruct the vision of other drivers, and when traveling above the speed limits—as intercity buses habitually do—they create the same dangerous "blast effect."

The bill would permit buses to be 102 inches wide instead of the present limit of 96 inches. The gain for the bus passenger would be trivial. Each of the four seats would be an inch wider and the aisle would be two inches wider. But in terms of the overall weight of the bus, the change would be startling. Representative Schwengel of Iowa pointed out in the House debate the other day that if this bill becomes law, a major bus line plans to increase the length of its buses to 40 feet, their height to 12 feet, and their weight from approximately 29,000 pounds to 42,000. In other words, every inch wider means a bus that is a ton heavier.

The bus-and-truck interests prevailed in the House. But if the Senate has concern for the nation's taxpayers and motorists, this is a bill that deserves to be flagged down and waved to the side of the road.

DETROIT BISHOP COMMENTS ON THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I came across an article in the Detroit News written by the auxiliary bishop-vicar general of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit, Thomas J. Gumbleton.

Bishop Gumbleton discusses the moral question of the Vietnam war. I believe his comments will be of great interest to the Members of the House. Therefore, I insert his statement at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Detroit News, July 9, 1971]

AN URGENT MORAL QUESTION—CAN U.S. JUSTIFY THE VIETNAM WAR?

(By Thomas J. Gumbleton)

The military involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia is more than a hotly debated political issue. "Vietnam" is an urgent moral question demanding an examination by all thinking Americans.

That war is always a moral matter should be clear enough. Political and military policies which provide soldiers and weapons for the purposes of death and destruction require a moral judgment of the individual citizens with whose tax money and, in some cases, very lives those policies are implemented.

A citizen is untrue to his human dignity as an intelligent, compassionate person if he surrenders his conscience to his government in time of war. In their collective pastoral letter of Nov. 15, 1968, the American Catholic bishops expressed the hope that "in the all-important issue of war and peace, all men will follow their conscience."

And prior to this, Pope John XXIII in "Pacem in Terris" had indicated that conscience today might require a new attitude toward war. "Therefore, in an age such as ours which prides itself on its atomic energy, it is contrary to reason to hold that war is now a suitable way to restore rights which have been violated."

We may think of this as a new attitude toward war. In fact, it is a moral position which links up with the earliest Christian tradition in regard to war.

For three centuries Christians generally refused service in military campaigns, rejecting killing as an immoral means to an end. Strong statements of men such as St. Justin, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Cyprian and others show the common Christian attitude in regard to the morality of war.

Obviously, for one who would follow the earliest Christian tradition, supporting the Vietnam war is morally unthinkable. But even if one were to base his conscientious judgment of the Vietnam war on the "just war" doctrine, I believe his conclusion could only be that continuing American military involvement in Southeast Asia is gravely immoral.

This doctrine is based on the obvious enough premise that war is an unspeakable physical evil. Like other physical evils, it sometimes cannot be avoided.

In certain circumstances a doctor—and the patient also—would accept the need to amputate an arm or leg. Similarly, the evil of war is "justified" in certain circumstances. Otherwise it is immoral.

One condition is that war must be waged by a legitimate public authority for the common good.

Is it really serving the common good to fight an undeclared war thousands of miles away against an enemy that poses no threat to the United States? And does congressional approval of funds to equip American forces sent to Vietnam under questionable circumstances (Gulf of Tonkin resolution) constitute a legitimate declaration of war?

A second condition is that a just cause is required. One will demand clear and cogent reasons before he will accept the amputation of his arm. To "justify" war requires no less.

Here the obvious question is: what is the cause for which American forces are fighting in Southeast Asia? Millions of Americans can be excused for having no clear answer to that question. We have been given so many different reasons, even to the point where we are told it is simply to uphold American prestige rather than accept the humiliation of defeat.

We may be excused for not knowing the reason for the war. We cannot be morally excused for participating without sure knowledge that the reason is sufficient.

A final consideration is that to be "just" the war must be fought within the limits of what is called the "principle of proportionality."

In 1968 the American bishops asked: "Have we already reached, or passed, the point where the principle of proportionality becomes decisive? How much more of our resources in men and money should we commit to this struggle? Has the conflict in Vietnam provoked inhuman dimensions of suffering?"

Without even considering the death and destruction in Laos and Cambodia, can we find any "justifying proportionality" in what we are doing in this war?

Whether we judge this war in the light of the earliest Christian tradition on war or according to the "just war" doctrine, I can reach only one conclusion: our participation in it is gravely immoral.

When Jesus faced His captors He told Peter to put away his sword. It seems to me He is saying the same thing to the people of the United States in 1971.

PROFILE: IBT'S FRANK E. FITZSIMMONS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters met in Miami Beach earlier this month and elected one of the world labor movement's foremost leaders as its president.

Frank E. Fitzsimmons heads the largest union in the world—more than 2,100,000 active members who represent almost 11 percent of organized labor and better than 2½ percent of every person now earning a paycheck in the United States.

The IBT has doubled in size since 1957, expanding at the rate of about 100,000 new members each year.

These men and women know that collective bargaining and their participation in a union have earned for them wages and benefits that have drastically improved their standard of living. The men who lead the labor movement—men like Frank Fitzsimmons—are aware of the faith of millions of people who de-

pend on them to help them achieve a life of dignity and honest work.

Frank Fitzsimmons has earned the respect of management and labor the world over. He is a quiet, loyal, humble man who prefers to win arguments at the bargaining table and not on the front pages of the Nation's newspapers. He is heart and soul for every man and woman in the Teamsters Union and will be an outstanding leader of this diverse and ever-expanding union.

Following is an article which appeared in a recent issue of "American Labor" concerning Mr. Fitzsimmons. I insert it in the RECORD today with the hope that my colleagues will find it as compelling a statement of the real integrity of this man as I have found. Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the American Labor, October, 1970]

PROFILE: IBT'S FRANK E. FITZSIMMONS

When one begins an analysis of the extraordinary complex the full name of which is the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffers, Warehousemen and Helpers of America—known generally as the IBT or simply as "The Teamsters" the problem is not where to begin but where to end. It's just that all-encompassing.

Its over-the-road driver-members, who carry every conceivable product in the economy from (a)lmonds to (z)inc and all the merchandise in the alphabet in between, comprise only about a third of the IBT's membership. And that's only the beginning.

A reading of its roster of locals points up a spectrum of workers job titles that cuts across practically every other facet of employment as well; an incredible fusion of seemingly unrelated manpower welded somehow into a homogenous whole.

Broadcast employees are covered by Local #1 out of Philadelphia; Brewery, Syrup, Yeast & Grain Workers make up Local #4 out of Newark, New Jersey; Scholastic Technical Services Employees come under the jurisdiction of Local #8 in Pennsylvania; in San Francisco, Local #9 bargains for the International Telegraph Employees; in Puerto Rico, the union represents hotel workers, the telephone company and perhaps two dozen other categories of labor. In Massachusetts, IBT has the United Paper and Allied Workers; in Rhode Island, it represents the Allied Production and Precision Workers; in Trenton, New Jersey, and Seattle, Washington, its membership includes automobile salesmen, garage and parts employees.

A partial listing of still other segments of the labor force within its sphere of influence includes such divergent occupations as: marine officers, citrus, cannery and food processors, industrial and allied employees, public service employees, wholesale and retail aluminum and building specialties workers, dairy plant and clerical employees, workers in frozen foods, in ice, storage, scrap metal and grain warehousing . . .

It represents Western Union International Telegraph Employees; employees of toll roads, bridges and tunnels in the state of Massachusetts; mail order retail department stores and warehouse employees; amusement park workers; commission, bakery, milk and ice cream salesmen; state, county and municipal workers (in Michigan); a paper tube converters union; phosphate workers, freight checkers, traffic clerks, chauffeurs, taxicab and bus drivers; firemen, oilers and maintenance men; vending machine service employees; inside winery and soft drink workers; dental, optical and instrument technicians; manufacturing and processing employees; grocery and candy workers; gas station attendants, construction, building material, coal, and laundry dry cleaning workers, embalmers, funeral directors, plastic and textile printing workers, steel, metals, alloys and hardware fabricators, drug, chemical, cosmetic and affiliated industries warehouse employees . . . and much more.

WORLD'S LARGEST UNION

Under the jurisdiction of its 870 odd locals is an aggregate membership that presently totals some 2,100,000 persons, representing almost 11 percent of organized labor and better than 2.5 percent of every individual (union and nonunion) now drawing a paycheck in America. Its collective bargaining efforts involve more people than are employed by AT&T, General Electric, General Motors, Ford, R.C.A. and the next top dozen blue chip companies combined. It is by far the largest individual labor organization in the nation and overwhelmingly the largest single union in the world.

Since its expulsion from the AFL–CIO in 1957 the growth of the IBT has been nothing short of phenomenal. It has almost doubled in size, and, over the past half decade alone, its rate of expansion has averaged in the neighborhood of 100,000 new members every year. It leads in all representation elections at the NLRB. (See box on page 27.) And if one more statistic is needed to set the picture in its most dramatic perspective: of the total organized workforce in the country, whose activities have proliferated some 2,400 unions both in the Federation and out of it (approximately that many reported last year under the Labor-Management Reporting Act) *better than one out of every ten persons covered by union contracts in the United States belongs to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.*

At a time when membership has been growing slowly in a number of Internationals as a result of technology and automation, the IBT has *enlarged its roster* by better than 900,000 people.

ON FITZSIMMONS HIMSELF

The man who currently heads this massive complex—General Vice President Frank E. Fitzsimmons—is a quiet spoken veteran of the labor scene who assumed direction of the International in March, 1967, a time when the challenges of the office seemed almost insurmountable. How well he has handled these challenges is as good a picture of both the character and strength of that individual as can be found.

Frank Fitzsimmons is a study in contrasts. In an industry where every move generates headlines because of its potential effect on the economy, he, himself, actually shies away from publicity. Where one might expect an extrovert, one sees instead, the complete opposite—a reserved and seasoned administrator whose objectives are far more wrapped up in the progress of his union than in personal glory. Low key in his responses, he seems as much the analyst as the planner, the thinker as the doer—a combination of generally antipodal attitudes generated, perhaps, by the very tenuous position he was chosen to occupy.

But there is a kind of quiet humor in his make-up that punctures an overlay of reserve and though he never loses the latter, the former seasons much of his conversation and gives it a character all its own.

Because of this quiet manner and the quality of reserve in his conversation, Fitzsimmons might easily be underestimated by some at first. That would be a massive mistake. The General Vice-President of the IBT is as able a labor leader and as practical and farsighted a negotiator as any in the business. The record, itself, is ample testimony to that. The union he heads is stronger now than when he first took over the "temporary" reins, has solidified itself on a number of fronts, expanded its activities in others and looks for "another million" members by the end of the decade.

If one judges by the track record to date, the figure seems conservative enough and certainly lends credibility to Fitzsimmons' confidence.

ON THE EXPULSION

Though the IBT has grown more rapidly than any other union since it became an independent, Fitzsimmons feels that the challenges which face all labor cannot be resolved by fractionalism, but by the concerted efforts of all unions (in and out of the Federation) working in harmony towards common goals.

"We must spend more time fighting what has to be fought," he said, "rather than waste our energies fighting among ourselves. We have cordial relations with almost every union in the AFL–CIO and we hope to keep them that way."

On the prospects of reaffiliation with the AFL–CIO, Fitzsimmons was equally succinct: "My firm belief is that the house of labors should be united," he said.

On "how" and "when" and "under what conditions" reaffiliation might be considered, Fitzsimmons became a bit more expansive.

"We were expelled from the AFL–CIO for reasons they thought were valid and it is only natural that I should oppose that kind of thinking," he began. "Before that drastic step was ever taken my feeling was—and still is—that the executives of our international union should have been given an opportunity to tell their side of the story, to analyze whatever complaints, and if some things were wrong—to be given a reasonable amount of time to correct them. But that wasn't the case. They saw fit to expel."

Asked what the next step might be, Fitzsimmons made his own position clear: "Speaking for myself, I have never been contacted, nor has any suggestion ever been made to me by the Executive Council of the AFL–CIO relative to reaffiliation. As for our union—I think our record speaks for itself. We have been cooperative with AFL–CIO unions, based on practical situations all through the years.

"We did not ask to leave," he continued, "nor have we been asked to come back. And *certainly*—we are not standing at the door with our hat in our hand. If we ever do reaffiliate, it will be after an honest, factual determination that will protect—in every aspect—the rights of our membership."

Expressing the opinion of the largest union in the nation, Fitzsimmons certainly speaks from strength—a strength he has helped in many ways (over his 33-year tenure as a member) to build.

In retrospect, its expulsion from the AFL–CIO is seen by some observers as more of a boon than a bother to the IBT. Once outside of the Federation, it is true the IBT was freed from certain previously held obligations—such as the "no raid" provision in Article 20. However, the IBT continued to cooperate at the local level and, in fact—to this day—has mutual and "no-raid" pacts with several AFL–CIO International Unions.

THE OVER-THE-ROAD CONTRACT

The most recent piece of this "history" revolves around the contract negotiated with the Trucking Industry for the Teamsters' 450,000 over-the-road drivers—a settlement that involved (among other benefits) a wage increase of $1.85 an hour—the largest such IBT settlement ever achieved.

Interestingly enough, when the smoke had cleared, it proved to be not only a great dollar victory for the drivers but perhaps an even greater personal victory for the man who had chairmanned the negotiations from their inception—Fitzsimmons, himself.

In a sense (such are the curious and ironic twists of circumstance) the final settlement figure *was—and yet was not*—all of his doing. Some of the credit (if one can call it that) for the additional cash in the final

stipulation, must go to the circumstance through which local 705 and 710 (for certain workers) do not participate in national bargaining contracts.

Recapping the highlights briefly: In his early talks with the Truckers, Fitzsimmons, deeply enmeshed in the economics of the situation, sensed the enormous need of keeping the wheels of industry turning if at all possible. A national strike—as he saw it—would paralyze the total economy which was having troubles enough of its own; unemployment, already at 5 percent, would skyrocket; billions of dollars would be involved, perishable cargo would rot, and the cry of "recklessness" would be hurled at the Teamsters from "critics" of every form in all media in the nation.

Facing this, Fitzsimmons chose for responsibility—both to the industry as well as to his membership. The 39-month package the Teamsters had settled for originally (at $1.10 an hour) was one he felt was the maximum the Truckers could absorb without asking for rate increases and one—that for his own industry—would not be labeled as "another round of inflation."

But that same sense of overall responsibility was apparently not felt by the Chicago membership, which did not see it his way at all, and demanded $1.65 for its own members—an action which brought a large part of the mid-western trucking industry to a standstill.

On the face of it, it looked as if Fitzsimmons might have settled for too little. Certainly, there were some who accused him of it. Though he had stated openly at the time that from IBT's research, and from the Executive Board's good judgment there was "no more in the wood" and that a larger demand would *have* to result in an increase in trucking rates that would only add further fire to inflation, some of his own union members didn't buy that concept either, and wildcat strikes—which the International immediately denounced as such—sprang up in several areas supplementing the major one in Chicago.

Criticized by these striking locals, the IBT leader waited patiently for the end of ACT II. When the Chicago Truckers settled for $1.65, he played his trump card.

THE AFTERMATH

What was not generally known to the public at the time was that, in its initial bargaining, the Teamsters had negotiated an "escape clause" codicil which stated—in essence—that if the Chicago unit (for which, naturally, the IBT did not negotiate) received a higher settlement, the door would then be reopened automatically for a second round of talks.

It was a protective measure that—as a practical negotiator—Fitzsimmons knew he had to have. When that second round of bargaining came down to signatures, the Teamsters gained 75¢ an hour more over the 39-month contract than they had settled for originally and 20¢ more than the Chicago settlement which had caused the work stoppage in the first place.

Commenting on the situation, Fitzsimmons stated the premise which had guided his original thinking:

"Our business is different and it has to be looked at in that light," he said. "Perhaps some of our younger members don't quite understand the structure or maybe some of them find it difficult to accept. But it exists and we have to live with it.

"You take a manufacturer of hats," he continued. "He has a level of costs. When a union negotiates a wage increase that goes much above that level, the manufacturer has the option to change his pricing structure. He doesn't have to account to anyone no matter *what* he chooses to charge for his merchandise. The only thing that guides him is the law of supply and demand.

"But it's another ball game in the trucking industry," he explained. "A trucker just can't *automatically* raise his rates because of any increase in labor or equipment costs—no matter how great. There's a governing body involved. Before a trucker can make any change at all, he first has to file for a tariff increase with the Interstate Commerce Commission, show the necessity and then—wait. And he has no security that he's going to get everything he wants or thinks he needs—or even anything at all!

"A union with a sense of responsibility to the public, has to take all that into consideration. And if you keep that in mind, it brings a different set of conditions to the bargaining table. We have to predicate our demands on a formula that can still keep the trucker competitive with other types of transportation—that can keep them rolling on the roads—or all we'd be doing would be putting our own men out of jobs. It does no one any good to have the best contract in the world if there are no jobs."

Reports to the ICC, as Fitzsimmons explained it, are generally provided by the truckers in June and cover the previous 12 months of business.

"Our last contract ended in March," said Fitzsimmons, "and in the new one—to help them in their fiscal-year bookkeeping, the truckers asked us if we would extend our present three-year contract from March of 1973 to June. Our Executive Board agreed—which is how we wound up with a 39-month agreement. Management's price for the 39-month agreement was an added 20 cents per hour.

ON 1973

The move, in a sense, is a fortuitous one for both. The Chicago Independent has only a 36-month contract and will probably have completed its negotiations before the IBT must finalize its own position—thus placing it in a much better bargaining spot than before.

As far as the American Trucking Association was concerned, a spokesman for that organization stated: "We thought Fitzsimmons handled himself very well. His concept was reasonable and responsible. If it wasn't for Lou Peick's problem in Chicago, we might have had a lot less trouble than we did."

The statement needs explanation. Louis Peick, Secretary-Treasurer of IBT's Local 705, who allegedly had some working "arrangement" with Ed Fenner, president of the Chicago Independent, refused to accept the IBT's original settlement and went out on strike with the Independent for the wage increase package of $1.65: Peick, apparently, had little choice. His men never would have held still for any agreement which might be lower than the Independent's. So he was damned if he did and damned if he didn't.

As to how this new contract would affect rate increases, the ATA stated (at ALM's press time) that the economic impact of the new wage structure had been costed out by the truckers, that they had petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that they were looking for an 8 to 12 percent increase "depending on geographic areas."

Questioned on whether it was not the usual custom to ask for more and settle for less, the spokesman laughed and said that "traditionally" the ICC cuts down the trucker's request by about 25 percent, but that this time "in the face of the extraordinary raise" there was "very little fat" in the costing and that the "economic necessity" of the situation might change the percentage figure.

SOME EARLY HISTORY

Like many other labor leaders in his age bracket (he was born April 7, 1908) Frank E. Fitzsimmons got more of his education out of school than in it. A native of Jeannette, Pennsylvania, the fourth child of five children given to Ida May Stahley Fitzsimmons and Frank Fitzsimmons, Frank Jr. was forced to leave high school at 17 to help support the family after his father had suffered a stroke.

The family had moved to Detroit by then and young Frank found his first job (as a time clerk) at Ternstedt Manufacturing Company, a firm that made automotive hardware. Salary—25 cents an hour. His first experience in the industry that was to become his life's occupation began about eight months later when he became a bus driver for the Detroit Motor Bus Co. handling the old double-deck buses so popular a generation ago. He was about 18 at the time, "but I told them I was 21," said Fitzsimmons, "I guess they must have needed drivers because they were perfectly willing to believe it."

He worked for the motor bus company "until I almost did reach 21," Fitzsimmons recalled with a smile, "at which time the city of Detroit took over the company and I was out of a job."

Picking up stakes, "Fitz" moved to New York and went to work for the Brooklyn-Manhattan Transit Company "as an instructor and driver"—at which spot he remained for almost a year. But family ties uprooted him once more and he returned to Detroit—this time to work with the National Transit Corporation. "You never really knew what you were going to do," he said. "Some days you'd work on the docks, others, as a city driver and on still others you'd be driving over the road at night. They had the old shape-up system then," he continued. "I used to get there at 3 o'clock in the morning—rain or shine—with about 20 to 50 other men and wait for the dispatcher to assign the jobs. Then we'd work the length of the particular job and sign out. You might have to put in as many as 14 hours to make $2.00 a day."

JOINS TEAMSTERS

Somewhere in that period (shortly before the Wagner Act became law) Fitzsimmons joined the Teamsters. "But you had to keep the union button on the inside of your coat back then," he said. "Detroit—in my opinion—was the greatest anti-union city in the country at the time."

After a couple of years at National Transit Fitzsimmons switched to the 3C Highway Co., driving on the road between Detroit, Dayton and Cincinnati. "We got $7.00 for the round trip which took 2 days—and you had to pay for your own room. You couldn't sleep in the truck. If we went to Cincinnati—we got $11.00."

To indicate the change that has taken place since that time: "When I worked for 3C, the drive from Detroit to Toledo (60 miles each way) paid $2.00," said Fitzsimmons. "Today—for that same run, the driver gets $35.25."

The trucks move along a lot faster today, he acknowledged, and the roads are much better. "But in '35—120 miles was a long trip."

In 1937, which he was 29, Fitzsimmons' abilities came to the attention of Jimmy Hoffa who, that year—at only 24—had been elected president of Detroit's famed Local 299. It was the beginning of a friendship that has lasted better than three decades.

It was Hoffa who selected him as business agent for that local which had 200 members at the time and which now numbers in excess of 19,000. It ultimately led to his election as vice president of 299 in 1940, to his appointment as Secretary-Treasurer of the Michigan Conference in 1943, to the vice presidency of Joint Council 43 in 1960, to his election as an International Vice President in 1961 and to his election as General Vice President in 1966. In 1967—in Hoffa's absence—he was appointed Acting President.

SINCE 1967

In broad figures, the International is composed of some 100,000 over-the-road drivers, about 350,000 people in local cartage, about 50,000 in car hauling, which includes yard people, mechanics, etc. and the rest are in the multiplicity of divergent industries listed before.

Speaking of Hoffa, "I've known him since the very early days in Detroit," said Fitzsimmons. "I have worked with him and been his friend for over 33 years. He's one-of-a-kind. Sure, he made enemies but he's made a million more friends who'd give their right arm for him.

"Outside of the union, his whole life was his family. As for his wife 'Jo' (Josephine Hoffa) her whole life is wrapped up in his."

Any simultaneous comparison of the two men would be unfair to either; they're two completely different personalities—which is perhaps why they got along so well together. Hoffa is the aggressive dynamo; Fitzsimmons is the cool and extremely able man behind the scenes. He took over his present office when the 1967 talks with the National Truckers were already well underway. Coming, thus, into the middle of things—and with Hoffa's own history of remarkable achievements to face, his was a peculiarly uncomfortable position at the time. No matter which way the final settlement came out, as he put it, "If it was good people would say Hoffa would have done better. If it was poor—It never would have happened if Jimmy were there."

As things turned out, Fitzsimmons proved his mettle under fire with a contract that was hailed as the best ever attained to that date. Since that time, he's been very much on his own and the judgments of his initiatives are less and less circumscribed by comparison.

ALLIANCE FOR LABOR ACTION

One of these initiatives was the partnership he formed with Walter Reuther now known as the Alliance for Labor Action. It was, in a sense, Fitzsimmons' official notice that he intended to steer the future fortunes of the Teamsters as he—in his own conscience—believed would be in their best interests.

At an Eastern Conference meeting held in Montreal in August of 1968, he explained his reasoning this way:

"The Alliance is, I think, the acceptance of our responsibility as leaders among men . . . let me assure you that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters has not bargained away any of its independence or autonomy. Nor have we in any way established a competing federation with the AFL–CIO. . . . What we did was take a new look at the total community, assessing its present problems and needs and formed an alliance to put the Teamsters in the mainstream of life as it exists today and offer our resources and talent towards the solutions of these problems."

The AFL–CIO, through its Executive Council did not see it quite that way. They visualized the new organization more as a threat to their own federation and when one of their internationals, the Chemical Workers Union, decided to move in with the ALA, they expelled it. The move may have been a statement of principles, but some observers—some even on the floor of the AFL–CIO Convention held a year ago—questioned its practicability.

The ALA has moved ahead with a number of organizing campaigns—particularly in the South—in keeping with its pledge of "a massive program in social and community action" aimed at improving incomes, race relations, education, urban housing and many of the other ills that plague 20th century civilization.

Asked about its progress to date, "ALA was born of necessity," the Acting President of the Teamsters replied, "And by its own degree of success is, I believe, head and shoulders above any labor organization in the country."

RE REUTHER

On Reuther—Fitzsimmons' comment—wrapped up in some 30 years of association was sensitive and warm.

It stimulated this writer to recall some of the remarks of the late UAW leader, delivered at the ALA Founding Convention, held in Washington, D.C., in late May of 1969.

Said Reuther, speaking of his early days: "When I left Wheeling, West Virginia back in 1927 at the age of 19, I made my way back to Detroit. Back in 1927 I had a great deal more energy than I have today, and so I joined the "Y" there in Detroit so I could get access to the swimming pool and the gymnasium so that I could give my excess energy an outlet.

"Back in those days when you joined the "Y" in Detroit, you were obliged to fill out a long questionnaire. It asked many questions: your formal education, your church affiliation, and questions of that nature which I answered quite readily. But the final question was a very difficult one for me at the age of 19. The question was, 'What do you want to do with your life?' And so I pondered that question, and I put down two answers. I said, 'I want to be a labor leader or a chicken farmer,' and I have been told by leaders in the American Labor Movement and in industry that I would have made a damn good chicken farmer."

"And he made a damn good labor leader, too," said Fitzsimmons. One of the greatest this country ever had. His tragic death was a great shock to me personally. We won't see his equal in a long, long time."

ON POLITICAL ACTION

On many of the critical problems of the day which have to be solved if society, as one knows it in America today, is to survive, Fitzsimmons believes the ballot box must be the ultimate answer.

"Labor organizations," he feels, "are not only essential to the maintenance of freedom but must work actively to preserve that freedom." And he urges that workers can best protect the institutions they cherish by actively participating in the political arena to guarantee that they are truly represented and that their needs and aspirations are placed in the hands of the legislators who understand them best.

"The time has come," he said, "when labor must dedicate itself to the political fight with the same vigor that we have given to battles on the picketline."

Lacking that, he saw a dismal future for the right of the work force "to join together in collective bargaining."

The Alliance for Labor Action, he felt, was one of the vehicles that would help achieve the workers' goals. "We've been working in this area independently for a long time," Fitzsimmons said. "The ALA is a kind of formalization of our basic commitment to the total welfare of the community. And we hope it will become a constructive vehicle for political action that will help every worker in the nation."

Taking issue with a number of the laws on the books that govern the management of labor organizations, Fitzsimmons pointed out what he believed to be some of the wasteful side effects they engendered. "Unions can't run themselves, today." he stressed. "The government runs the unions through its restrictions and reporting provisions."

Arguing their cases "with those who seek to destroy the unions," as Fitzsimmons put it, and providing the mountains of attendant paper work, eats up time that could be much more gainfully employed in developing programs for the membership and for the community at large. A strong supporter of labor's community involvement, he believes commitment by union members "serves to bring the quality of the community up to the level it should have", not only for workers' families but also for those who may be less fortunate.

In its long history as a labor organization, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters has had only four presidents to date. As time ticks on, there are those who believe that Frank E. Fitzsimmons seems the likeliest candidate to become the fifth.

MEMORABILIA

Memorabilia is man's contact with yesterday—his tactile association with the past. It is out of such material that history is molded and the lost years are colored with the fresh excitement of rediscovery. In the office now occupied by the Teamsters' General Vice President Frank E. Fitzsimmons, memorabilia is everywhere; memorabilia of its former resident, James R. Hoffa. On the paneled wall behind the leather chair in which Fitzsimmons now sits are a pair of 10'' by 12'' pictures of Hoffa's grandchildren. On the desk, itself, stands a wooden plaque placed there by Hoffa, bearing the inscription: "Illegitemi non carborundum" ("Don't let the bastards wear you down")—an ironic thought now in the light of his present travail and one that must be constant in the mind of the charismatic Teamster president these days. On the wall to the left hangs a sizable oil painting of J.R.H. Framed quotations from Abraham Lincoln and others—all, the property of the volatile little giant who dominated his union—hang there, too, exactly as they hung before. Fitzsimmons has disturbed nothing since he moved out of his own office in Detroit to the one in Washington. The only thing he has added is a large framed photograph of Hoffa (placed now between the grandchildren) which he brought with him when he came. A warm touch, indicative of his affection for the man he has known for over 33 years.

The explanation for the lack of change is simple enough but the telling of it holds a tragedy all its own. When Fitzsimmons was appointed General Vice President following the Hoffa trial and conviction, the original thought was that this would be an "interim" assignment pending the president's return. So—since it was still the president's office, nothing was altered. Most of the executive board as well as the membership believed, at the time, that Hoffa would return long before the next election which was to be held in 1971 and that when he did, his re-election was assured. With the passage of time, however; with the persistent negative attitude of the courts to hold for any of Hoffa's appeals; with the curious refusal of the Pardon Board to release him under the same rules that it applies for any other prisoner and with the Chicago charges still hanging over his head, the likelihood of that return becomes increasingly conjectural. Whether the man was railroaded or not has been argued in print too often to bear recapping. What must be faced now is that—though the punishment does not seem to fit the crime—time seems to be running out and the pragmatic issue of choosing a successor begins to confront the membership. Hoffa—like Napoleon at Elba—is waiting out his destiny and nobody really knows what that will be. With less than a year to go the odds grow larger every day. Unions, nevertheless—like life itself—must go on. Fitzsimmons' own review of the situation is compassionate and clear. "As far as Hoffa is concerned," he said, "he's a political prisoner. For a man to remain behind bars without any cause and for such a length of time without a pardon is horrendous and inhuman. As far as my own position is concerned, since 1967, I have represented this union—independently—to the best of my abilities and in its best interests as my conscience has dictated. I have had no contact with Hoffa. They won't even allow me to write to him."

He said that he hears from Mrs. Hoffa and Hoffa's son and that he sincerely hopes the court will reconsider its position before the next convention. "There's never been a union leader in United States' history who has achieved for his members as much as Hoffa has," he said. "If he is discharged and available to run at the next convention, he will have my unqualified and absolute support." And if he is not?

"If he is not," Fitzsimmons replied quietly, "I am a candidate for the office of General President."

THE TEAMSTER LABOR INSTITUTE

Under the aegis of General Vice President Frank Fitzsimmons, the Teamster Labor Institute was opened last year. Because of the scope and the very "personalizing" of the project, several aspects of it are worthy of note.

"The guts of a local union program," as the Teamster booklet states, "has been organizing the unorganized and negotiating contracts." These objectives are still top priorities but the changing characteristics of the workforce and the increasingly sophisticated operations evolving in the overall collective bargaining process, makes refresher courses mandatory. A review of procedures and techniques is a "must" for every union official engaged in this sphere of activity.

Differing from the formal industrial and management relations courses offered by universities, the TLI concentrated study programs take a little different tack. Working with professionals (organizers and union officials) they concentrate not so much on theory as on the practical application of that theory to specific Teamster problems. In addition, they concentrate on how the solutions can be turned to the expansion of Teamster influence as it may relate to the total good of the community.

Located in Miami, Florida, the building that was chosen has been completely renovated and redesigned to meet classroom and administrative needs. A staff of top professional educators has been hired, with William Goode serving as Educational Director and Kenneth A. Silvers as liaison agent between the General Executive Board and TLI. Subject matter is designed to better equip local-union leaders and full-time Teamster representatives for the variety of problems that face them today: (1) the problems of the newer entrants in the labor force as they relate to the generation gap, (2) problems relating to wages, hours and working conditions and (3) community relations objectives designed to provide better communities in which to live and enjoy the fruits of their labors.

The TLI teaching approach is three-pronged and cataloged under three broad headings: (1) local skills, (2) administrative skills and (3) community skills.

The first division encompasses public speaking and parliamentary procedures, the development of skills which make for better communication with the membership. Under the second broad category, instruction involves such areas as "psychology of union membership," pinpointed principally to the development of a deeper grasp of the generation gap, and the factors that may enlarge or diminish it; also, such subjects as the changing nature of the work force, minority group aspirations and how to help achieve them; female workers and equal pay, etc.

Labor law, too, is an essential subject here as well as an overall analysis of the psychology of work. The third catagory (community skills) covers political action and public relations programs as they relate to the Teamsters on a community-by-community basis.

The curriculum also permits the student to become more conversant with the economics of collective bargaining, the methods of analysis of a company's financial standing and the refinement of skills in this overall area.

The Institute is fully aware that a two-week "cram" course such as it offers—no matter how intensive the study nor how dedicated the student—can only serve as a beginning. Repeat attendance is seen as the answer to greater union sophistication and once all Teamster representatives have attended, the plan is to upgrade and revise the courses to the experience of the first year of operation and offer a new curriculum on some sort of annual or bi-annual basis.

The entire cost of the Institute (maintenance, administration, etc.) is underwritten by the International which also provides each student with a rent-free room and the money for breakfast and luncheon as well. The individual locals need provide only the round-trip transportation for its people and the cost of the evening meal. In the assembling of its classes, the Institute tries "as nearly as possible" to recruit 25 students from each area conference to each class.

"It started out as an idea stemming from a steward's seminar we ran in Detroit in 1968," said Fitzsimmons. "That one worked so well that the International decided to take it on as a major project. The school was opened formally in 1969 and to date we've put through over 700 people."

HAULING OUT SOME TRUCKING FIGURES

Better than 17 million trucks, ranging from the farmer's pick-up to the big twin-trailer units, rolled on the highways of America last year. The aggregate distance traveled totaled a staggering 205 billion miles. And that figure is for the over-the-road traffic alone. There is no universe for in-city traffic because merchandise may be moved five or six times after it hits a central warehouse before it reaches its final destination and no one has been able to compute it to date.

The industry consumes 22.3 billion gallons of fuel and 1.5 billion quarts of oil a year making it by far the largest purchaser in America. It employs over 8 million people—second only to agriculture. It eats up 1,050,000 tons of rubber annually—enough to outfit all the armed forces in boots and shoes for the next 935 years. It buys enough copper annually to mint 9 billion pennies. It wears out 21 million tires, 15 million tubes, buys 55 million pounds of aluminum and 34 million square feet of glass, and enough paint to cover over a million homes.

In dollars—the latest annual expenditures were $68.8 billion. Of this, $55 billion went for labor, $5.3 billion for fuel and oil and some $8.5 billion for trucks, trailers and accessories.

Ninety-four percent of all the gravel in the United States is moved by truck; 69 percent of all the crushed stone; 60 percent of the hard coal; 42 percent of all refined petroleum and gas. Trucks move 94 percent of all the beef in the nation, 99 percent of the hogs, 95 percent of the sheep and lambs. Last year, the incredible total city-to-city haulage figure alone was 400 billion ton miles. If to this, one adds a like amount for in-city trucking (which is conservative) and tops it with the tonnage carried by buses, taxis, funeral cars, etc., under the aegis of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the aggregate might reach the astronomical total of a trillion ton miles a year.

NLRB ELECTION RESULTS

	1967	1968	1969
ALL UNIONS 1967-69			
Total elections held	7,758	7,714	7,805
Total elections won	4,616	4,355	4,339
Percent elections won to those held	59.5	56.2	55.6
Total employees eligible to vote	616,450	574,525	552,710
Total employees eligible in units won	355,488	297,399	257,333
*Average size of units won, all unions	77	68	59
IBT 1967-69			
Total elections held	2,359	2,338	2,344
Total elections won	1,342	1,252	1,202
Percent elections won to those held	56.9	53.6	51.3
Total employees eligible to vote	95,012	96,250	104,405
Total employees eligible in units won	42,740	42,868	42,983
*Average size of units won, IBT	32	34	36
Percent IBT elections held to total held	30.4	30.3	30.0
Percent IBT elections won to total won	29.1	28.7	27.7
Percent eligible employees in IBT elections won to eligible employees in all unions	12.0	14.4	16.7

* The organizing philosophy of the IBT is nowhere more graphically expressed than in the comparison of the 2 figures pointed up by asterisks.

"Size of unit" means the number of members involved in the union—and in this lies the philosophy. Whereas most unions tend to shy away from organizing tiny units because it is uneconomic, "We work on the principle," said an IBT spokesman, "that if people want to be organized, we will help them achieve those aims. It's expensive, but we feel that every worker deserves that right.

"Our contract runs 32 pages and it's a costly document," he continued, "Yet I don't know how many thousand times we have bargained for, negotiated and signed contracts when the total manpower involved was a single driver working out of a furniture store."

MR. LOGAN LOVES US

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the outstanding educators in Michigan announced his retirement. At a time when many of us are searching for ways in which we can develop a more effective educational system in the United States, we do frequently forget that the most significant variable in providing for effective leaders is the component of the teacher himself. This was brought home personally once again when one of the outstanding educators in Michigan announced his retirement.

To me Harold Logan was the epitomy of the "good man, teaching well". I personally knew Mr. Logan, not only in our professional relationship, but also as a principal for my daughter.

I take the liberty of calling attention to Harold Logan's contribution through reprinting an article that was recently published in the Ann Arbor News:

MR. LOGAN LOVES US

(By Dave Friedo)

"By my example and my teaching I could help my students to become good American citizens, to find their plan in life and to be happy," said retiring Pioneer High teacher Harold Logan, as he summed up his philosophy of teaching the other day.

As he sat in his chair, he crossed his legs and talked easily. While he talked the photographer snapped pictures and then, puffing his pipe, Logan caught himself:

"Oops, I almost forgot. Let me put my pipe down. It wouldn't be good if the kids saw me with my pipe. I never smoke in front of them."

This may not surprise many, yet it does represent Logan's deep commitment to his philosophy of teaching. And from all accounts, this philosophy worked extremely well. He has won several teaching and admin-

istration awards and in addition has won the love and respect of fellow teachers and students.

"I wasn't an iron-fisted person but the kids knew I could handle myself," Logan said. "The kids knew that if I didn't care for them I wouldn't punish them." Logan then told a classic ball-through-the-window story which revealed the firm but gentle hand of Mr. Logan, the principal.

"Tony stood in front of Slauson School and threw a hard ball to the catcher who crouched in front of the main door. The catcher couldn't handle the ball and it went through the expensive window in the door.

"I was standing behind Tony the whole time and after the ball went crashing through the glass I went up to him and tapped him on the shoulder, as if I crawled out of the woodwork, and said,

"It was a beautiful slider but you better get a catcher who can hold you. That'll cost you $18 bucks. You know it's less expensive to pitch out there in back of the school on the playing field.' "

Harold Logan was born April 8, 1908, in Niles, near South Bend, Ind. He was an outstanding student at Niles High School and received a $600 college scholarship from the high school upon graduation in 1926. Next he attended Alma College where he majored in history and chemistry. In addition to working part-time, Logan was a second string football player and continued to excel academically.

A popular fellow, Logan was president of his senior class, yet with his many extracurricular activities he managed to graduate in 1930 at the top of his class—summa cum laude ("with highest praise"). And, he won a state fellowship to the University of Michigan and did graduate work here in history. He received his master's degree from the University in 1931.

Logan's first teaching job was at Hastings High School near Grand Rapids where he taught journalism, history and English literature for five years. 1936 was a good year for Ann Arbor and Logan because that is the year he began teaching here, and that is the year he married his wife, Zatae. She works as a public health counselor for the Kellog Foundation and they have two daughters, Nancy and Martha. Both are trained teachers.

When Logan first came to Ann Arbor he taught at Mack School for a few months and then went to Slauson as soon as it was completed. In addition to teaching social studies, he kept up his interest in sports and helped Lou Hollway start the football program there. In the summer of 1937, he went to Harvard to study social studies and guidance, and in later summers did work in administration, guidance, education and communication here at the University.

In 1941, Logan was named principal of Slauson School and remained in that position until 1968. He described the faculty at Slauson in glowing terms:

"The faculty at Slauson was terrific. The most important things in a school system are the teachers and the kids."

In 1962, at the suggestion of the Slauson faculty, Logan was named the natalonal Secondary Principal of the Year, an award given by Croft Publications. Also in that year, the Board of Education recognized him as "One of the best loved and highly respected members of our staff."

After his term at Slauson, Logan returned to classroom teaching at Pioneer High and in the 1968–69 school year he promptly won the "My Favorite Teacher" award given by the Detroit News. Logan, who earlier was twice elected president of the Michigan junior high school principals' organization, told of his experiences at Pioneer:

"I just loved teaching at Pioneer. In fact I was so anxious to get there in the morning I always arrived a half-hour early. But I do want to say this. You know there has been talk of young people being this and that and I want to say it has been a thoroughly enjoyable experience at Pioneer. The kids were really great."

Asked if he detected any differences between kids today and those of years past, Logan said:

"The difference in today's kids is they are knowledgeable, but they have no more horsepower."

Thad Carr, principal at Pattengill, and Ted Rokicki, former Pioneer principal, described Harold Logan as a real humanitarian.

Carr: "I've known Harold since 1945 when he was the principal at Slauson School. Harold was the kind of person that made everyone feel welcome. He made the students feel good about themselves and he made them feel important.

"I remember when data processing was being instituted in the schools and Harold just couldn't accept it. He said it was an impersonal treatment of the kids. He's one of the few principals who could step into teaching and have the love and respect of teachers and students right up until the time he retired."

Rokicki: "I came to the system in 1958 and taught English under Logan at Slauson. I was hired by Logan and he encouraged me to go into administration. It was quite ironic that in 1968 our jobs were reversed: I was the principal and he was a teacher.

"Logan was a junior high principal for 27 years—one of the real humanitarians. He had great respect from teachers, students, friends and the community.

"At graduation I said that because of his tremendous contribution to this community and to the youth of this community, the Board of Education should give consideration to naming the sixth junior high school after Mr. Logan. Before I could ask him to stand, everyone spontaneously stood up and clapped, leaving him the only one sitting down."

Behind Logan's gentle but firm guiding hand and his example lies a simple philosophy. A student once summed up this philosophy in these few words:

"Mr. Logan loves us."

THE UNDECLARED WAR ON THE NATION'S FIREMEN

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I joined my Republican colleagues on the Judiciary Committee in cosponsoring a bill that would give $50,000 to families of police officers who are killed in the line of duty. Today, I have introduced a bill that will extend the same benefits to firemen.

Parade magazine printed a story that told of the increasing number of attacks on firemen. I am inserting this story and hope that my colleagues will consider this very important matter. It is my hope that the House will act on both the police and fireman bills. The article follows:

THE UNDECLARED WAR ON THE NATION'S FIREMEN

(By Sid Ross and Herbert Kuferberg)

"Every time I go out on the engine I feel like a sitting duck," says a fireman in Cincinnati.

The fact is that all over the nation, firemen are under siege. In big cities a war is being waged against them by residents of ghetto areas with rocks, bricks, bottles—even gunfire. So intense has this barrage become that firemen are wearing bulletproof vests and face shields, putting sheet metal and Plexiglas around engine cabs, and recruiting armed guards to protect them while they go about their job of extinguishing fires.

"The most popular sport in some sections of this town is pulling the box and waiting for the firemen to come so they can throw stones and bottles at them," says Capt. Wendell L. Shingler of Engine Co. 30 in the nation's capital.

Attacks have reached such a stage that some fire fighters are threatening not to go into areas where there is a repeated pattern of hostility and harassment. Bridgeport, Conn., last year officially adopted a "let it burn" policy for outdoor fires that do not endanger lives or property, after a dozen firemen had been hit with missiles while fighting junk fires apparently set deliberately near a low-income housing project.

Teenagers and older youths often lure firemen into ghetto areas with false alarms, according to fire authorities, who stress, however, that only a tiny minority of residents are involved.

"The false alarms are pulled to set you up for an ambush or attack," charges Lieut. Dave Marshall of Pittsburgh, vice-president of Local 1, International Association of Fire Fighters. "It's not all blacks, either. In some parts of town you get white young punks attacking with rocks and bottles."

BLACKS ABUSED, TOO

Although black firemen are relatively few in number, some of them have been abused, too. When one Negro fireman remonstrated with a crowd of Boston blacks who were taunting and throwing stones at him, he was told: "You represent the Establishment. Whitey owns the fire department."

Even women and children are getting into the violence act. "It's a helluva note to see little kids 6 and 7 flinging rocks at you," says a Cleveland fireman. "There's a lot of urban renewal going on around the east side of town, so there's plenty of loose ammunition to bomb us with." Sometimes, too, children will step on the hose purposely to cut the water flow.

Another Cleveland fire fighter, stationed in the run-down Hough area, told of a recent incident: "We were operating the pumps at a garage fire. There were maybe 100–150 kids gathered around. All of a sudden they started heaving rocks at us. One man got hit four or five times; I got hit, too. Then they started with bricks and flattened tin cans they scaled at us. We turned the pressure up and sprayed them with the water to keep them away a bit. Luckily, nobody got hurt real bad.

"Afterward we talked to a couple of those kids. They were grinning and laughing. They didn't deny throwing rocks at us—they acted like it was all good, clean fun."

In Washington, according to a report filed by one engine company platoon, "a group of ladies" was waiting at the scene of a garbage fire to greet the fire fighters with "obscene words" and a volley of stones and bottles.

CHILDREN JOIN IN

Comments Cleveland's Capt. James P. Neelon: "It's a relief to get only verbal abuse, and we just take it. Like not long ago a little 4- or 5-year old kid started taunting us: 'You're chicken because you're white.' There were 20 or 25 teenagers hanging around to see how we'd react. We just swallowed it—we don't let harassment interfere with our job."

In some cities, public officials have tended to "play down" or not report assaults on firemen in hopes of quieting the situation, but many firemen feel that full disclosure of such incidents and seizure of the guilty

parties is the best way to prevent recurrences.

In Pittsburgh, as elsewhere, booby traps have been set for firemen engaged in battling blazes. "Holes have been cut in floors, and steps removed from stairways," says Dave Marshall. "We've had firemen injured this way to the point where they've had to retire."

Also in Pittsburgh, harassers stretched nylon cables between light poles on opposite sides of the street, hoping that a fire engine would run into them. In another instance, a porch roof's supports were cut to give way when firemen went up a ladder.

WAIT ALONG ROUTE

Says Deputy Chief James M. Finn of Boston: "Most attacks are planned. They know the route the equipment will be taking. They're lined up waiting for you with bricks and bottles and anything they can lay their hands on. Yes, we've had injuries—fortunately not serious ones. But it's a hell of a note—you're going in there to save lives, and this is how you're greeted."

The guerrilla warfare has been carried right into the firehouses themselves. Engine Co. 29 in Cleveland wryly calls itself "Fort Apache." Recently Kenneth Paganelli of Engine Co. 9 left the station to buy a quart of milk. On his way back he was attacked from behind by two youths wielding a heavy wooden slat. He almost lost an ear; 61 stitches had to be taken in it.

In Cincinnati last year, 15 shots from an automatic rifle were fired into a firehouse, severely wounding two men inside. Guns have also been fired at engines in Cairo, Ill.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Chicago, Pittsburgh and Cleveland. Two firemen were killed during the Detroit riots, another in the Watts riots and still another in Newark, N.J.

As a result of the Cincinnati firehouse attack, whose perpetrators have never been caught, Fire Chief Bert A. Lugannani announced that off-duty firemen would "ride shotgun" on all fire equipment answering calls in parts of the city considered "dangerous." These guards, all of whom received overtime pay, wore plain clothes, crash helmets and face shields—and carried riot guns. After about six weeks they were withdrawn, but the department stands ready to use them again.

In the meantime, Cincinnati is equipping its engines with steel protective sheathing, and has turned at least three fire stations into fortresses by bricking up some windows, putting iron mesh over others, and erecting protective walls. Baltimore has installed plastic bubbles and steel roofs over its engines after repeated harassments.

"FLAK VESTS" USED

Street attacks on firemen have created a booming business for manufacturers of bulletproof vests. These "flak vests," some of which weigh about 35 pounds and can range to more than $50 apiece in cost, are cumbersome, uncomfortable, and hard to work in, but they're becoming a normal item of fire equipment in several cities, along with plastic face guards and similar devices.

Capt. Alfred Benway of New York's Uniformed Fire Officers reports that harassment in New York is "getting worse all the time," with an enormous increase in false alarms. From 1968 through April, 1971, New York fire officials report a total of 2589 recorded harassment incidents in which 659 firemen were injured. Like many other fire authorities, Benway would rather see increased protection from the police than have firemen carry guns. In Washington, D.C., the firemen's union has been vigorously campaigning for better police protection, as well as for a Congressional bill that would make it a Federal felony to assault a fireman performing his duty in the District of Columbia.

But as important as it is to capture and punish those responsible for the attacks on firemen, many public officials—and some of the fire fighters themselves—believe it's equally important to get at the underlying causes of the assaults. To many authorities, they are basically a symptom of frustration and anger over living conditions. "Firemen offer a convenient, vulnerable and highly visible target for a ghetto kid who feels the world is against him," says one New York government official.

BURN CARS AND GARBAGE

It's significant, says this official, that many of the ghetto fires are deliberately set in piles of street garbage and abandoned cars by residents who think they're getting less in sanitation and other municipal services than more affluent sections of the city. In Brooklyn's low-income Williamsburg section last month, a mob of 200 men, women and children dumped uncollected refuse into the street and set fire to it. When firemen and police rushed into the area they were pelted with bottles and bricks. At a similar incident in the Bronx, where a garbage fire was also set, firemen were showered with missiles and debris from rooftops and windows.

New York has also seen a vast increase in fires set in vacant, abandoned buildings. One police officer with good contacts in the neighborhood has been told that the "decent people there don't want the fires put out in those empty buildings, which are a hiding place for dope addicts, perverts, muggers and others who prey on the community—that's why they impede the firemen." Nevertheless, such fires cost New York City an estimated $23 million a year to combat, and such places often are booby-trapped, with the flooring deliberately loosened and steps cut away.

"Even if these people do have legitimate gripes," objects a member of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Fire, as the department there is called, "why should firemen be made to pay for the sins of society?"

Another factor sometimes cited for the attacks is the relative lack of Negroes in the ranks of the fire-fighting organizations. The International Association of Fire Fighters is sensitive to charges of discrimination in the hiring of blacks, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans.

IAFF President Howie McClennan insists that his organization is trying to get more minority group members into the nation's fire departments. But recruitment efforts do not seem to be producing the desired results. Boston began such a program in 1964 in its ghetto area. Only 26 blacks expressed an interest, five actually went through the course, and two passed the civil service exam held in 1966. Today, of 1900 Boston firemen, 21 are black.

WILKINS' STATEMENT

Asked by PARADE to comment on attacks on firemen, Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said: "The NAACP is today, as it always has been, opposed to efforts to obstruct public servants in the proper performance of their assigned duties. The harassment of firemen by certain elements in a community is inexplicable. Firemen are employed to save lives and property. A community which permits interference with the performance of that duty is harming itself."

Many fire departments are going out into the community to improve relations between the firemen and the people they are trying to serve. In Philadelphia, for example, fire representatives regularly visit schools and neighborhoods to build understanding. In Los Angeles County, Fire Fighters Local 1014 sends firemen out in a campaign to recruit candidates for training among blacks and Mexican-Americans and runs a "community involvement program" in which the heads of the union consult regularly with neighborhood leaders.

THE HOT SEASON

But despite such efforts, the nation's fire fighters are keeping their fingers crossed this summer of 1971. "The long hot summer" traditionally is the time when false alarms reach their peak and street disturbances flare up, and the firemen are bracing themselves for the attacks that may come any time they race to answer an alarm in a ghetto or slum area practically anywhere in America.

Says McClennan: "Fire fighters resent the harassment by misguided people in the inner cities. It's more than resentment—it's the knowledge that death or serious injury may result. Fire fighting is the most hazardous job in America. When you've got a fire at your front and a gun or a club at your back—that's more than a fireman can cope with. We like to say, and we believe: "Fire fighters fight fires and help people." That's why we are embittered when some persons choose us as the symbol of the Establishment and try to kill or maim us in our job of protecting the community."

ROOFTOP ASSAULTS

Adds a spokesman for New York's Uniformed Firefighters Association: "We've had everything thrown at us, even refrigerators from rooftops. We've been shot at with guns and peashooters. The men are bitter about it. Some of our guys wanted to carry guns and we had quite a job to cool them down. Yet with all the harassment, we still go out there and do our job. I think, that from all indications, we're in for a tough summer, tougher than any we've ever had."

And grimly sums up a fireman in the Homewood section of Pittsburgh: "I'm getting more jittery as the weather gets warmer. Whenever I ride the pumper through this area I get a funny feeling between my shoulder blades. I don't know whether I'm going to get a brick or a bullet in my back."

SENATOR PERCY INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A SPECIAL ACTION OFFICE FOR DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the problems of drug abuse and dependence are rampant in our society today. To counter this dilemma, President Nixon presented the Congress last month with a comprehensive message urging an all-out assault on this national menace. Among other things, the President's proposal calls for the establishment of a White House office to provide overall planning and policy, as well as direction, management, and funding allocations for all Federal drug abuse training, education, rehabilitation, research, prevention, and treatment programs—excluding law enforcement activity. Pending statutory establishment, the President has created that office by Executive order. The President deserves the highest commendation for these efforts and the American public deserves expeditious congressional action on the drug abuse measures it has before it.

On the Senate side, Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, of Illinois, has introduced S. 2097 to establish a Special Action Office

for Drug Abuse Prevention to accomplish the aims the President seeks. In an excellent statement on July 7, 1971, before a joint session of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization and the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senator PERCY observed that—

The Federal government today is neither organized nor oriented for a concerted drive against the factors which nurture drug demand. Over the years, efforts to reduce drug demand have been appended, almost as an afterthought, to programs aimed at mental illness, poverty, and crime . . .

Dispersed responsibility among several agencies has meant no responsibility for program failures. Federal drug efforts that supposedly have had different purposes have literally worked at cross-purposes. Comparative analysis for related programs in separate agencies has produced non-comparative data, making impossible any rational budget decisions.

State and local authorities all too often are at a loss as to which Federal agency to turn to for needed help. Resources for drug control efforts are inefficiently channeled in the absence of central direction. How much of the duplicative projects of BNDD and NIMH might have been avoided? How much of the needed research has gone unexplored? Finally, programs of training, rehabilitation, research, education, treatment, and prevention are commonly subordinated to primary agency mandates in terms of management direction, highest calibre personnel, and funding.

Because the text of Senator PERCY's testimony merits the attention of my colleagues and also addresses itself to the excellent drug abuse program that is presently being conducted in the State of Illinois, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to have Senator PERCY's remarks reprinted, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR CHARLES H. PERCY

Mr. Chairman, I appear this morning not to tell you we are faced with a crisis involving wholesale use of hard drugs in this country, but to beseech this Committee to take quick action toward arriving at a solution. The critical importance that the President himself attaches to this matter is underlined by his comprehensive message to Congress just two weeks ago and by the personal intervention of his office in helping to arrange for his morning's distinguished panel consisting of Attorney General John Mitchell, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Elliot Richardson and Under Secretary of Defense David Packard.

S. 2097—which I was pleased to introduce on behalf of the Administration; of which you, Mr. Chairman, are the principal cosponsor; and which 21 of our esteemed colleagues have joined in co-sponsoring, including most of the members of these two subcommittees convening today—would establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President to concentrate the resources of the nation in a crusade against drug abuse. I am pleased to see that this joint session is also taking up S. 1945, introduced by Senator Muskie, Chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, which would create an office similar to that envisioned by S. 2097. I am certain that the differences in language and jurisdiction contained in these two bills are negligible when compared to the wide consensus that you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Muskie, and all of us here share: that addiction must now be overcome.

I noted last week that the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs estimates that at the end of 1969—over one and one-half years ago—there were as many as 330,000 narcotics addicts in the United States, 95 per cent of whom were addicted to heroin. It would hardly be presumptuous to suggest that the number of heroin addicts—in our cities and in suburban and rural areas—has accelerated alarmingly over the past year. Almost three out of five addicts are under the age of 30; eight per cent are under 21. In 1969 and 1970, new addicts under 18 years of age increased at a rate of three and one-half times that which was experienced in the preceding three years.

According to a recent estimate from the provost marshal's office in Saigon, there are between 30,000 and 40,000 American servicemen in Vietnam who are heroin users—close to 15 percent of the troops stationed there. One study showed that the average age of the addicts included in the survey was only 20.5 years and the length of time addicted 5 months. With plenty of cheap heroin available in Vietnam, the servicemen have no trouble supporting their habit. But when they return to this country, their habit becomes more expensive—and most will have to steal to pay for it. They are sentencing themselves to lives of crime.

Heroin addicts need from $20 to $150 per day to support their habit. If New York City's approximately 100,000 addicts spend an average of $35 per day on heroin, the total exceeds $3.5 million per day or $1.3 billion per year. Most turn to crime to get the money to pay for the heroin, since they ordinarily are unable to earn enough to pay for it. One survey in New York City showed that only 2 percent supported their habit through gainful employment; 98 percent were involved in criminal activity. If addicts steal goods, they must steal five times the cost of their habit, since stolen merchandise brings only 20 percent of its value when fenced. On a yearly basis, an addict must steal $90,000 worth of merchandise.

To offset this vicious cycle of addiction, S. 2097 proposes the establishment of a central authority within the Executive Office of the President to have overall responsibility for all major Federal programs of drug abuse prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation, training, and research programs. The authority will be designated as the Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention and will be headed by a Director accountable to the President.

Because of the emergency nature of this problem, the President has already established this Office by Executive order, pending passage by the Congress of specific enabling legislation.

I am deeply gratified to see that the President has appointed Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, director of drug abuse control program of the State of Illinois, to head this new office in the temporary capacity of Special Consultant to the President for narcotics and dangerous drugs. Dr. Jaffe left yesterday for Vietnam but will appear before us immediately upon his return.

Dr. Jaffe has pioneered in developing innovative techniques for the treatment of heroin addiction as part of the Illinois Drug Abuse Program.

That program offers treatment and rehabilitation to drug abusers, concentrating on persons addicted to heroin, but also providing facilities for young people who abuse other drugs.

Abusers either volunteer for the program, or are referred by the courts. They are admitted to special clinics where treatment begins. There are no bars or guards, and people are not forced to enter or to stay. Yet the program, through many flexible features, tries to keep people in voluntarily because they continue to see the benefits of the program.

A variety of methods are used and abusers are allowed to move from one method to another until each arrives at one that works best for him. Not only are abusers' medical needs served, but also their larger social needs—through counseling, legal, vocational and recreational services, and work activities.

The program is operated by the Illinois Department of Mental Health in cooperation with the University of Chicago Department of Psychiatry. Financing is provided through the Department of Mental Health and by a five-year grant from the National Institute of Mental Health to the University of Chicago.

Cognizant that several methods might be effective, persons operating the program originally tried the following treatment procedures:

Use of methadone, a substance which prevents withdrawal symptoms and eliminates the craving for heroin.

Total abstinence while living in a residential community.

Hospitalization for withdrawal, followed by therapy in a clinic.

After withdrawal, abusers could be treated with a drug called cyclazocine, which blocks the effects of heroin.

At first the program was an experiment, because no one know which method would be most effective for Illinois, and particularly Chicago—the initial target area. Beginning in January 1968 with one patient, one bottle of methadone and one office, the program grew quickly. By July 1971 there were 2,002 individuals in treatment—15 percent in residence, and 85 percent outpatients—and 24 facilities.

Of these 2,002 individuals, 1673 are receiving methadone; 329 are drug free, 157 of whom are in abstinent residential communities, and 172 of whom had gone through withdrawal and were receiving care in clinics. No individuals were using cyclazocine, but the possibility of using such an agent remains—pending development of a longer-acting form. Also 118 young non-heroin drug users were receiving treatment.

Today the program is no longer an experiment. Initial treatment methods remain intact with the exception of replacing hospital withdrawal with residential withdrawal. The program has evolved from individual clinics using only one treatment method to some clinics which use all methods. Clinics can be divided into those that are solely residential, those that are both residential and outpatient, and those that are outpatient only. Initially concentrated on the South Side of Chicago (where the immediate need was greatest), clinics are now on the North Side and the far South Side of Chicago and at several locations throughout the state.

One of the most important facets of the Illinois Drug Abuse Program centers about the epidemiologic activity being conducted under the direction of Dr. Patrick Hughes. That activity focuses on the natural settings where drug users spend most of their time. Field teams are assigned to heroin-distribution or "copping" areas over a period of six months to a year to observe and collect information from addicts who regularly appear at that location. Dr. Hughes observes:

"Through this approach, we have been able to go beyond simple head counts of active addicts meeting at a given location. We are able to study the complex social system developed by heroin addicts to protect themselves from arrest. The roles elaborated by these local distribution networks are substantially more complex than the usual dichotomy of "user" and "pusher". The dealer cannot stand on the street corner with bags of heroin in his pocket because of heavy police pressure at these sites. In one Black copping community observed for a period of one year, we found that 125 different heroin addicts regularly bought or sold drugs there. We found that 6% occupied the role of "big dealers" or local wholesaler, 6% were street dealers, 15% were part-time dealers who sold only enough to support their own habits,

and 6% were bag followers or touts who carried out liaison functions to protect dealers from direct exposure to the consumer and risk of arrest. A third of this distribution network, or copping community, maintained their heroin habits by performing dealership functions. Two-thirds were consumers, 38% being hustlers (usually thieves or prostitutes) and the remaining 28% held at least part-time legitimate jobs. The data are interesting in several respects. For example, of the 34% occupying dealer roles we found only 2 non-addicted dealers motivated purely by profit."

Although it is too early to completely evaluate the Illinois Drug Abuse Program, several criteria preliminarily point up the effect of treatment. These are a decrease in cost to the community as a result of decreased antisocial activity on the part of patients, an increase in the number of patients employed, and a reduction in illicit drug usage.

Follow-up study of outpatients indicates that arrest rates have fallen dramatically; that about two-thirds of those who are medically able to work are gainfully employed; and that in any given week, use of illicit drugs—as determined by analysis of urine samples—is limited to less than 20% of all outpatients and less than 10% of all patients in treatment.

Additionally, the program has shown:

That it is possible to develop a multimethod treatment system within a single administrative structure.

That such a system can reduce or eliminate the inefficiency and rivalry which often stymie the operations of single-method treatment programs.

That where vested interests have not developed and treatment of abusers has not become politicized, people with widely different philosophies can not only talk together, but can actively cooperate. For the future, the program expects to expand into other Illinois communities as funds and trained staff become available, so that no one need wonder whether death or some other catastrophe will occur before someone takes an interest.

At the federal level, we now know that effective law enforcement, by itself, cannot yield a solution to the problem of drug abuse so long as the demand for drugs persists. Yet, the Federal Government today is neither organized nor oriented for a concerted drive against the factors which nurture that demand. Over the years, efforts to reduce drug demand have been appended, almost as an afterthought, to programs aimed at mental illness, poverty, and crime. The focus of these efforts has been tainted as a result. Thus, we have examined demand factors within particular subcultures or geographic areas, but have not addressed ourselves to the pervasive conditions in our society as a whole which give rise to what has become a nationwide demand—and for that reason a national tragedy.

For example, only residents of specific inner-city areas qualify for Model Cities-funded treatment programs; only individuals with poverty-level incomes are eligible for O.E.O. education and treatment programs. Middle class communities or communities which suffer from non-opiate drug abuse problems frequently fund themselves without any prospect of Federal assistance.

Dispersed responsibility among several agencies has meant no responsibility for program failures. Federal drug efforts that supposedly have had different purposes have literally worked at cross-purposes. Comparative analysis for related programs in separate agencies has produced non-comparative data, making impossible any rational budget decisions.

State and local authorities all to often are at a loss as to which Federal agency to turn to for needed help. Resources for drug control efforts are inefficiently channeled in the absence of central direction. How much of the duplicative projects of BNDD and NIMH might have avoided? How much of the needed research has gone unexplored? Finally, programs of training, rehabilitation, research, education, treatment, and prevention are commonly subordinated to primary agency mandates in terms of management direction, highest calibre personnel, and funding.

By establishing an Office directly under and reporting to the President and by vesting that Office with direct responsibility for all major Federal programs of drug abuse prevention, education, rehabilitation, training and research, S. 2097 would go a long way toward correcting the organizational impediments to an effective Federal approach.

* * * * *

Mr. Chairman, I do not know all of the reasons that cause this Nation to experience the intensity of its present drug crisis. But in the course of these hearings and in our private deliberations, I think that we should begin to reexamine some of the underpinnings of our way of life. We tend to blame the war in Vietnam, and the restlessness and alienation it has wrought. Surely the war is a factor and an important one, but not an explanation. We have had other unpopular wars before. Ending the war would relieve many of the tensions that beset this nation and would enable us to redirect our energies. But I suspect that the problem that brings us together today would remain.

And so, I ask myself—Why?—Why now? What is it about our society, about our life, about our values that leads so many of our citizens, such a large segment of our youth and our G.I.'s to turn-on, tune-in, drop-out and in so doing, risk physical and psychological dependence, disease, and death?

If these hearings can shed any light on those larger issues, we shall have done the Nation a great service. "Why?" is the question I shall put to every one of the distinguished witnesses that have been scheduled to appear before us in the course of these sessions.

BANKERS' VIEWS ON GUARANTEED LOAN TO LOCKHEED

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as the loan guarantee for the Lockheed Corp. is due for consideration on Friday, July 30, I thought my colleagues would be interested in the timely comments and recommendations of a few of the bankers in the Los Angeles area.

The Lockheed loan is an extremely controversial and complex matter and, thus, the comments of those in the financial community should be given due consideration.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters from various bankers in my area giving their views on the pending action which would authorize the Federal Government to guarantee a loan to the Lockheed Corp.:

BANK OF AMERICA,
Gardena, Calif., July 20, 1971.

Hon. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: This letter refers to your letter fo July 13, 1971 addressed to me as manager of the Bank of America, Normandie-Redondo Beach Blvd. Branch, Gardena, California concerning the hearings to be held relative to a $250,000,000.00 guarantee in bank loans on behalf of Lockheed Aircraft Corporation.

As you already know, the bank has already stated in direct testimony to both the Senate and the House of the position they take on this matter. Therefore, I am writing this letter and expressing an opinion as a private citizen.

The California economy in general has suffered economically because of the cutbacks in the Aerospace Industries and allied affiliates. As I understand the Lockheed situation, there has already been invested over $1,250,000.00 in the project. It would seem to me that for the lack of an additional $250,000,000.00, we would be wasting a huge investment. Not only that, this would directly affect tax revenue the Government would receive if the project were completed.

Secondly, if the funds are not made available, then the economic loss to California would seriously compound the problem that already exists. Everyone seems to assume that the Government is going to pay out these funds directly to Lockheed whereas the truth of the matter is the Government's endorsement is the item in question.

From all the information I have read, the amount of $250,000,000.00 would make this a healthy project, and the loan ultimately repaid. Instead, people are assuming that the project will ultimately fail. As a citizen, I feel very strongly about this matter.

For years, the Government has subsidized farmers, guaranteed loans for home purchasers and students; is Lockheed an exception? We think nothing of making foreign loans in many million of dollars, and I think we should at least be willing to endorse this project for an American Corporation.

I ask you most urgently to vote in favor of the Government Guarantee.

Sincerely,

HARRY HOWISON.

WELLS FARGO BANK,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 21, 1971.

Hon. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Cooley, President of our bank, and Mr. Arbuckle, Chairman of our bank, have asked me to answer your letters concerning H.R. 8432 as I have been closer to the Lockheed situation than they. As a matter of fact, I appeared as our bank's witness at the House Banking and Currency Committee hearings last week.

Our bank believes this guarantee bill should be passed. It is an exceptional measure to deal with an unusual emergency which was largely caused by circumstances beyond Lockheed's control. There may be an element of bad management in Lockheed's predicament, but there is much more to this situation than can be explained away by accusations that the company was poorly run.

It is apparent that the Department of Defense must take a major part of the responsibility for the present situation. The "Total Package Concept" contract instituted during the regime of Secretary of Defense McNamara proved to be unworkable. It called for a firm contract years in advance to develop and produce advanced weapons systems which were close to being beyond the state of the art. In trying to anticipate the unforeseeable, the D.O.D. wrote contracts which were so involved that they lent themselves to misunderstandings and legal disputes which ultimately contributed to Lockheed taking losses of $484 million on their total package contracts. These settlements were forced upon Lockheed although the evidence indicates that there was better than an even chance Lockheed would have won a favorable judgment if the contracts had been adjudicated through the legal con-

tract claims procedures. It was this tremendous drain on their cash flow that caused Lockheed to request $250 million in a guaranteed loan.

There is $1.4 billion invested in the L–1011 project, all of which is worthless if the L–1011 is abandoned. The House Banking and Currency Committee raised the issue of why don't the banks take the unpledged assets of the company as security for the additional $250 million instead of asking for the guarantee. The unpledged assets have a cost of $320 million, a book value of $161 million, and an insurable value of $401 million. Of the cost value, $244 million consists of tools, dies, specialized machinery, etc., which are practically worthless in a liquidation situation. The banks' position will not be improved by the guarantee if Lockheed should ultimately go bankrupt. Under the proposed guarantee, the Government would have a first lien on Lockheed's fixed assets. The most liquid of these assets are pledged to the banks as collateral for the $400 million loan. Obviously, the Government would use these to pay off their claim, which would leave the banks with the collateral that is difficult to dispose of in a liquidation situation.

The question of free enterprise philosophy has been raised by many people. I am sure you will agree that a company who does most of its business with the Department of Defense certainly does not have the freedom of choice that a company has whose business is entirely within the private sector. There is ample precedence for a guarantee in this case. Douglas Aircraft Company was given a $75 million guarantee when the company got into trouble over their DC–8 and DC–9 programs. In fact, McDonnell-Douglas even has commitments for $639 million for the export of DS–10 aircraft. It is our understanding that there was over $137 billion in loan guarantees outstanding at the end of 1970.

In summation, a bankrupt Lockheed would cost the taxpayers at least $500 million in income tax losses, Southern California would receive a severe economic blow, and somewhere in the neighborhood of 30,000 people would join the unemployed.

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. BREEDEN,
Executive Vice President.

BANK OF AMERICA,
Carson, Calif., July 19, 1971.

Hon. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GLENN: Thank you for your letter of July 13, 1971. It is most gratifying to know that you value my opinion on such controversial matters as the Lockheed Loan Guarantee.

I am wholeheartedly in support of such a loan guarantee, not only as a banker but also as a businessman, civic worker and citizen taxpayer.

I am certain that such a loan guarantee is in the public interest economically, socially and morally.

I also believe that the issusance of such a guarantee by the Federal Government would be far less costly to the taxpayers than the collapse of a company the size of Lockheed. I do not believe the Government would ever be called on to honor the guarantee. The loss of corporate tax revenues, personal income tax revenues, the cost of unemployment benefit payments, welfare payments and the like would be far in excess of honoring such a guarantee if it were to be honored.

I believe the loan guarantee is needed in order for Lockheed to survive their present financial plight, which I believe was not entirely of their own making. I am confident that with such a guarantee the company will not only survive but will go on to produce an aircraft that will add greatly to our country's air carrier needs, prestige and technology.

It is also my contention that profits will result to everyone concerned with the L–1011 project if the aircraft is produced and sold as projected.

The scope of the International ramifications cannot be overlooked either if the L–1011 project is allowed to collapse. Especially as they affect Rolls-Royce, the PB–211 engine and the English political leaders that backed the engine project based on sales to Lockheed.

I, personally, request that you vote in favor of the Loan Guarantee to Lockheed Aircraft Company.

Respectfully yours,

C. H. OLSEN,
Manager.

BANK OF AMERICA,
San Pedro, Calif., July 15, 1971.

Hon. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONRESSMAN ANDERSON: The House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency commenced hearings this week on legislation authorizing the U.S. Government to guarantee up to $250 million in bank loans to the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation. I urge that you support the authorization of the U.S. Government to guarantee loans up to $250 million to the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation.

The Bank of America has $30 million on loan to Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, which compels a keen interest in the pending federal loan guarantee legislation before Congress.

Yet the economy of California and the nation provides an overriding reason for the support of this legislation as Treasury Secretary John B. Connally pointed out in testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Board Chairman Chauncey J. Medberry of the Bank of America testified before the same committee to the effect that the 24 banks which had loaned Lockheed $400 million to date could not loan more without the government guarantee.

Turning to specifics, Secretary Connally said:

"Underlying this investment in physical inventories (nearly $1.4 billion) is a financial commitment that would have to be largely written off. Apart from the net equity of Lockheed's 55,000 shareholders, which now amounts to about $235 million, subcontractors are estimated to have invested $350 million in the program, a consortium of 24 banks has loans outstanding to the company of $400 million, and debenture holders have claims of another $135 million . . .

"In addition, the Treasury would suffer tax losses. Just as the Government is a partner in business profits, it is a partner in business losses. Lockheed's creditors could take some solace in deducting their losses on their tax forms. Any estimate of the exact cost to the Government of these tax losses would be speculation, but it is hard to imagine that the net tax loss on $1 billion of written off investments wouldn't exceed substantially the $250 million guarantee . . .

"Moreover, though it is more difficult to estimate, it is evident that for every employee directly laid off, others in communities where their income was counted on will also suffer. It is estimated that counting this indirect impact, a total of 60,000 employees will end up without jobs if the L–1011 is shut down. Even on a direct basis, the cost is heavy, as the reductions that have already taken place show . . ."

Furthermore, the L–1011 will reduce Lockheed's dependency upon defense contracts from 90 percent now to nearly 50 percent in the future. In the view of experts who have reviewed development efforts to date, the 400 passenger L–1011 (TriStar) represents a second-generation, wide-bodied jet aircraft with engines that will be virtually smokeless and with a noise level nearly one-half that of those on aircraft in use today.

Mr. Medberry explained that, when the banks first made the $400 million commitment, Lockheed had a net worth of $395 million, a debt of $450 million exclusive of subordinated debt, and a net profit after taxes averaging $50 million per year for 6 years.

He said that today Lockheed's net worth—after Lockheed agreed to a $200 million loss on Department of Defense Contracts—dropped to $235 million with a debt of $1.065 billion, exclusive of the same subordinated debt, and grave losses in place of profit.

Mr. Medberry said this, combined with the risks inherent in this development of a new airframe and new engine on the technological frontiers of the aerospace industry, would make further bank financing imprudent without the government guarantee.

In summary, Mr. Medberry developed these four points in his testimony:

"First, that the survival of Lockheed and the issuance of a government loan guarantee are definitely in the public interest.

"Second, that the issuance of such a guarantee would cost the taxpayers far less than the collapse of the company.

"Third, that the guarantee by the government is essential to the survival of Lockheed; and

"Fourth, that the company will survive with the loan."

Again, I urge that you support the authorization of the U.S. Government to guarantee loans up to $250 million.

Sincerely,

V. A. BAUCHIERO,
Vice President and Manager.

UNITED CALIFORNIA BANK,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 20, 1971.

Hon. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: In response to your letters of July 15 to Frank L. King, Chairman of the Board and to me requesting comments as to our position and recommendation with respect to the U.S. Government guarantee of bank loans to Lockheed, I spoke with your Administrative Assistant, Mr. Harry Anderson and he has requested that I provide you with a written resume of my observations.

It is my feeling that without the requested guaranteed funds Lockheed is faced with bankruptcy. This event would not only have a disrupting effect on our economy but would make all government contract financing subject to the most careful scrutiny by the financial market.

As to the economy, estimates place the investment of the private sector in the L–1011 at something in the neighborhood of $1.5 billion, while the "people" investment in the form of gainfully employed individuals has been placed at 30,000. In the event of bankruptcy, these positive factors would be lost with the resultant diminution of funds going into the consumer market and a substantial decrease in tax revenues.

An analysis of the Lockheed position would seem to indicate that the government is not entirely without fault in contributing to the Lockheed problem. The type of contract used in the four disputed projects has I believe been discredited and is no longer used. The cash drain of over $500 million imposed on Lockheed primarily through negotiated set-

tlements of legal disputes arising out of military programs predicated on these contracts has substantially added to Lockheed's need for financial assistance while at the same time reducing the company's capital structure to a point where it has been unable to properly support these additional requirements.

The banks participating have already evidenced their support of Lockheed by extending loans totaling $400 million. This figure does not include the substandard secondary support provided by the banks through related loans to subcontractors and to the various airlines who have made substantial cash deposits incident to the L–1011 effort.

It is my feeling that the government should support the company as requested. In as much as such guaranteed funds would be on a "last in first out basis" with priority over all other creditors, the exposure of the government and the taxpayer would be minimal. In contrast, any additional credit provided by private sector would not enjoy such priority and the lack of such protection would make it imprudent for any bank to extend new support. There is ample precedent for the government to extend such an accommodation when consideration is given to the financial assistance already extended to the several other areas of our economy. In this instance, however, the economy will benefit immeasurably by this government action in support of one of our major Southern California and national defense industries with no outlay of funds.

Sincerely,

NORMAN BARKER, Jr.

BANK OF AMERICA,
July 19, 1971.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: In the absence of George Staff, who retired effective June 1, 1971, I would like to take the liberty of answering your letter of July 13, 1971, concerning the U.S. Government guarantee of a loan to the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation in the amount of $250 million.

Our feelings are quite strong that the Government should guarantee such a loan, as the consensus seems to indicate that it would enable the Lockheed Corporation to complete the L–1011 program successfully, and it is our understanding that the Government's guarantee will commence to be reduced from the first deliveries of the aircraft, thus minimizing the risk.

The thing that we feel strongest about is the dependence of many of our smaller businesses, such as foundries, machine shops, electronics firms, etc., that would be adversely affected in event of a bankruptcy in the case of the Lockheed Corporation. These adversities are, of course, in addition to the loss of jobs that result because of the necessity of the direct discharging of the Lockheed Company employes.

And, finally, we are not altogether convinced that Lockheed's problems are all company generated. We seem to recall that Mr. McNamara changed the method of handling Government contracts which resulted in companies such as Lockheed developing enormous projects such as the C5A and other intricate developments on what amounts to a fixed price contract. When one considers the length of time consumed in such developments it seems impossible to us to anticipate the cost of such projects when the development time may encompass anywhere from five to ten years. Such things as inflation, change orders, acts of God, etc., can have a devastating effect on the amount of funds necessary to complete a project. It is, therefore, our opinion that an "aye" vote would be in order, enabling Lockheed to continue as one of our major Government and public producers of aircraft.

Sincerely,

T. R. KINLEY.

FIRST WESTERN BANK AND TRUST CO.,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 19, 1971.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: This is in response to your letter of July 15 regarding the proposed guarantee by the United States Government of $250 million in bank loans to the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation.

I do not envy you in having to participate in this most difficult decision. On the one hand, we have the question as to whether or not the United States Government should be guaranteeing loans to private enterprise and on the other hand, we have the potential devastating economic consequences of Lockheed's failure. In my own case, I feel that the economic consequences outweigh my normal rejection of a U.S. Government guarantee of any private industry debt. Not only would we have substantial unemployment in our area caused by the failure of Lockheed, but we would lose a very potent industrial force which could be vital one day in the defense of our country.

Given the fact that I would favor keeping Lockheed alive by authorizing such guarantee, the next question is one of how the loans should be structured to give maximum protection to the United States Government in its position as guarantor. As a lender, I have some very strong feelings about how this should be done. The primary thrust of my approach to this problem would be to ensure that the existing major creditors have a subordinate position to that of the new loans which would be guaranteed by the U.S. Government. When I refer to the major existing creditors, I am speaking of the banks, the airlines which have made advance deposits on future delivery of aircraft and the major subcontractors to the TriStar Program who, I understand, are large Lockheed creditors. There would probably be no way to make these new guaranteed loans have a priority position as to all other existing creditors, but I would think that the major creditors listed could be put into a subordinate position.

As you probably know, our bank is not one of the institutions involved in the Lockheed credit and, therefore, we are not closely informed as to the company's financial position or the prospects for the L–1011; hence, you are not getting in this letter an expert opinion of a well-informed banker regarding this specific issue. Rather, you are receiving the general reaction of a banker to the problem as outlined in broad scope in the various news media. I hope that this will be of some assistance to you in resolving this difficult question.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. BROWN,
Executive Vice President.

THE CAPITAL NATIONAL BANK,
Compton, Calif., July 16, 1971.

Congressman GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSON: Thank you for your letter of July 13th regarding the proposed legislation concerning the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation. Your letter is an excellent indication of your sincere efforts and desire to represent your congressional district.

In a word, I do support some type of legislation or government guarantee to prevent Lockheed Aircraft Corporation from going into bankruptcy.

In today's complex economic society, I believe that Lockheed and others similar industrial giants cannot entirely control their own destiny. I believe that the federal government has become so involved that in some instances, a company's failure could be partially a result of government contracts, restrictions, etc. In the case of Lockheed, I believe the CA–5 is an example.

Economic conditions over which Lockheed had little or no control—wages, cost of materials—resulted in huge overruns in the cost of the production of this plane. I believe Lockheed's situation today is partially a result of this government contract.

Thank you again for your letter concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT V. LOGAN,
Executive Vice President.

BANK OF AMERICA,
Torrance, Calif., July 23, 1971.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I am answering your letter of July 13th addressed to Dave Holland. Mr. Holland has since been transferred to our Santa Monica Branch and I have replaced him.

By this time you have undoubtedly received a letter from Mr. Francis Herwood, one of the Bank of America executives, outlining the Bank's position on the Lockheed loan guarantee. As a local bank official and citizen, I fully agree with the Bank's favoring of this guarantee and feel that it is in the best interest of the citizens of California that favorable action would be given this proposal.

Thank you for taking the time to request our local feeling and I shall be happy at any time you are in the area to meet you or assist you in any manner I can.

Yours very truly,

D. E. REVILL,
Manager.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week, on Wednesday the 21st, the House commemorated Captive Nations Week. Additional reports have reached me from activities throughout the country. I insert the following:

The program of the Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations celebration in Los Angeles.

The invitation to the program of the Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations.

A resolution introduced by Dr. Olgierd J. Klejnot, president of the Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations.

Text of the speech by Dr. O. J. Klejnot on the presentation of the Captive Nations Medal to George Putnam, television commentator.

Captive Nations Week appeal by Women for Freedom, Inc.

The material follows:

AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM OF CAPTIVE NATIONS,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 24, 1971.

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
U.S. Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DERWINSKI: At the conclusion of Captive Nations Week, it is my

privilege to send to you an account of the celebration at Los Angeles. The enclosed invitation card gives the particulars. The postcard shows our motto, displayed on a large poster during the ceremony. During the past year we used the motto: Condemn Communist Criminal Conspiracy!

Highlights of the program were: speech by Mr. Jose Norman (Cuba) on Communist threat and training camps for "urban guerrillas" in Castro's Cuba, which have trained 1,500 subversives thus far; speech by Dr. Anthony Butkovich (Croatia) on the role of Captive Nations as the greatest force actually opposing the Soviets (overnight fall of Gomulka!) and ours, as torchbearers for freedom; speech by Dr. Louis Kaufman, president of Los Angeles City College on the school situation; resolution by the assembly.

Enclosed are my introductory remarks and the unanimously voted resolution, which has been sent to the President of the United States. We respectfully request that this text be included in the extensions of remarks in the Congressional Record. We do believe in asking for Freedom of Captive Nations and keeping this idea alive as a burning torch . . . until freedom and independence are achieved for all the captive nations of the world. You may like also the enclosure on the presentation to Mr. Putnam.

We thank you very much for the reprint "The Captive Nations Scorecard". With best wishes for success of your good legislative work in Congress I remain

Very sincerely yours,

Dr. OLGIERD J. KLEJNOT,
President, Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations in Los Angeles.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RALLY AT CIVIC CENTER MALL IN LOS ANGELES, JULY 17, 1971

(Resolution introduced by Dr. Olgierd J. Klejnot, president, Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations, Los Angeles)

Dear Friends for Freedom of Captive Nations: As this annual commemoration comes to a close, we may look at the past Captive Nations Week, and into tomorrow.

Thirteen times has a week been devoted to Captive Nations. We have had proclamations issued and it has been duly documented that Captive Nations do live in captivity and do not have the human rights and freedoms that we enjoy. This was officially expressed by our elected representatives from Congress to the President, to State, County and City. However, a point in time is now reached that begs the question to be asked: how long will this be carried on in this vein? How long will this be deemed sufficient?

It is not enough to condemn the Communist criminal conspiracy. We, the concerned people, should wish to answer the Presidential Proclamation, and to call this answer out for all the world to hear, better than heretofore.

Freedom for the Captive Nations! Not a memorial to past freedom, but live Freedom, now-Freedom to the living, suffering Captive Nations, the captive people!

Therefore, as an example for today, I like to recall the Baltic Freedom Rally of June 13, 1971 at Los Angeles. That Rally was held by our members about the same events, the same peoples and nations. It was the same commemoration of barbaric floods, breaking over outnumbered free people. But it was called Freedom Rally.

Out of that Rally came a County Resolution, respectfully urging the President of the United States to bring the question of the liberation of the Baltic States before the United Nations. For creating this precedent, our deepest-felt thanks to Supervisor Ernest Debs!

Now we, Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations, propose that this assembly of citizens may act as a Freedom Rally for Freedom of All Captive Nations. Let us not be caught commemorating freedom. But on the day commemorating the loss of freedom, let us demand freedom for the unfree, because we are still free to do this, and they are not.

Now, I will read a resolution, which will be voted upon after a second reading and sent to the President of the United States with the signatures of those who would like to put their names under it.

LOS ANGELES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION OF THE LIBERATION OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Whereas, the Captive Nations seized by the Soviet Union languish under a barbaric colonial rule; and

Whereas, these Captive Nations had their independence taken from them by mass murder, aggression and other illegal means; and

Whereas, the notorious, treaty-breaking Soviets tricked this country into illegal agreements, violating the rights of the presently Captive Nations,

Now, therefore, we, citizens of the City and County of Los Angeles, assembled in the Civic Center Mall in Los Angeles to commemorate the glorious traditions of freedom-loving peoples in accordance with the Presidential Proclamation of Captive Nations Week, respectfully request the President of the United States to bring the question of the liberation of the Captive Nations before the United Nations.

PRESENTATION OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS MEDAL TO GEORGE PUTNAM, TV COMMENTATOR

(Text of the presentation Speech by Dr. O. J. Klejnot, on behalf of Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations)

Mr. Putnam, we honor you today as a champion of freedom for the Captive Nations. For many years, you have supplied huge audiences with revealing reports about the Communist criminal conspiracy, attempting to subjugate the whole world outside its present reach. Your subtle and inspired analyses became classics on the subject of freedom under law and constitutional government, as opposed to oppression under tyranny. You have defended the human rights of peoples who are deprived of the freedom of expression—whose speakers are muzzled and silenced. Your thoroughly researched "one reporter's opinions" became a legend in their own time.

Now, therefore, the delegates of nationality groups united in the Americans for Freedom of Captive Nations at Los Angeles have unanimously voted to award to you the highest honor available to us—the President Eisenhower Captive Nations Proclamation Medal. They are here, and represent also many others. They are American Armenians, Bulgarians, Byelorussians, Croats, Cubans, Estonians, Hungarians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Rumanians and Ukrainians.

This medal, founded in 1969 on the tenth anniversary of the Proclamation, has been given previously to such champions of the Captive Nations cause as President Nixon, Senator Goldwater, and here in Los Angeles, Mayor Sam Yorty.

I am proud and privileged to present to you the medal, which bears the quotation from Public Law 86-90 on Captive Nations Week: "The President . . . to issue a . . . proclamation each year until freedom and independence . . . have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK APPEAL BY WOMEN

Women for Freedom and the undersigned women's organizations are appealing to all members of their sex to manifest concern for the millions upon millions of their sisters throughout the world who are still suffering from the burden of being females, and even more so for their religious, political, and social beliefs. These are the enslaved women of the Captive Nations who yearn to express their womanhood through their love of God, family, and friends, but who are denied these basic freedoms by the Communist oppressors of their lands.

Therefore, we call specific attention to the 13th Captive Nations Week which is being observed this year July 18–24 throughout our nation and other free countries. It behooves all women who cherish freedom to participate actively in Captive Nations Week observances in their communities. But beyond this, concerned women should carry forward their commitment to their sisters in captivity through their community groups, organizations, churches, communications media and legislative representatives. In keeping with their love of human dignity, they should seek implementation of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, and through their congressmen, they should work for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. At every opportunity they should strive to call attention to the denial of human rights to our sisters in captivity throughout the world.

For the millions of women who do not share with us the dignity of free and unfettered womanhood, we must offer hope, courage and commitment to help them escape the bondage which destroys them not only as women but as human beings.

This, then, would be a true women's liberation movement!

FEDERALLY FUNDED HOUSING CODE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, urban decay is a problem that afflicts a great many areas of the country, and massive Federal assistance programs are needed not only to restore decayed neighborhoods but to help prevent currently liveable neighborhoods from declining. Members of the House and other readers of the RECORD may be interested in a code enforcement assistance program grant recently made to the city of New York for the Highbridge section of the city, which I have the honor to represent. The success of this and any similar program, of course, requires effective and sensitive administration and community cooperation, and I intend to do everything I can to see that those essential ingredients are present in the operation of this project, which I was active in seeking on behalf of the residents of Highbridge. A report on the code enforcement project from the July 18 New York Times follows:

HIGHBRIDGE GETS A FEDERAL GRANT—MONEY WILL BE USED TO FIGHT DECAY IN BRONX SECTION

(By Edith Evans Asbury)

A Federal program, little used in the four years it has been available to the city, has granted $818,814 for an effort to stave off further deterioration and abandonment of housing in the Highbridge section of the Bronx.

The grant was announced by Representative Jonathan B. Bingham, a democrat, who represents the section. He said it had taken more than two years of effort to persuade city and Federal authorities to approve the

grant, and had required his personal appeal to George W. Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, "to get the ball rolling."

The Federal funds will be used to repair and otherwise improve apartment buildings, install street beds and curbs, improve street lighting and plant trees along the streets.

Loans for up to 20 years at 3 per cent annual interest will be available to owners for building improvements. Owners of one- to four-family buildings who qualify because their income is below a certain level will be given outright grants to improve their properties.

WILL AID FAMILIES

Families found to be living in overcrowded conditions will be assisted in relocating, with expenses for them and stipends for landlords who make facilities available to them.

"It is clear," Representative Bingham said, "that lack of decent housing is one of the most urgent and pressing problems this city faces. It is therefore critical that existing housing be protected and not allowed to drift into the all-too-familiar process of gradual decay and abandonment."

The Federal funds will be administered by the city's Housing and Development Administration through an assistant commissioner, Edward Gibbs, who has charge of its Federal Code Enforcement Program.

Mr. Gibbs will supervise a site office that will have a staff of experts in housing/inspection, architecture, community relations, relocation, mortgage advice, planning and rehabilitation.

"Properly administered, with adequate community consultation, this can be a great program," Representative Bingham said.

Ways and means of achieving proper community involvement in the program were discussed yesterday, he added, at a meeting with community leaders and officials, and Bronx Assemblyman Seymour Posner, a Democrat-Liberal.

Funds from the Federal Code Enforcement Program have been available to the city for rescuing deteriorating housing, but only two other areas have taken advantage of them during the last four years.

U.S. PAYS CITY

One, in the East Concourse section of the Bronx, provided 30 loans totaling $564,900 and six grants totaling $19,387 to owners to bring their property up to code standards.

The other, in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn, provided 72 loans totaling $1,655,250 and 22 grants totaling $72,057.

An additional $4-million was given by the Federal Government to the city in 1967 to pay two-thirds of the cost of public improvements in connection with the two projects.

Mr. Gibbs said the city had applied for seven other areas to receive the aid, but had been rejected for a variety of reasons, some not clear to him.

William Rose, special assistant to S. William Green, regional administrator of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, said that the city had not shown that it could put the money to use with proper speed and had proposed areas "not deemed suitable."

PROBLEMS RELATED TO DISABILITY RETIREMENT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a resident of my district, Mr. George T. Nickolas, has recently written an article which should be of great interest to all members of the armed services. He discusses very knowledgeably and in some detail, the importance of electing disability retirement over regular retirement whenever a person so qualifies. The article follows:

WHY DISABILITY RETIREMENT?

(By George T. Nickolas)

Many of the servicemen now on active duty and many of those who have been released are not aware of the provision of title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (now codified in Title 10, United States Code, principally in Chapter 61). The provisions provide benefits for eligible members whose military service is terminated due to a service-connected disability. This single law is made applicable to officers and enlisted personnel of all the military services.

A member of the Armed Forces on active duty who is found to be unfit to perform his duties because of a disability incurred while entitled to receive basic pay may be either permanently retired or placed on the temporary disability retirement list (TDRL) with retired pay. His disability must be rated at least 30 percent, and be as a result of the performance of active duty, or was incurred during war. Disabilities resulting solely from intentional misconduct, willful neglect, events during a period of unauthorized absence, may mean the loss of disability benefits from the Service or the Veterans Administration.

What problems are being experienced today? First, we all must realize that retirement benefits are paid by the Military Service and thus come out of the Defense Appropriation. This should have no effect on granting a *Disability Retirement*, but it does. When I mentioned retirement benefits, you should note that I did not refer only to pay. Retirement pay is only a part of the benefits that are available to disability retirees. Medical care at Military Medical Facilities, use of the Military Post Exchanges, use of Military Base Facilities (i.e. Pool, Movie, Recreation Facilities, and etc.) use of the Military Commissary, and others, are only provided members of the Military Service who are retired on length of service or retired for physical disability.

What if the base pay of the serviceman, who is to be retired, is low and the 50 percent rating is less dollar wise than the serviceman would receive in compensation benefits from the Veterans Administration? The law provides that the Serviceman can waive a part or all of the Retirement Pay and receive Veterans Administration Compensation. The serviceman must apply to the Veterans Administration after he is retired to be evaluated and a rating established. His rating from the Veterans Administration may differ from that of the military service. But, in any event, the serviceman should maintain his retirement Status in order to receive the other than pay benefits from the military service. The serviceman must report for the periodical evaluations by the military service that are required for the period that he is carried on the TDRL (which is limited to 5 years). Permanent Retirement for disability does not require the serviceman to return for evaluations. Of course, if he draws Veterans Administration benefits, the Veterans Administration may require periodical reviews of his case. If the benefits that a serviceman received from the Veterans Administration (the dollars and cents) decrease below that which he is entitled to receive from the Military Service, then he can change his election and receive benefits from the Military Service.

The current law does not provide benefits for dependents of veterans who are receiving Veterans Administration benefits only!! The Military Retiree's dependents are entitled to benefits from the Military Service. A dependent of a veteran who receives Veterans Administration Compensation only is not entitled to medical care from the Veterans Administration of the Military Service, but a dependent of a military retiree is entitled to care (subject to some limitations) in a Military Hospital or at a Military Base Medical Facility. If no facility is available in the area, the Military Retiree's dependent can utilize civilian medical facilities and the Government will share 75% of the cost subject to limitations and provision of CHAMPUS (Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services).

I think that this is the time to point out that most Veterans Organizations are Veterans Administration oriented and any advice sought from these organizations should be weighed. Of course, there are those members of Veterans Organizations who are themselves retired for disability and are able to relate the correct information, as some of the service officers. The reason to point this out is that the benefits of retirement for enlisted men is something that came into existence following World War II and thus many active members of Veterans Organizations are not entitled to these benefits.

What does a serviceman do to insure that he obtains the maximum benefits he is entitled to? We must, of course, make the assumption that the serviceman has been injured, wounded, or disabled by some disease in the line of duty or while on active duty (even active reserve duty) with the Military Service. The serviceman must request, provided the disability precludes him from performing his duties, that his disability be evaluated. Each Service has its own process leading up to a final decision for each case. These procedures are very similar, but they differ in some details. The initial medical determination is made by a medical board, which will determine exactly what your physical condition is and recommend one of the following to the hospital's commanding officer:

1. That the serviceman be returned to regular duty.
2. That the serviceman be returned to limited duty, that is, duty which can be performed satisfactorily regardless of the disability, providing that it would not aggravate the serviceman's physical condition.
3. That the serviceman be hospitalized pending another examination at a later date.
4. That the serviceman be transferred to another hospital that is better equipped to handle the medical condition.
5. That the serviceman be given an administrative separation; that is, find him physically qualified, but recommend discharge because of inaptitude for military service.
6. Refer the case to a Physical Evaluation Board (PEB).

What is a Physical Evaluation Board? It evaluates the physical condition of the serviceman and determines the physical qualification relative to retirement, discharge, or retention on active duty. It does not make decisions; it passes its recommendation along to higher authority.

What type of determinations can the Service make if the physical disability of the serviceman disqualifies him from the Service? The Service can permanently or temporarily retire the serviceman or give him a disability discharge with severance pay or without severance pay.

Permanent retirement for disability will provide a fixed sum of between 30 and 75% of the basic pay of the serviceman's retired grade each month for the rest of his life. If the serviceman is placed on the Temporary Disability Retired List, he will receive monthly payments of at least 50 percent of the basic pay of his retired grade, but not more than 75 percent, as long as he remains on the list.

If the Service determines that the serviceman is permanently disabled and so retires him with at least 30 percent, he can elect to

receive retirement pay from the Service based on either the percentage of his disability or length of service, whichever will result in the greater amount of money for the serviceman.

If a Service determines that the serviceman's disability is rated at 30 percent or more that *may* be permanent, but which cannot be definitely classed as permanent at the time, and if he is otherwise qualified, he will be placed on the Temporary Disability Retired List (TDRL). There must be some doubt as to whether or not the disability or a degree of disability is of a permanent nature, or whether the condition indicates the serviceman might be acceptable for further service in 5 years' time or less.

By law, a serviceman cannot be kept in the temporary disability retired status longer than 5 years. He must be given periodic medical examinations during that time as often as determined necessary, but at least once in every 18 months. The serviceman must report for the medical examination. All medical examinations are mandatory while a serviceman is on the TDRL even if he has declined his *Service Retirement Pay* in favor of Veterans Administration disability compensation. Failure to report to a designated medical facility when ordered to do so can disqualify the serviceman from maintaining his retirement status and he will lose his entitlement to other benefits of Retirement. If a serviceman is unable to report at that designated time, he can write, immediately upon receipt of the orders to report, and explain why he can not report and ask for another appointment. If the serviceman is a patient in a VA or civilian hospital at the time of his examination appointment, he should notify the agency from which he received the orders of the name and location of the hospital where he is a patient. The Service will then obtain a report of his condition from the hospital. This report will take the place of the required medical examination.

When the examining doctors (or designated reviewing authorities) recommend changing the serviceman's status (and they must do so within 5 years), the case will go back to another Physical Evaluation Board (PEB). Once again, the serviceman will have a choice of being present in person or not, choosing a counsel or not, and of calling witnesses or not. Also, if the serviceman feels that one of the board members is prejudiced, he may challenge his right to remain on the board while the serviceman's case is being evaluated. Sometime, before the end of the 5th year, the case will be forwarded to the Service Secretary's Office and he will decide to order the serviceman "back to duty"; discharge the serviceman with severance pay, if appropriate; or permanently retire the serviceman because of disability. If the decision is "back to duty", he can refuse further assignment, but if the serviceman refuses further assignment, his name is removed permanently from the Service's active and retired lists. If the serviceman chooses to return to active duty, he will be returned in a status as nearly as possible equal to the one which he held when he was placed on the TDRL. The years of service on the TDRL count for basic pay computation, but they do not count as creditable service for retirement.

A serviceman might become anxious to take the fast discharge and not seek the disability retirement. Remember that the serviceman can lose benefits equal to thousands of dollars and will be of benefit to his family or his future family. These benefits are:

1. Privileges of Base Facilities such as the Officers and NCO Open Messes; Commissaries, Exchanges, and FPO's and APO's; Use of field ration dining facilities; Military Theaters; Library services, Dependents' Schools; Clothing Sales Stores; Family Services Center; Aid Societies; Drycleaning and Laundry; Recreation Facilities; Legal Assistance; Transient Quarters; and Base Chapels and Related Facilities.

2. Travel on Department of Defense Aircraft and Ships as follows: Space-Available Travel Overseas; Space-Available Travel within Continental United States; and etc.

3. Medical Care at a Military Medicare facility for the retiree, his wife, legitimate child, dependent parents and parents-in-law, and adopted children.

4. Medical Care in civilian facilities for the retiree, his wife, and legitimate children limited to paying twenty-five percent of the charges for inpatient care (including physician); or in an outpatient basis the retiree will pay the first $50 (the deductible) on himself or the first $100 (deductible) on the family (two or more) each fiscal year, plus 25 percent of the charges in excess of the deductible. The fiscal year run from July 1st of one year through June 30th of the following year.

If the serviceman is already out of the service, and if he is rated 30 percent or greater by the Veterans' Administration, and his disability was incurred in service, he can and should file a DD Form 149 to have his case reviewed by the Correction Boards. The increased number of applications for disability retirement filed with all of the Correction Boards confirms studies which conclude that too many severely disabled servicemen are too often being denied the benefits which they have earned by acquiring a disabling impairment while on active duty with the Armed Forces. It is recommended that the veteran prepare the DD Form 149 with assistance from a *knowledgeable* Veterans Organization Service Officer.

But, the serviceman who is in the service, must make every attempt to have his case reviewed prior to discharge for the purposes of retirement. It has been found that the appeal route is a much more difficult route to take.

The DD 149 appeal states that the appeal must be made within three years from the date of discharge, but, the Boards are reviewing cases in excess of three years because of the many deficiencies in the disability separation program.

AGNEW'S BLACK LEADERS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent furor which surrounded Vice President AGNEW's statements on the subject of America's black leadership, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues a reasoned and factual analysis of Mr. AGNEW's remarks which recently appeared in the July 23 edition of the Washington Post. In "Agnew's Black Leaders," William Raspberry touched on a fact which, in my opinion, is essential not only to an understanding of the Vice President's views, but also those of most black Americans.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a phenomenon which Mr. AGNEW obviously does not perceive and which black citizens refuse to ignore: the time is long since gone when our "leaders" can be ordained and established by white America. The time has come, finally, when we demand at least enough equality to designate those persons who can speak for us on the national level.

It is unfortunate that the second most powerful elected official in this Nation is unable to define black leadership in terms other than their ability to be summoned to his Governor's mansion and be sent away supposedly quaking in fear. I am afraid this lack of perception only reconfirms what many Americans have known since "AGNEW" became a household word: The man does not understand and therefore cannot exercise true leadership.

Mr. Raspberry's article follows:

AGNEW'S BLACK LEADERS

(By William Raspberry)

Spiro T. Agnew is a subtle man, and it is no surprise that so many people have misinterpreted his recent criticism of "those in the United States who have arrogated unto themselves the position of black leaders."

The Vice President's quarrel—and this is the point most people missed—is not with black leaders as such; it is with those who have "arrogated unto themselves" the role of black leadership.

The acceptable way of becoming a black leader is not through self-arrogation but through ordination. No black man can lay just claim to the title "black leader" until he has gone through the proper ritual and been appointed by white folk. (The ritual, you may recall, entails a certain amount of shuffling, head-scratching and Tomming.)

The whole procedure used to be common knowledge. It didn't matter whether you were preacher, principal or supreme exalted potentate of the local lodge, you weren't a black leader until white people said so—or more specifically, until white reporters came to ask you what black folk were thinking about the latest racial controversy.

But this protocol, like so many ancient virtues, has been abandoned by the young and headstrong. Black people no longer are waiting for white ordination but are "arrogating unto themselves" the right to decide who their leaders shall be.

Mr. Agnew, who remembers the old way, doesn't like the trend. I'm not even sure he was aware of the trend until the spring of 1968 when, as governor of Maryland, he ordered Baltimore's black leaders to do something to halt civil disturbances and otherwise keep black folk in line. The black leaders ignored him—walked out on him, in fact—and he has been understandably unforgiving ever since.

Nor is that all that's bothering him. He might have been able to make the necessary adjustments, one supposes, except for another breach of protocol.

Black leaders not only are refusing to be selected by white people, but they also, Mr. Agnew observed, "spend their time in querulous complaint and constant recrimination against the rest of society."

It might as well be said right now: The Vice President was right.

Show me a black leader in the United States and I'll show you a "querulous" complainer. Mr. Agnew, being a gentleman, didn't name names, but you know who he's talking about.

Take the congressional Black Caucus, those people who have "arrogated unto themselves the position of black leaders" in spite of the fact that they were mostly elected by black, not white, people.

They engaged in "carping and complaining," to use the Vice President's words, because they sought, and were refused for 14 months, an audience with the President.

Roy Wilkins and other officers of the NAACP have been "carping and complaining" because they believe the administration is more concerned with politics than with the rights and dignity of black people.

Elijah Muhammad and the Black Muslims have been, well, querulous, because their cattle herds have been poisoned in Alabama, proving that white people won't leave you alone even when being left alone is all you want.

George Wiley of the National Welfare Rights Organization has been particularly querulous in his insistence that the country can afford to make a reasonably adequate income a matter of right.

Bayard Rustin was in town just the other day to complain, querulously and very eloquently, that the administration is inadequately committed to ending racial discrimination in housing opportunity.

And so it goes. About the only black leader who isn't behaving querulously, who in fact spends a lot of time praising the Nixon-Agnew administration is Clay Claiborne, head of the Black Silent Majority Committee.

Since the seed money for Claiborne's organization was put up by the National Republican Congressional Committee (which is to say, white people) it appears he has taken the traditional route to black leadership.

It still isn't clear who his followers are.

WOLE SOYINKA AT THE EUGENE O'NEILL CENTER IN WATERFORD, CONN.

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, we in eastern Connecticut are honored to have the Eugene O'Neill center for the dramatic arts; one of the most innovative and successful theater workshops in the United States. One indication of the success of the center is contained in an article in issue No. 58 of Topic magazine, published by the U.S. Information Agency, for distribution in Africa. The article, which follows, highlights the work of Wole Soyinka, from Ibadan, Nigeria, and his work at the O'Neill center:

THE MAKING OF A PLAY

(By David Lavine)

On a warm summer afternoon a playwright sits in a secluded room drawing on his inner thoughts for a new work. From nearby comes the sound of surf rolling on the Connecticut coast. The artist looks down at his blank sheet of paper, takes his pen and begins to write. A work of dramatic art is about to be born.

The scene might not appear too unusual until you consider the following remarkable items: the playwright is Wole Soyinka, on a working visit to the United States from Ibadan, Nigeria. The work at hand, which will grow to a rich full-length drama in the next several weeks, will be Soyinka's first new play in several years. More important, from the dramatist's point of view, will be his ability to see his material take shape and substance. Each day his words will move from the typewriter to the mimeograph machine and then to the stage, where a company of players he has brought with him from Nigeria will breathe life into his creative output. Together, the playwright and the actors are guests of the Eugene O'Neill Center, one of the most imaginative and richly creative forces in current American theatrical life.

For Wole Soyinka, his contact with the center started with an odd transatlantic telephone call early in 1970 from the center's artistic director Lloyd Richards. In spite of living in the age of communications satellites, neither Richards nor Soyinka could hear each other during the call. They had to rely on the London operator to pass their words along. Enough was said, however, for Richards to set up a flying trip to Nigeria in April to explain more about the center and its objectives to West Africa's leading dramatist.

Establishing a theater to perform the works of new playwrights without the economic pressures of the professional stage affecting the work is the prime purpose of the center. The driving force for this much-needed theatrical outlet comes from George White. In 1964 he purchased an estate in the Connecticut town of Waterford, near the city of New London which was the birthplace and the home for many years of the noted American dramatist Eugene O'Neill.

The O'Neill Center grew rapidly in the next six years; by 1969 nearly 500 aspiring playwrights submitted their works to be considered for production. Fifteen of these plays were accepted and during the summer month they were performed by professional actors at the Waterford theater.

The centre also moved in the exciting directions. It sponsored a Theater of the Deaf, where deaf actors brought unbelievable richness to drama. While narrators spoke the words the players drew out new meanings from the plays by their sensitive insights into movement and mime. Today there are three companies in the National Theater of the Deaf and their performances are enjoyed throughout the world.

The year 1969 added a new dimension to the center's activities. White and Richards decided to seek a non-American playwright who might benefit from the creative atmosphere of the Waterford workshops. They brought to Connecticut from Trinidad poet-playwright Derek Walcot, who had been working for 10 years with his company of actors on his play *The Dream of Monkey Mountain*. It had been a labor of love, carried on in spare moments with scant money. Now, at long last, the actors and the playwright had the chance to develop the script with professional assistance under actual theatrical conditions.

Walcot's work was so successful that the center immediately set out to bring another non-American dramatist to Waterford in 1970. Nigerian Wole Soyinka was the center's considered choice.

The West African dramatist was already known in the United States. He had visited the country on several occasions and a number of his plays had been performed in cities across the nation. *The Trials of Brother Jero* and *The Strong Breed* had drawn much favorable criticism in New York when they were staged in 1967. Other critics had seen and applauded *A Dance of the Forests* and *The Lion and the Jewel* when they were performed in Nigeria. The center hoped that Mr. Soyinka, after troubled years in a Nigerian prison, was now ready to write a new drama.

During their April meeting Lloyd Richards urged Wole Soyinka to come with his company to the United States. He stressed the rising interest in African theater, an interest that was particularly keen in the black urban communities. He told Soyinka that the Connecticut Commission on the Arts would sponsor performances of a new play in various cities throughout the state. Soyinka agreed to make the trip. He had three or four ideas, any one of which might develop into a full-scale play.

By early summer the playwright was well into his drama, *Madmen and Specialists*. A solid, serious man, Soyinka worked at amazing speed and produced a script which had according to *The New York Times'* drama critic, "language with an almost Shakespearean soar to it." *Madmen and Specialists* is a complicated allegorical play about a young doctor who rejects a career in medicine to become a tyrannical political figure. Woven into the play is a chorous of four beggars commenting obliquely on life. It is a haunting work of art, full of imagery and ideas, which was to demand the complete attention of the audience. Through it throbbed the music of Nigeria.

During the time Soyinka and his company were relaxing they were able to stroll along the wide lawns of the center, pausing to watch the other plays that were in rehearsal. Each day was a casual yet intense sharing of dramatic experience among the actors and writers, the designers and critics. Here the real significance of the center made itself felt. A community of artists were enlarging upon each other's work by their comments, their exchange of ideas and their mutual presences.

For the Nigerian visitors the transition to an American summer was less difficult than an outsider might imagine. The world of the theater links actors and playwrights together, regardless of culture and heritage. For the most part all the actors at the center shared common living quarters at a neighboring university. The center scheduled trips to the nearby dance festival at Jacob's Pillow and to America's Stratford in Connecticut where Shakespeare's plays are staged in a lavishly reproduced Elizabethan theater.

In general the meals served to all at the center were standard American cooking, with the exception of a generous addition of rice for the Nigerian troupe. Perhaps there was, however, some mild puzzlement for the visitors when they received sweatshirts with a picture of Eugene O'Neill stencilled on the front. These shirts are part of George White's ubiquitous advertising campaign for his energetic center.

Early in August, Soyinka was ready to take *Madmen and Specialists* on the road for full-scale working rehearsals. One member of the cast designed a handsome poster, catching the folk-feeling evoked by the play. The first performance was in Bridgeport before an audience of children, who enjoyed the rhythms but were mystified by the content of the work. Performances followed in New Haven and Waterbury and then came the world premiere at the Eugene O'Neill Center. The audience was excited and enthralled. "Marvelous to listen to," said *The New York Times*, adding, "The play is complex, not always penetrable, but it forces, and deserves, attention. It is one of those rare pieces of theater that you would like to discuss with the author after the performance." Further, commenting on Soyinka as the director, the review says, "He has very resourcefully used the amphitheater stage and also the entrance ramp as playing areas. With a minimum of scenery and with actors miming props he has successfully evoked his exotic environment—even as the Connecticut foghorns bleat incessantly in the background."

For Wole Soyinka there was to be still another high point to his visit to the United States. He and his company traveled to New York to present the play first in New York University's Black Arts Theater and then in the city's Harlem section, where for several nights standing-room-only audiences cheered the production. It was clear that the men and women of America's largest black community felt the play to be part of their own heritage. Lloyd Richards commented that *Madmen and Specialists* could have gone on forever in the Afro-American Theater on New York's 125th Street.

The summer over, Soyinka and his troupe returned to Ibadan University, leaving behind them splendid memories for those audiences fortunate enough to see one of their productions. At the Eugene O'Neill Center there is the hope that much more of Soyinka's material will soon be available for the American stage.

PREDATOR CONTROL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 29, I will reintroduce with cosponsors H.R. 9668, a bill which would prohibit the use of poisons on public lands unless specifically approved by the Secretary of the Interior, in conjunction with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The response from my colleagues has been gratifying and I appreciate their wise counsel and recommendations regarding the measure.

For the benefit of my colleagues and for the benefit of all who believe that wildlife should be preserved rather than decimated, I am including in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in today's New York Times describing the Government's attitude toward predators—an attitude that must be changed:

LOSS OF A FEW EAGLES

The bald eagle, traditional symbol of the United States, is under imminent threat of extinction—with the tacit encouragement and active participation of the Department of the Interior.

In the single month of May, the remains of 48 bald and golden eagles were found in one section of Wyoming—a huge proportion of all the eagles estimated to be in the state. How many others have died in remote mountainous regions of the West cannot be known. Sheep ranchers persecute eagles because occasionally one may swoop down and make off with a lamb. Such depredations are rare, but the Interior Department, conscious of the political power of ranchers, allows them to shoot eagles, a slaughter known as "seasonably protecting livestock."

Even more dangerous to these birds, however, is the Department of the Interior's incredible "predator control" program. Huge quantities of poisoned meat and poisoned grain are placed out in the open to attract the coyote, the wolf, the mountain lion and other predators. These potent poisons not only kill the animal that eats the grain or meat but also kills any bird or animal that eats the poisoned animal's carcass. The consequences of this monstrous program, along with the despicable bounty system, have been devastating for a wide range of birds and animals.

This arbitrary attempt at control has inevitably upset the balance of nature. Most predators, for example, do not live primarily by eating agricultural livestock. They prey upon rodents such as rabbits, squirrels and field mice. With the predators poisoned off, these rodents multiply, and more poisons are spread around to get rid of them.

The Council on Environmental Quality in cooperation with the Interior Department has recently launched the first comprehensive assessment of public and private predator control programs. A report is due in October. Meanwhile, Senator Bayh of Indiana and Representative Anderson of California are sponsoring a bill to ban the use of poisoned bait on the public lands. It would be a major advance though not the complete answer.

A true solution would require a change in public attitudes in the West. The anachronistic viewpoint which still prevails there was expressed the other day by a county prosecutor in Wyoming after a rancher responsible for the poisoning of at least 22 eagles was let off with the minimum fine. The prosecutor after fulsomely praising the rancher, said: ". . . ranching is still the backbone of the state. Predator losses are a problem for all of them and predator control is more important than the loss of a few eagles."

In reality sheep raising is a declining and marginal industry which is kept alive by Government subsidies of which predator control is one, bounties another, and ridiculously low grazing fees for use of the public lands still another. But the prosecutor's words express an attitude also found in the Wildlife Bureau of the Interior Department. It is an unconscionable outrage that agencies of the United States Government go on blindly participating in this folly.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT PREDICTIONS GLOOMY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the main concerns of our people in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District is the future of agriculture and more especially, the family farm.

This concern was well expressed in an editorial written by Gordon Duenow in the Little Falls Daily Transcript.

To share this concern with my colleagues and all of those interested people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert Mr. Duenow's editorial in the RECORD:

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT PREDICTIONS GLOOMY

We hope many of our readers noted a story on the editorial page of Tuesday's Transcript which reported a story by Agriculture Department economists predicting that by 1980 more than half the nation's food and fiber will be coming from about 95,000 big farms.

In an area such as Morrison County this is big and bad news for everyone as agriculture is our dominant industry. While it may be possible to expand industry in our towns by 1980, it still is important to keep what industry we have—and that includes our farming industry.

We have noticed the steadily declining Little Pig Market in Little Falls each week and wonder how many people realize the amount of purchasing power which has been lost. For instance, last Saturday little pigs were selling for only $12 per head. As there were 988 little pigs sold, this represented income for the producers of nearly $12,000. Not an insignificant amount and highly important to the producer as well as the rest of us as much of this money is spent right in our area.

When you realize that only a year ago little pigs were selling for about twice as much it is readily apparent that over $10,000 in spending power has gone somewhere else. We mention somewhere else because most of us must know that pork prices in grocery stores aren't much cheaper today, if any, than they were a year ago. We pay the same for our food but the farmer gets less for his product.

It isn't much consolation to read stories such as printed in Tuesday's Transcript that the total number of U.S. farms is likely to drop from nearly 2.9 million this year to about 1.9 million in 1980, a decline of about 50 per cent. Imagine how a decline of 30 per cent in the rural population of Morrison County by 1980 would affect all of us.

The fact that nearly five per cent of the surviving farms in 1980, according to the study "projections," will be big operations with annual sales of $100,000 or more a year won't be of much help. Also the information that while the big farms will account for only five per cent of all units and produce more than 50 per cent of all cash receipts from farm marketing won't help us here much either.

Apparently these big farms will produce just as much food so the rest of us won't have to worry about starving. All we'll have to worry about is finding the money to buy the food.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S DENUNCIATION OF BLACK LEADERSHIP IN AMERICA

HON. RALPH METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1971

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, Vice President AGNEW's recent remarks concerning black leadership in the United States are divisive and misleading. Mr. AGNEW stated that black leaders in the United States spend their time in "querulous complaint and constant recrimination against the rest of society." The Vice President seems to equate a state of healthy discontent which exists when individuals believe and say so publicly that their Government is capable of doing better in meeting the demands of its citizens with what he terms "carping" and "complaining." The former is really an affirmation of one's belief in society to effect an orderly change.

It is indeed ironic that the Vice President of the United States should lecture individuals of any group on the qualities of leadership.

Instead of being critical, the Vice President should try to implement the recommendations of the congressional black caucus.

Where did Mr. AGNEW obtain his instant expertise in the affairs of black people which qualifies him to criticize the black leadership of this country?

The black leadership of this country should be commended for addressing itself to the problems of the country and for attempting to offer viable alternatives to present policies which are not working This is not the time for senseless criticism. This is a time for constructive suggestions.

The late Malcolm X put it this way:

Our objective is complete freedom, complete justice, complete equality. That never changes. Complete and immediate recognition and respect as human beings, that doesn't change. That's what all of us want. I don't care what you belong to, you still want that recognition and respect as a human being.

Mr. Speaker, the late and distinguished Frederick Douglass, hardly a complaining and capricious individual, said a long time ago:

No man can be truly free whose liberty is dependent upon the thought, feeling and actions of others, and who has himself no means in his own hands for guarding, protecting, defending and maintaining that liberty. The law, on the side of freedom, is of

great advantage where there is power to make that law respected. I know of no class of my fellowmen, however just, enlightened and humane, who can be wisely and safely trusted absolutely with the liberties of any other class.

In his inaugural address the President said that he, and one would think his entire administration of which the Vice President is a part, would be committed to ending the divisiveness that exists in this country. It appears as though the Vice President is pursuing a different course.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to either repudiate the remarks of his Vice President or inform the American public if his position has changed since he delivered his inaugural address.

The Vice President has a history of indulging in name calling rather than addressing himself to the substantive points raised by those who disagree with him. We are not too sure whether Mr. AGNEW's name calling as a course of action is merely the man's style or an indication that he is unable to enter into a discussion of important issues.

In the final analysis history will be the judge as to who was "querulous," the Vice President or the leaders to whom he refers; those who have committed themselves to effectively articulating the legitimate demands of the blacks and the poor or the individual who decided to indulge in name calling while on a goodwill tour representing the United States.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 3 weeks ago we celebrated the Fourth of July. That day was set aside as a national holiday so that we might be able to reflect upon the meaning of our independence, to be thankful that we are able to exercise our guaranteed rights—to speak freely, to worship our own God, to vote, to assemble freely—for each of us to live our lives as we wish. But there are many people throughout the world who have no cause to set aside a day to celebrate, for when millions ponder the meaning of freedom, they are thinking of something they are denied.

For the 13th consecutive year, the third week in July has been declared Captive Nations Week. During this week it is altogether proper that we should turn our eyes to those less fortunate. It is important that we recognize that the oppressed peoples of the world are not satisfied with their plight. The events of Czechoslovakia in 1968 clearly demonstrated the desire of a people to lift the yoke of their oppression. The brutal response to the Czech policies of liberalization offered vivid testimony to the unpopularity of the Russian Government—for it is only a nation without the popular endorsement of its policies that has need to resort to repressive measures. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that in every oppressed nation of the world, men are struggling to attain freedom for themselves and their people. These men merit our recognition and deserve our applause. It is their fervent dream of liberty that moves them to act, and we should do nothing to discourage them in their endeavors.

There is no better time than Captive Nations Week for the American people to rededicate themselves to the ideals of liberty and to the principle that all men the world over should be free to live their lives as they desire. Let us never become so self-centered a nation that we forget our less fortunate brethren across the seas.

PADEREWSKI WOULD NOT APPRECIATE MEMORIAL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an interesting commentary on the constant struggle for the minds of men between the free world and communism was dramatized in an article by Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished foreign correspondent of the Copley Press, which appeared in the Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News on July 14. The editorial tells of the efforts of the Polish Communist ambassador to Washington to ride the coattails of the high esteem which the American public has for the great Polish hero and pianist, Paderewski.

The article follows:

PADEREWSKI WOULD NOT APPRECIATE MEMORIAL

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—The Communists have some nerve. When they don't have heroes of their own, they steal them from someone else.

Look at the case of the Polish artist and national hero Ignace Jan Paderewski who died 30 years ago.

He would turn in his grave to know that the Polish Communist ambassador to Washington had the audacity to stage a memorial at Paderewski's grave in Arlington National Museum. To him a puppet Communist regime in Poland would be anathema. He fought for the independence of his country throughout his adult life.

Born in Russia in 1880 of Polish parents, Paderewski became one of the world's leading pianists and composers, but his musical career did not impede his fight for the independence of his country, which was then under Russian occupation. During World War I he came to the United States as the representative of the Polish National Committee.

It was at Paderewski's insistence that President Woodrow Wilson included into his famous Fourteen Points a clause proposing the independence of Poland.

The Peace Treaties of Paris 1919 granted Poland independence and Paderewski became prime minister in Jan. 17, 1919. He resumed his musical career in 1921. The Russians never gave up the idea of recapturing the lost territories and in 1920 the Bolshevik armies attacked the new country reaching the gates of Warsaw. They were repelled by the armies of Marshal Josef Pilsudski.

The Hitler-Stalin pact of August, 1939 which triggered World War II brought Paderewski back into the political fight. When his country was dismembered by the invading Nazi and Soviet armies, he became chairman of the Polish National Council in Paris. After the fall of France he came to the United States where he died. President Franklin D. Roosevelt decreed he should be buried in Arlington until such time that his body could be returned to a free Poland.

That day still hasn't dawned.

The effrontery of the Reds to try to claim him as their own is nothing new.

"This should surprise no one," says a Polish exile leader. "The Communists want to acquire stature, gain respectability by associating the memories of dead patriots with their own system. They are past masters at rewriting history."

The Communist wreath at Arlington was not unchallenged. Michael Kwapiszewski, a former member of cabinet in the Free Government of Poland in exile, placed a wreath on the patriot's grave on behalf of freedom-loving Poland. In other cities meetings, concerts and other remembrances were staged on June 29. Paderewski remains a symbol of the Polish fight for freedom and independence.

THE CITY POLITIC

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, home rule is the subject of great debate in New York City and State. I should like to bring to the attention of our colleagues an article which appeared in the July 19 issue of New York magazine on that subject written by our colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH) and the very distinguished Democratic county leader of New York's Queens County, Matthew Troy, Jr.

The article follows:

THE CITY POLITIC

(By EDWARD KOCH and Matthew Troy, Jr.)

There's nothing new about New York City getting knocked around by upstate Republican legislators. Historically, for better or worse, New York City has been dominated by Democrats, the state government by Republicans. It has been a continual contest for political power with the interests of the 8 million people in this town caught in the middle. We are the shuttlecock and never more so than now with a weak mayor, who is neither Republican nor Democrat, and a strong Republican governor who owes his re-election to a 740,000 victory margin provided by suburban and upstate voters.

The Albany performance this year was truly a political mugging of the mayor and his administration. But, of course, the real victims, as always, are the people—the welfare mother with her children's food budget cut 10 per cent; the elderly couple on a fixed income threatened by a harassing landlord who wants to decontrol their apartment; and the young middle-income family wanting to flee the city as taxes go higher and services deteriorate.

It is not a pleasant picture, and little wonder that the mayor starts talking about making New York a "national city" chartered by the federal government so it can "receive broad federal financial support in order to insure functions of national responsibility." What the mayor is probably trying to say is that the federal government will look more kindly upon New York City's fiscal crisis if it becomes Washington's adopted child. Well, we already have one

"national city"—Washington, D.C.—and if anyone thinks the federal goverment cares for its own with greater largess than Albany, he ought to go down and talk to the frustrated and bitter residents of the District of Columbia. New Yorkers may be underdogs, but D.C. residents are no more than chattel to the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition that rules the city.

The mayor is also seriously studying the concept of a 51st state which was put on the recent political map by the Mailer-Breslin campaign in 1969. Mailer commented then that "if Lindsay were to run on a 51st state platform, statehood would arrive in 22 years." Incidentally, the novelty of the 51st state must take second place to the scheme of Fernando Wood, a corrupt New York mayor (William Marcy Tweed apprenticed under him), who recommended to the City Council in 1861 that New York not only break its ties with Albany but secede from the Union and become a free city. It happened, at the time, that New York City's business interests had $150 million in long-term crop loans with the South. Fortunately, the City Council did not accede to the mayor's request.

Whether or not a breakaway city-state is what the mayor thinks we need, no one should try to run away from the political realities that have brought on all this talk. New York City's fate is largely governed by the political relationship between the governor and the mayor. New York City suffers most when a politically weak major confronts a politically strong governor beholden to upstate interests. The political realities today are just that. John Lindsay is not the leader of the New York City Democrats or Republicans, and he and Rockefeller have been personally feuding for years. The mayor's endorsement of Goldberg for governor last year didn't help matters either. It didn't help Goldberg and, as things turned out, it certainly didn't help those "8 million New Yorkers" on whose behalf the mayor made the endorsement.

As a last resort, New York City's interests have been best protected when the governor has had the political incentive and courage to use his veto power on the city's behalf. The Albany legislature has rarely mustered the two-thirds vote in either house to override a governor's veto, since no opposition party normally has enough elected assemblymen or senators to do it. Can anyone imagine a Democratic governor permitting the Albany legislature to do what it did to the city this year?

If this political analysis is correct, perhaps the first order of business is not the 51st state but the challenge to secure a Democratic majority in both the Senate (the current balance: R–32; D–25) and the Assembly (R–79; D–71) in 1972, to elect a Democratic mayor in 1973 and a Democratic governor in 1974. Democratic Party victories might be the fastest way to establish a better political balance with Albany and to win greater "home rule" for New York City. Historically, political leverage has been largely dictated by the extent to which New York City has been permitted to exercise local power without legislative interference from Albany.

For a long time, New York City was so underrepresented in the state legislature that the movement for "home rule" was considered the only way the city could protect itself from Albany's determination to run the city's affairs. Until a 1962 U.S. Supreme Court decision mandated "one man-one vote" in legislation apportionment, New York City paid dearly for the consequences of its underrepresentation in Albany. Albany has never had a very high opinion of New York City—"a sewer of ignorance and corruption flowing in upon it from foreign lands" was the remark of one upstate delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1894 which, nonetheless, gave the city its first measure of local autonomy.

Despite some improvements in "home rule" provisions through successive constitutional amendments, the state legislature with the help of the state courts has limited the scope and undermined the intent of such constitutional provisions. The judicial doctrine of "state concern" has practically given Albany a free rein in regulating by statute the property, affairs and government of New York City.

Democratic Party success at the polls should create a more favorable political balance with Albany. But with New York City losing population to the suburbs, we will want the support of upstate urban legislators, both Republican and Democrat, who also have a stake in working for genuine "home rule." With a majority in the state legislature, New York, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Yonkers and Albany should press for a constitutional amendment allowing the "big-six cities" to exercise all powers not specifically denied to them by the state constitution.

It seems that a coalition with upstate legislators formed around the issue of "home rule" is more feasible than trying to muster a legislative majority for the creation of New York City as the 51st state. Some people have suggested that a legislative majority for the 51st state might be found by enlarging the city-state's territorial boundaries and seeking the support of suburban legislators. Though metropolitan area planning points in that direction, political realities again intrude to remind us that the suburbs are not quite ready to cast their lot with what they believe to be the crew of the Titanic. We must prove them wrong before we shall ever get them to join us.

In the meantime, the Democratic Party is going to have to start winning some elections, and soon. The best interests of New York City do not rest with any one party, but the political imbalance in New York State today is destroying our city. Until a more acceptable political balance is struck with our suburban neighbors and upstate antagonists, "home rule" can never be won and the 51st state will remain just a fashionable fantasy.

THE PLIGHT OF THE PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ZION) asked his colleagues to each make a 1-minute speech condemning the treatment of the American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia; the idea was to have a Congressman speak every day, for as many days as there were volunteers. I am one of those who volunteered to participate.

The gentleman from Indiana requested that each participant mention length of time that has elapsed since the first American was captured. I am not going to do that. Instead, I am going to state the length of time that is going to elapse until the men are released, if our Government's present policies continue.

It will be forever.

If we plan on leaving a residual force indefinitely, if we plan on continuing massive air support indefinitely, the other side is not going to release the prisoners. It is not even required to do so by the Geneva Convention.

So I say this to my distinguished colleagues: If you really care about the prisoners, urge the President to set a date for complete withdrawal, and let us see if the other side lives up to its offer to return the prisoners as we withdraw.

If, on the other hand, you value Thieu more than the prisoners, or you value good relations with the White House more than the prisoners, admit it, and submit your honest views to your constituents next November.

The prisoners do not need 1-minute speeches. They do not need crocodile tears. They do not need petitions to Hanoi, or James Bond military extravagances. They need a withdrawal date.

CHARLES H. PURKISS, A LEADER IN RAILROAD LABOR

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the House's attention to the retirement of an old friend and former colleague of mine from our railroading days together, Charles H. Purkiss, of Colton, Calif. He closed out last December 31 a distinguished career that covered 48 years of service to his company, his community, his fellow workers, the State, and the Nation.

Back in the days when it required a great deal of courage to assume leadership in such matters, Charlie Purkiss helped organize the Colton Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railway, Airline, and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. For nearly 35 years I have been a member of this organization and remain so today, and so, accordingly, had a unique opportunity to follow the efforts of Charlie Purkiss on behalf of the BROC and railroad workers in general. Charlie held various offices in the lodge throughout his long career with the Pacific Fruit Express Division of Southern Pacific Railroad. In 1960, he was elected to the board of trustees of the Southern Pacific System Board of Adjustment. In 1964, he was elected secretary-treasurer of the brotherhood's State legislative committee, and 3 years later he became chairman of the legislative committee. In that capacity he devoted full time to the job of scrutinizing the activities of the California Legislature and representing the interests of the State's working men and women. My friends in the brotherhood tell me Charlie Purkiss was one of the finest chairmen the legislative committee has ever had.

He also has been a leader in the Masonic organization, having served as Master of the Colton Masonic Lodge and charter member and Venerable Master of the San Bernardino Scottish Rite bodies. He is a 32d degree Mason.

Charlie decided to retire after he had learned he was suffering from a disease known as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, sometimes referred to as ALS. In the 30 years since the famed baseball player, Lou Gehrig, was struck down by this same disease, medical science has not

learned to cope with it. I understand that scientists working under the direction of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke have made progress in their studies of ALS and feel that they are getting closer to the time when they will develop a cure for it. I hope Members will keep that in mind, Mr. Speaker, when we vote this week on appropriations for this Institute and others of the National Institutes of Health.

Charlie Purkiss is now fighting a courageous battle against the effects of ALS, with the constant help of his lovely wife, Katherine. As with other friends who know of their ordeal, they have my admiration and my prayers.

MODEL DRUG PROGRAM IN MORRIS COUNTY

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written recently about the alarming use of drugs among our teenagers. Despite extensive discussion in the press regarding various aspects of drug abuse, there still appears to be an appalling amount of misinformation among many parents about drugs.

This was revealed in two surveys, commissioned by the Morris County Department of Drug Abuse. It happens that I live in Morris County, which forms part of the Fifth District of New Jersey. The executive director of the county department of drug abuse ordered the attitude studies in the belief that a meaningful program to combat drug abuse should take into account how people felt about the problem. One of the disturbing findings was the lack of information and misinformation among parents of teenagers about the various drugs and their effects. Related to this information gap, evident in both surveys, was the marked difference in attitudes toward drugs between parents and children. This could indicate that many parents are ill-prepared to have meaningful discussions with their children about drugs.

Of particular interest is the finding that most adults are caught in a "dilemma of immobility." In other words, parents are often full of anxiety about the drug problem but tend to avoid direct action to resolve problems that they have correctly identified as lying within the home. Instead, many adults tend to want reassurances that someone else is doing the job.

On the basis of these surveys, Morris County has decided to put as much emphasis on educating and involving adults as it has on educating teenagers. One adult education program, experimentally introduced last year, has had such favorable response that it is now being expanded to cover the whole county. One neighborhod volunteer attends a three-session workshop at the county drug abuse department; he or she then organizes one or more coffee hours with other parents in the neighborhood. The department provides literature, films and discussion topics and gives guidance on organization and followup.

Besides bringing information to adults, Paul J. Megan, the leader of Morris County's effort against drug abuse, is instituting a new program of reaching out to the teenagers. He has assembled a traveling roadshow that will bring music and entertainment to the places where young people congregate. With the roadshow will be 10 to 15 young drug abuse specialists who will talk with the young during the concerts. Their chief aim will be to establish rapport and credibility for the drug education program that these specialists will present at junior and senior high schools throughout the county this fall.

Morris County is fortunate indeed to have an imaginative and vigorous program dealing with various aspects of drug abuse. Mr. Speaker, in the hope that other persons might benefit from knowing about such a program, I insert in the RECORD certain materials describing the neighborhood coffee hours and the summer youth program:

ORGANIZATION OF A NEIGHBORHOOD COFFEE ON DRUG ABUSE

1. Attendance at a 3-session orientation workshop at The Morris County Department of Drug Abuse. The workshop includes:

(a) An overview of the drug scene specifically as it applies to Morris County.

(b) Discussion of rehabilitation techniques.

(c) Discussion of prevention-education programs in Morris County.

(d) Pertinent literature.

(e) Screening of films on drug abuse.

(f) Adequate opportunity for questions and discussion.

2. Within 2 weeks after the workshop each volunteer should make arrangements with several couples from his neighborhood to spend an evening over coffee and cake to discuss the drug abuse problem, specifically how it applies to home and neighborhood.

3. After the discussion date is set distribute literature to the participants several days prior to the coffee. The reading materials will include:

(a) "Issues, Attitudes and Responses to drug use in Morris County."

(b) "Programs of The Morris County Department of Drug Abuse."

(c) Pamphlets from the National Institute of Mental Health.

These materials will be provided free of charge by The Drug Communications Control Center, 539–0460.

4. Confirm the discussion by telephone the day before.

5. At the coffee use the notes and discussion guide prepared during the orientation. Take notes at your coffee. Remember the purpose of the discussion is to raise people's level of awareness and concern about the drug problem. Giving correct answers is not as important as raising intelligent questions. The most significant impact of the discussion will take place after everyone has gone home in the days and weeks that follow.

6. Within 10 days contact each of the participants once more. Get their feedback on the discussion—did they get anything out of it? What did they learn? Could they suggest any ways to improve the discussion? Then tell them that you have another piece of literature: "Drugs in Suburbia" reprinted from the *Wall Street Journal* for them to read. Invite them to attend a follow-up coffee. Make arrangements for a second session within 6 to 8 weeks of the first session. In any case distribute the *Wall Street Journal* article. *Follow-up is very important for effective communication.*

7. The second coffee should pick up on significant questions and ideas generated in the first session. Your notes should help you recall these. The objectives of this coffee is to re-inforce positive attitudes presented earlier and to communicate any observations and insights generated during the intervening weeks since the first coffee. The discussion guide developed for the first meeting can serve as a model.

8. Make participants aware of the many services available through the Department of Drug Abuse and the Drug Communications Control Center. Encourage people to call the Center for any or all questions or problems about drugs. Arrangements can be easily made for private counselling sessions.

"SUNSHINE" PUTS DRUG INTERVENTION IN NEW LIGHT

MORRISTOWN, N.J.—Young people from Morris County have been hard at work this summer planning a new approach to the drug problem. "Most of the drug prevention programs are not appealing to young people," says Jeff Warren of Rockaway Township. "We need to reach kids at their level and speak to them in their language," he commented.

"Sunshine, Inc." is an answer to this need in Morris County. It is a combination of programs developed with the endorsement of the County Drug Council aimed at establishing channels of communication with youth of all ages. The most notable aspect of "Sunshine, Inc." is a traveling road show featuring two popular local musical groups. Oolium Cannis, a rock band, will premiere the "Sunshine" program on July 21 at Lake Shawnee's first beach in Jefferson Township "Ho-Hum", a folk-singing group, will also be featured in the initial presentation.

"We feel that the music will give us an entree to the young people so that we can then engage them in a meaningful dialogue," said Paul Megan, Director of the County Drug Dept. under whose auspices the "Sunshine" program is being conducted. The purpose of the dialogue is to point out to youth that there are alternatives to drugs. The County-wide effort presumes that the most effective way to lure kids away from an interest in drugs is to offer them exciting alternatives.

"Interesting kids in alternatives to drugs is what our phase of 'Sunshine' entails," say Mike Hunter and Bill Hennessey. As college-age staff members of the Dept. of Drug Abuse they have set up a variety of "turn-ons." Free classes in yoga, candlemaking, macrame, karate and a variety of other appealing activities are being set up in Morristown and Parsippany. "We have to do more than just talk about alternatives," the organizers commented, "we have to be able to point kids to them and encourage them to get involved."

Following the opening night at Lake Shawnee, the "Sunshine" crew plans regular stops at several key locations in Morris County. Arrangements for these congregating points are being made in cooperation with many municipal Drug Abuse Councils. A vehicle to carry entertainers and their equipment has been provided through the courtesy of Warner-Lambert of Morris Plains.

The idea of a road show and the arts and crafts "Alternatives" seems to have captured the imagination of many citizens who recognize this as an opportunity to help with the drug problem. The Dept. of Drug Abuse has indicated that it is anxious to have the assistance of any group or individual interested in sponsoring the road show or other activities in their community. Further information can be obtained by calling 539–2800.

EDUCATORS BEHIND BUSING EIGHT BALL

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of all Members to what I consider to be an outstanding analytical commentary on how forced school busing has continued to drain the lifeblood of quality education from the school systems of the South. The article, authored by nationally syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick, appeared Monday, July 26, 1971, in the Mobile Register and I hereby submit it for inclusion in today's RECORD:

EDUCATORS BEHIND BUSING 8-BALL

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

ROANOKE, Va.—Several hundred principals, supervisors, and others engaged in education at the elementary school level met here a few days ago for a conference on what ails them. The delegates came from six southern states, whites and blacks alike and for three days they listened dutifully to a program built around trade unionism and the new worry of "accountability."

These are important concerns. The unionization of public school teachers has become a fact of education life, and the principals, understandably, were eager to know all those things about contract negotiation they always had been afraid to ask. The business of accountability embraces the growing demand of parents for a kind of quality control in the classrooms: If Miss Jackson's third-grade pupils fail to learn to read at third-grade levels, fire Miss Jackson.

But back in their rooms, or over a drink in the hotel pub, these deeply troubled professionals were not talking of militant unions or critical parents. They were talking of busing. A summer conference at a modestly posh hotel ought to mean happy times. These were the saddest sessions I ever sat in on.

The term "busing" has come to mean a great deal more than the mere physical transportation of pupils from Point A to Point B. In today's lexicon, it connotes such measures as "pairing" and "clustering" and "closing" and by extension it takes in all the problems of discipline, white flight, and school-community relations that afflict Southern school systems today.

By way of example, consider two elementary schools in a major Southern city. One of them, Hyde Park, on the east side of town, is located in a section of the city that has been wholly black for 70 years. The other, Bellhaven, on the west side, serves a neighborhood once wholly white but now substantially mixed. Each of the schools has a capacity of 800 pupils.

Under court order, Hyde Park and Bellhaven were paired for the 1970–71 school year. Roughly 160 white children were shipped every day to Hyde Park, and roughly 120 black children were shipped every day to Bellhaven. All six grades were maintained at each school, and the situation created problems that were "real but not intolerable."

For the coming year, the schools are to be "split-paired." The local District Court has decreed that all schools in the city system must be racially mixed, as nearly as may be practicable, in a ratio of 65 blacks to 35 whites. A part of the decree requires that Hyde Park abolish its kindergarten, first, second and third grades; and the Bellhaven abolish its four, fifth, and sixth grades. The object is to place 520 blacks and 280 whites in each school.

The principal of Bellhaven, who happened to be telling me all this, is a plump fellow in his early fifties; his face looks as if all the happiness had been squeezed out. He has spent the past six weeks, since the school year ended, in these educational endeavors. He has moved all his school furniture for fourth, fifth, and sixth graders to Hyde Park, and he has received like shipments in return. He has worked with his librarian in purging the Bellhaven shelves of 2,000 books beyond the third-grade level, and he is swapping these with the Hyde Park collection for tiny tots.

Mostly he has been on the phone with parents. His opposite number, eleven miles across town, has been equally engaged. Infuriated black parents are threatening violence and boycott. Outraged white parents have filed 230 requests for pupil records as a preliminary to placing their children in private schools. The principal of Bellhaven at this moment has no idea "if I can produce my 280 whites." He won't know until September 7.

I do not identify the city or the principal; educators have been warned they may be in contempt of court if they publicly criticize busing. Those are not the true names of the two schools. But the story is absolutely true. It is entirely typical. Down in Austin, Texas, the government has been demanding imposition of a plan that would give each school the same ethnic mix of the city at large—64.6 per cent white, 20.4 per cent Chicano, and 15.1 per cent black. This is education? No. This is madness.

ANNIVERSARY OF MOON LANDING

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I witnessed the launching of Apollo 15 with its crew members—Astronauts Worden, Scott, and Irwin. As a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I would like to take a moment to wish these men the best fortune in their journey to the moon. The knowledge gained from these manned space flights is invaluable in advancing the cause of peace and better living for all mankind.

But I also think it is noteworthy to mention at this time that it was just 2 short years ago on July 20, 1969, that Neil Armstrong became the first man to set foot on the moon. This anniversary seems to have gone by almost unnoticed by most people.

I realize that our world is beset with many problems and often our personal dilemmas make us forget the great events of our time. But should our memories be so short that we fail to remember one of the truly historic moments in all man's history?

The effort involved in performing a task of this magnitude includes countless man-hours of self-sacrifice by thousands of people associated with the space program. Their ability and knowledge have enabled this country to take a major part in exploring space and the planets which are earth's neighbors.

Apollo 11 was the first step, and the missions that followed have enhanced America's prestige throughout the world. We are grateful to those men who have had the courage to participate in our entire space effort over the years.

And to the men of Apollo 15, again may I say God be with you and thank you from all America.

PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF BANGLA DESH

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, as you know from my previous statements and from the resolutions and statutes I have introduced, I continue to be much concerned with the refugee problem of the Bengali people in the area known as East Pakistan.

My primary concern is the famine and cholera problem facing these refugees and the express desire to prevent the shipment of American arms to Pakistan.

I would like to call your attention to certain political activities which are taking place in that area. While I do not recommend that any action be taken at this time, I think it well for us to be apprised of the fact that East Pakistan has declared its independence as the new nation of Bangla Desh. Pakistan, as an entity, had 130 million. In West Pakistan there are 55 million. The Bengali in what was East Pakistan numbered 75 million. If the new nation of Bangla Desh—translated, this means "Bengali homeland"—becomes independent now, it will be the eighth largest nation in the world. Only China, India, the Soviet Union, the United States, Indonesia, Japan, and Brazil have more people.

Prof. Albert P. Blaustein, professor of law at Rutgers University, has procured from the Bangla Desh Consulate in Calcutta a copy of the Bangla Desh Declaration of Independence proclaimed on April 10, 1971. The text of that declaration is as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF BANGLA DESH, APRIL 10, 1971

Whereas free elections were held in Bangla Desh from December 7, 1970 to January 17, 1971, to elect representatives for the purpose of framing a Constitution and

Whereas at these elections the people of Bangla Desh elected 167 out of 169 representatives belonging to the Awami League, and

Whereas Gen. Yahya Khan summoned the elected representatives of the people to meet on the 3rd of March, 1971, for the purpose of framing a Constitution, and

Whereas the Assembly so summoned was arbitrarily and illegally postponed for an indefinite period, and

Whereas instead of fulfilling their promise and while still conferring with the representatives of the people of Bangla Desh Pakistan authorities started an unjust and treacherous war, and

Whereas in the facts and circumstances of such treacherous conduct, Banga Bandhu Sheikh Hupibur Rahman, the undisputed leader of 75 millions of people of Bangla Desh, in due fulfillment of the legitimate right of self-determination of the people of Bangla Desh duly made a declaration of independence at Dacca on March 26, 1971, and

urged the people of Bangla Desh to defend the honour and integrity of Bangla Desh, and

Whereas in the conduct of a ruthless and savage war, the Pakistani authorities committed and are still committing numerous acts of genocide and unprecedented tortures, amongst others, on the civilian and unarmed people of Bangla Desh, and

Whereas the Pakistan Government by carrying on an unjust war and committing genocide and by other repressive measures made it impossible for the elected representatives of the people of Bangla Desh to meet and frame a Constitution, and give to themselves a Government, and

Whereas the people of Bangla Desh by their heroism, bravery and revolutionary fervour have established effective control over the territories of Bangla Desh,

We the elected representatives of the people of Bangla Desh, as honour-bound by the mandate given to us by the people of Bangla Desh whose will is supreme, on this day of April 10, 1971, duly constitute ourselves into a Constituent Assembly, and

in order to ensure for the people of Bangla Desh equality, human dignity and social justice,

declare and constitute Bangla Desh to be an Sovereign People's Republic and thereby confirm the declaration of independence already made by Banga Bandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, and

do hereby affirm and resolve that till such time as a Constitution is framed, Banga Bandhu Sheikh Mujiur Rahman shall be the President of the Republic and that Syed Nazrul Island shall be the Vice-President of the Republic, and

that the President shall be the Supreme Commander of all the armed forces of the Republic, and

shall exercise all the Executive and Legislative powers of the Republic including the power to grant pardon,

shall have the power to appoint a Prime Minister and such other Ministers as he considers necessary, shall have the power to levy taxes and expend moneys,

shall have the power to summon and adjourn the Constituent Assembly, and

do all other things that may be necessary to give to the people of Bangla Desh an orderly and just Government,

We the elected representatives of the People of Bangla Desh do further resolve that in the event of there being no President or the President being unable to enter upon his office or being unable to exercise his powers and duties due to any reason whatsoever, the Vice-President shall have and exercise all the powers, duties, and responsibilities herein conferred on the President,

We further resolve that we undertake to observe and give effect to all duties and obligations devolved upon us as a member of the family of nations and by the Charter of the United Nations,

We further resolve that this proclamation of Independence shall be deemed to have come into effect since 26th day of March 1971,

To give effect to this our resolution, we further authorize and appoint Prof. M. Yusuf Ali, our duly constituted Potentiart to give to the President and Vice-President oaths of office.

CHAING KAI-SHEK SPEAKS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a great speech by a great leader. Chiang Kai-shek delivered this speech on June 15, 1971. He comments on the rampant tendency toward appeasement manifesting itself in the free world and the determination of the Chinese people to stand firm in the face of what seems to be a case of contagious cowardice.

The speech which appeared in the June edition of Asian Outlook follows:

STAND OF OUR NATION, SPIRIT OF OUR PEOPLE

(By President Chiang Kai-shek)

(Editor's note: Following is the English language translation of remarks, entitled "The Stand of Our Nation and the Spirit of Our People," delivered by President Chiang Kai-shek on June 15, 1971, to the National Security Council.)

At the beginning of the year, I told our people:

Within this year, we shall face I don't know how many difficulties and dangers nor how much pain. These will test us and try us, and will have to be overcome, one after another.

The rampant tendency toward appeasement has sparked voracious and spreading flames of violence, has brought about the ebb of moral strength and damped and dimmed moral faith and legal principles. Even so, righteousness and justice are still shining in the hearts of mankind. Timidity will be overcome and righteousness and justice will emerge from flaccid inaction and enter into a period of vigorous expansion. Rights and justice may suffer momentary eclipse, but moral and legal principles will be adhered to with firmness and never allowed to be watered down even fractionally nor to come under the subjugation of the force of evil. The spirit of our race must stand staunch and unshakable so that humankind may be saved from more holccausts. Our confidence in the Revolution can never be weakened by hardship or humiliation. Our people provide a stabilizing force which cannot be shaken by any conceivable change in the situation.

If all of us stand firm in our conviction of what is right and just in accordance with our principles, we shall have peace of mind and find solace. We shall be free from anxiety and fear. Moreover, danger and doubt will give us opportunity to manifest our convictions of righteousness and justice, and anxiety and pain will provide our nation with opportunity for rebirth. So it may be said: "Don't rely on the assumption that the enemy will not come" but on the fact that "We are fully prepared to cope with the enemy when he does come."

UNSCATHED FROM TESTS, TRIALS

During the last five months, we have experienced a sequence of adversity, insult and suffering. But as a result of our total preparedness, we have been able to emerge unscathed from all these tests and trials.

In ancient times, the people often said: "Everything in the world is determined by how the people conduct themselves, and the people should never depart from noble aspirations because of momentary adversity." Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the Founding Father of the Republic, told us: "Existence has its roots fixed in the independent and persevering spirit of the nation and people." He also said: "We must understand that when a nation suffers reverses, it can recuperate on its own resources in the course of time. But if a nation should act as though it were intimidated by others, and not seek out the means of resistance, it would lose its basic spirit. That nation would not be able to profit by the opportunity, even when there was much to be gained."

Some countries of today are myopic and lured by immediate advantage to the point of irrationality and the ignoring of righteousness. These nations talk of peace but actually are engaging in actions which destroy peace. Should we be angered, discouraged or even intimidated by these nations and thereby depart from our faith and lose our temper, this would be tantamount to a failure to maintain firm the will and do no violence to passionate nature and we shall be guilty of undermining with our own efforts our noble determination. If all of us can respect and reinvigorate ourselves, if we can be cautious enough to make sure that our judgment is sound and that we are holding firm to the independent and persevering spirit of our nation and people, if we can fight in terms of will, and not in terms of our passionate nature, then there will be no test that we cannot pass, no difficulty that cannot be overcome and no enemy that cannot be defeated. This shows that while "the situation is objective because other people have made it so, strength is subjective because it is in our hands."

As a matter of fact, every page in the 60-year history of our Revolution clearly attests that we revolutionaries have fought singlehandedly. We have been isolated in adversities and difficulties and also isolated in our moral principles and sense of justice. Often we have been insulted, attacked, plagued by disunity. Even so, we have reversed each unfavorable situation and in the end have successfully attained our objectives.

Today, the Republic of China is moreover:

The first, the most stable and the pivotal citadel of freedom in Asia.

The first nation of the world to expose Communism, the nation which has persisted in the termination of Chinese Communist crimes and the nation which has made the greatest contributions to the great undertakings of anti-Communism.

A nation with *San Min Chu I* (Dr. Sun's Three Principles of the People) to act as the principal guideline for the times.

A nation blessed with stable and organized leadership to inspire strenuous efforts of invigoration.

A nation (with 700 million minds at home and abroad) obsessed with burning dedication to the struggle against Communism and Mao Tse-tung.

ROC CONTRIBUTION TO UNIVERSAL PEACE

Some people of the world do not understand even today the immense contribution of the Chinese Revolution to the cause of universal peace. A number of these people have their own specific motives. They have purposely ignored or distorted the aims of the Revolution and have not shown awareness of their past mistakes. This has led to the war and calamities which the world now faces.

To judge from the history of these 60 years of National Revolution, we have positively carried out Dr. Sun's teachings to "assume the responsibility of the world by helping the weak and raising up the fallen." We are doing what conscience dictates and have not put our conscience to shame in what we have done. Specifically, we are checkmating the Chinese Communists. The destiny of Asia hinges on our efforts. No one can take our place, change us or shake us in this vital stand. No nation in Asia fails to understand nor does the free world fail to recognize this persevering national characteristic of the Republic of China and the universals of freedom and justice symbolized in the persistence of its struggle. The Revolution of the Republic of China is not merely a revolution for the freedom and independence of a single nation. The anti-Communist struggle of the Chinese race is not merely an anti-Communist struggle for the survival and safety of a single race. Our wisdom, sincerity and determination represent the ultimate rational morality and intelligence emerging from our history, culture and ideology, and the spirit of our martyrs. So long as our vitality soars

high to become the moral courage and righteous strength decisively involved in assuring the world's security, can there be anything which we should fear or be worried about?

With regard to the future of our nation and people, we have already established the principle that we ourselves shall choose whether to take action or refrain from it. This means that the decision of action or nonaction depends on our own judgment, which will be exercised in the spirit of independence and self-determination. Expressed simply, our principle is that:

PRIME OBJECTIVE: MAINLAND RECOVERY

Recovery of the Chinese mainland is our prime objective and unceasing task. We can never set this aside in favor of lesser problems. Should we commit such a mistake, we would fall into the Maoist trap and give the Maoists opportunity to escape their inevitable destiny. All the people of this nation must have the single-minded determination to fight through from the beginning to the end and to strive more fervently and with utmost dedication to win the final victory.

All of our undertakings are based on belief in freedom and justice and have been entered upon in accordance with sovereignty and international law. We have never been dismayed by adversity. We have never been discouraged or daunted because of the opportunity for easy gain, nor have we been intimidated. All of us must be aware that when we recover the Chinese mainland, all problems may be solved easily. Should we forget our fundamental goals and give consideration only to minor problems, or should we lose our temper and faith, or allow lack of forbearance in small matters to detract us from the great pursuit, then we should not succeed, and this is especially true of the leaders charged with the responsibility of doing their best for the nation and of those who love the people.

Th accomplishment of a revolutionary task is never by chance. In this stage of our revolutionary undertakings, we cannot allow any further mistakes, no matter how small. Nor can we allow the emergence of a psychology of dependence.

To be considered as our friends are those who have fought the Maoists with actions, those who have opposed the Maoists in their consciences, those who followed and worked for the Maoists but later awakened to oppose them, and any and all who oppose the Maoists. As I have said before, our attitude is that those who are not our enemies are our friends.

Then this is the stand of our nation and our people. This is also our sworn pledge to uphold responsibility to our history, to our culture and to our nation and people.

Everyone knows that cowardice is but a human tendency which reveals itself in expediency and indolence. Yet when faced with oppression and humiliation, even a coward will turn from turbidity to lucidity and from flaccid inaction to bold action. The pathway of the international appeasers has almost reached its end; it is impossible that in the long run they shall not change direction and turn back to the right course.

All of us know that never in human history has an outlaw or pirate regime escaped collapse and extermination when its iniquity had reached a maximum. This is the case with a regime which has resorted to power struggle, slaughter, conspiracy, traffic in narcotics, infiltration, subversion and violence as its means of existence, and especially so when the people under its control are eager to risk their lives in attempts at defection.

DON'T MIND FIGHTING ALONE

This present moment is but the darkness before the dawn. We do not mind being the only people who still have faith in anti-Communism and who still have the courage to persist in the struggle against Communism and for the cause of freedom and justice. This means that in our hands hangs not only the destiny of the nation, but the security or the destruction of all mankind.

This type of faith and confidence do not emerge only from my own experience but are shared in common with all our people. In a brief period before us, difficulties, bitter times and dangers inevitably will appear before us. Some may consider these as obstructions or catastrophes, lose their faith and become sceptics and cowards. Yet this situation will not frustrate the true and sincere revolutionary, who will only consider that this is another opportunity to reach the final goal. As true and sincere revolutionaries, all of us shall strive more fervently in the spirit of "laboring and suffering with the nation" and "calling the people to awaken and serve the nation." In this time of crisis, we shall achieve final success and victory despite treachery, danger and difficulty.

CHARLESTON MONUMENT TO L. MENDEL RIVERS

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, that distinguished American, Gen. Mark Clark, has brought to my attention a project being undertaken by the leading citizens of Charleston, S.C., of which I am sure all Members of the House will want to be aware. A committee, headed by General Clark, is planning to erect a monument to our late and beloved colleague, L. Mendel Rivers.

The monument will be a bust of Mr. Rivers on a substantial but simple pedestal which will be placed in a small park in the heart of old Charleston. Artists and architects are already at work on the project.

Members of the House will be interested to know that all members of the South Carolina General Assembly have signed a statement attesting to the "greatness" of Mendel Rivers and each has made a contribution to the monument fund.

I am sure many Members of the House will want to make their own contribution. Gifts can be mailed to Rivers Monument, Charleston, S.C. 29401.

A copy of the press release relating to the monument follows:

MONUMENT TO HONOR THE LATE CONGRESSMAN RIVERS

CHARLESTON, S.C., July 17.—Admirers of the late Congressman L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina will erect here a monument in his honor.

Gen. Mark W. Clark, president emeritus of The Citadel, is chairman of the committee of distinguished citizens who will commission the preparation of the monument, ensure its proper placement, and raise the funds with which to underwrite the project. General Clark said, "We want all who admired this great American to have an opportunity to contribute to the monument. Large contributions will be welcomed. However, we hope for thousands upon thousands of small donations from those Mendel affectionately called 'My People'."

According to General Clark, the monument will be an exquisite bust of Mr. Rivers on a substantial but simple pedestal. It will be the only monument in what the General termed "A beautiful little park in the heart of Old Charleston."

The park and the monument will be enclosed with handsome fencing with an open gate. Artists and architects are already at work on the monuent.

A formal nation-wide solicitation of gifts for the monument will be made later this summer. In the meantime, donations of any amount will be welcomed. Gifts should be mailed to Rivers Monument, Charleston, S.C. 29401.

Funds remaining after monument expenses have been paid will be placed in one of the scholarships already established in memory of Congressman Rivers.

Joseph P. Riley, Charleston businessman, is vice-chairman of the committee chaired by General Clark. President Theodore S. Stern of the College of Charleston is secretary-treasurer. Other members of the committee are William Harold Butt, Edward Kronsberg, Delacy Shuman, and Y. W. Scarborough; State Representative F. Julian Leamond; Chairman of Charleston County Council, Richard E. Seabrook; Dr. John A. Hamrick, president of the Baptist College at Charleston; and Rear Admiral Herman Kossler, commandant, Sixth Naval District.

A NATIONAL EMERGENCY MEDIATION BOARD

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, for months I have urged my colleagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to give serious attention to some sort of National Emergency Mediation Board, simply so we may lock the barn before the horses are stolen.

We are reaping the whirlwind of our lethargy, almost daily. Essential services are denied us by the stubbornness of both management and labor, while we wring our hands and pass emergency legislation that sometimes works and more often does not.

Rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that 1972 will have its share of emergencies, some of which may make those of 1971 pale into insignificance. The time to deal with them is now, not next year, and I am glad to report that our committee is working on such legislation with that timetable in mind.

A recent editorial in the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal expresses my feeling precisely, and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

ANOTHER RAIL STRIKE

Railroad management in the early days often was in the hands of rascals. They fleeced investors, gouged shippers and dealt in a high-handed manner with their workers.

As a consequence of all that, the railroads came under strict government regulation and the workers organized into militant unions to demand better pay and working conditions.

Today the railroads which once had a virtual monopoly in transportation face stiff competition on the highways, the waterways and the air lanes. Investors shy from them, preferring what they consider better risks for their money. But the unions too often still are insisting upon working conditions that grew out of the plodding steam locomotive era.

And as a result the nation now is faced with another strike that threatens to shut down the nationwide rail network which still is needed to move the bulk of the goods we all use.

The unions defend the rules, some on the grounds of safety and others because they say they were negotiated and the workers are bound to abide by them.

There is something to be said about safety. Deterioration of rights of way in recent years has resulted in making many of the railroads dangerous. That is the fault of management. Where the unions demand action to improve safety, they have the full support of the public.

But the unions have failed to impress the public with the need for many of these old rules even on the grounds of safety. What safety results from the workers blocking the introduction of walkie-talkie communications systems instead of old flag and lantern signals? And how does changing crews every 100 miles or so improve the safety?

And then there are the rules which simply cut into railroad revenues without any justification, such as the ones that require maintenance of a certain number of switching crews in yards that have lost their usefulness because the businesses they served have moved away.

These are the kinds of rules the public cannot understand any more than managements, seeking to modernize their operations, can comprehend them. And it is the unions' insistence upon them that loses them the support of the public even when they may have a justifiable complaint against their employers.

Surely even the most militant union members must recognize that some of these rules must go. Other unions have been able to make the adjustment that progress requires, why not the railroad workers?

But the unions have not been alone in their resistance to change. Congress must share some of the blame for this most recent strike as well as some abortive walkouts in recent months.

It has had before it for many months now several proposals for dealing in a new way with railway labor disputes that management and labor are unable to resolve themselves. It has dallied over those proposals, postponing action from one crisis situation to the next. Neither railway labor nor railway management is enthralled with these proposals, but neither has come forward with anything better than the 1926 Railway Labor Act which so clearly has proven to be as antiquated as the wood-burning locomotive and the candy butcher.

Sooner or later Congress will have to face up to the problem. Now would be as good a time as any.

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN HOSPITALS URGES TIGHTER DRUG CONTROLS

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a national hospital association has called on its members to tighten procedures to guard against drug abuse within hospitals and to provide continuing education programs for hospital personnel in the area of drug abuse.

The Federation of American Hospitals, the national association of investor-owned—proprietary—hospitals, took this action at its board of directors meeting held in Portland, Oreg., on July 17, 1971. The federation has established a drug abuse committee and is presently developing an education program for its member hospitals as well as exploring joint programs with appropriate Federal agencies on the drug problem.

It is particularly urgent at this time to make sure that our Nation's medical and hospital personnel are familiar with all aspects of the drug problem, particularly the identification of addicts. In addition it is imperative that health care facilities take steps to guard against laxity in control of drug distribution within their own physical plants.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of the resolution of the Federation of American Hospitals on this most important subject:

RESOLUTION

The Federation of American Hospitals recommends that each Member investor-owned hospital in the United States assign to a representative of its administrative staff the responsibility for controlling drug abuse in the hospital and the education of its staff and all other employees on the subject of drug abuse.

PHARMACIST OF THE YEAR FOR NORTH CAROLINA

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to my colleagues at this time that Mr. Robert Buckner Hall, of Mocksville, N.C., has been named North Carolina Pharmacist of the Year for 1971 by the North Carolina Pharmaceutical Association.

Mr. Hall received the Mortar and Pestle Award, symbolic of his outstanding achievement, in ceremonies held July 14, at the First Presbyterian Church in Mocksville. Presenting the award, given in recognition of Mr. Hall's work in the fields of pharmacy, education, and public health, was Mr. B. Cade Brooks, immediate past president of the State pharmaceutical association.

I am sure my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Hall for winning this coveted award, and for their benefit, I now insert in the RECORD two articles from the Davie County Enterprise Record, one announcing the award and the other reporting on the awards ceremony. I commend them to my colleagues' attention:

ROBERT B. HALL TO BE HONORED AS STATE PHARMACIST-OF-THE-YEAR

Robert Buckner Hall of Mocksville, who was named Pharmacist-of-the-Year at the 1971 convention of the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association wil be honored at a dinner to be held in the Fellowship Hall of the First Presbyterian Church of Mocksville, July 14 at 7 p.m. At that time he will be presented the Association's Mortar-and-Pestle Award in recognition of his meritorious achievements in the fields of pharmacy, education, and public health. Mr. Hall operates Hall Drug Company of Mocksville.

Graduate of the UNC School of Pharmacy, Mr. Hall has been an active member of the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association since 1949, and served as its president in 1961–1962. He is Director and past president of the N.C. Pharmaceutical Research Foundation, Chairman of the Consolidated Pharmacy Student Loan Fund; member of the N.C. Academy of Pharmacy, and charter member of the Academy of General Practice of Pharmacy.

He is a Trustee of the Consolidated University of North Carolina, having recently been elected for his second term. He serves on the Committee of Health Affairs which encompasses UNC schools of Pharmacy, Dentistry, Public Health, Medicine, and Nursing.

Mr. Hall is a member of the Mocksville Board of Central Carolina Bank, the Board of Directors of Mocksville Savings and Loan Association, and The Board of Davie-Yadkin-Wilkes Health Department.

He has served as a Jaycee officer, Chairman of Heart and Cancer Fund Drives, Director of the Rowan-Davie Heart Association, Director of Mocksville Rotary Club, Member of Davie Co. Morehead Selection Committee, of the Girl Scout Council Committee, of Uwharrie Council of Boy Scouts, and Director of Northwestern N.C. Economic Development Commissions.

He has served as Trustee and Chairman of the Board of Deacons, and President of the Brotherhood of the First Baptist Church of Mocksville; he is currently serving on the Finance Committee.

Mr. Hall is married to the former Sara Hope Fitchett of Dunn; they have a daughter, Hope Fitchett, and two sons, Robert Buckner, Jr. and Carl Stacy.

The July 14th dinner program will feature John C. Hood, Jr. of Kinston, president of the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association, who will preside. The invocation will be brought by Mr. Hall's minister, the Reverend Charles Bullock. Other speakers for the evening include D. J. Mando, Mayor of Mocksville; Dr. George P. Hager, Dean of the UNC School of Pharmacy, Chapel Hill; W. Dorsey Welsh, Washington, Past-President of the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association. B. Cade Brooks, Fayetteville, immediate past-president of the NCPhA will present the award.

Guests will include members of the Hall family and pharmacy leaders and friends from over the state. Represented will be the University of North Carolina, the North Carolina Board of Pharmacy, the North Carolina Pharmaceutical Research Foundation, The Traveling Men's Auxiliary and the Woman's Auxiliary of the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association.

Former recipients of the Mortar-and-Pestle Award will be among the guests, as well as a number of past-presidents of the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association.

The dinner will be open to the general public and anyone who would like to attend is cordially invited. Local reservations may be made by calling Sue Short at the Davie County Enterprise-Record, Mocksville, phone 634–2120.

ROBERT B. HALL HONORED AT LOCAL DINNER

Robert Buckner Hall of Mocksville was honored last Wednesday night as the North Carolina Pharmacist of the Year.

More than 200 persons attended the buffet dinner sponsored by the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association that was highlighted by the presentation of the Mortar-and-Pestle Award to Mr. Hall.

John C. Hood, Jr., President of the North Carolina Pharmaceutical Association, presided.

The invocation was given by the Rev. Charles Bullock, Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Mocksville.

Tributes to Mr. Hall were given by Mayor D. J. Mando of Mocksville who enumerated past and present accomplishments of Mr. Hall as pertained to Mocksville.

W. Dorsey Welch, of Washington, a past-president of the association, outlined the ac-

complishments of Mr. Hall in his service to the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association stressing that he had done things not to seek recognition but for the good it would do the association and others.

George P. Hager, Dean of the School of Pharmacy of UNC-CH, pointed out that as a student at UNC, Bob not only learned to be a good pharmacist but also a good leader.

"In his work with the state association and as a trustee of the university, Bob is not only able to define the problems but actively works for their solutions. His works conform with his words", said Dr. Hager.

The presentation of the award was made by B. Cade Brooks of Fayetteville, immediate past-president of the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association.

The Mortar-and-Pestle Award is presented annually for distinguished service in the fields of pharmacy, public health, education and welfare.

Three other state winners in other fields from Mocksville were recognized:

Miss Jo Cooley as the "N.C. Handicapped Woman of the Year."

Dr. Clyde Young as a former "Veterinarian of the Year."

Dr. Ramey F. Kemp as a former "Chiropractor of the Year."

W. J. Smith, Executive Director of the N.C. Pharmaceutical Association, read messages of congratulations from Dr. William Friday, President of the University of N.C., and George Watts Hill, President of Central Carolina Bank and chairman of the board of trustees, UNC–CH.

The career highlights of Mr. Hall are as follows:

A native of Wayne County and resident of Mocksville since early youth; education in the Mocksville Schools and at the University of North Carolina. Member of Phi Delta Chi Fraternity.

Returned to work with his father at Hall Drug Company upon graduation and is now owner and operator of the pharmacy.

Served in the Army Air Force during World War II.

In his community he has served as secretary and vice-president of the Jaycees; Chairman of Heart Fund Drive; Director of the Rowan-Davie Heart Association; Director of Mocksville Rotary Club; Member Davie County Morehead Selection Committee; On committees of the area Girl Scout Council and Uwharrie Council for the Boy Scouts; Director of Northwestern North Carolina Economic Development Commission. He is presently a member of the Mocksville Savings and Loan, and a member of the Board of the Davie-Yadkin-Wilkes Health Department.

In the First Baptist Church he has served as trustee and chairman of the Board of Deacons as well as president of the Brotherhood; he is currently serving as a member of the Finance Committeee.

Mr. Hall is past-president of the North Carolina Pharmaceutical Association and the North Carolina Pharmaceutical Research Foundation. He continues to serve on the Board of Directors of the Foundation. He is Chairman of the Consolidated Pharmacy Student Loan Fund; member of the Academy of Pharmacy, and a charter member of the Academy of General Practice of Pharmacy.

He was recently elected for a second term as Trustee of the Consolidated University of North Carolina and serves on the Committee on Health Affairs which encompasses Schools of Pharmacy, Dentistry, Public Health, Medicine, and Nursing.

Mr. Hall is married to the former Sara Hope Fitchett of Dunn; they have a daughter, Hope Fitchett, and two sons, Robert Buckner, Jr. and Carl Stacy.

THE TRAGEDY OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last 6 years have proven that the unwarranted and ill-conceived intervention of the United States in the Dominican Republic in 1965, and the 18-month military occupation which followed, was a tragic mistake of the greatest proportions. The chaos, corruption, political instability, social and economic dislocations which have ensued are almost impossible to describe. The suppression of civil liberties, the stifling of the voices of constructive dissent, intrigues, deaths, and disappearance are occurring in the classic manner of a dictatorial regime. It is reported that, in recent years, more political murders have occurred in the Dominican Republic than in any comparable period during Trujillo's dictatorship. In 1970 alone there were some 186 political murders and 30 unexplained disappearances.

In a recent issue of the New York Review of Books the noted Latin American authority, Norman Gall, has reviewed two books relating to the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic and its aftermath. Moreover, Mr. Gall presents a very penetrating and well-documented study of the current reign of terror in this Caribbean Republic and the complicity of certain U.S. personnel in some of the events connected with it.

A particularly frightening feature of this terrorism is the fact that many of the victims are the poor, repressed inhabitants of Santo Domingo's barrios. Furthermore, the executions and other acts of terrorism are frequently conducted by roving, paramilitary "death squads" organized by the armed forces and the police—organizations receiving U.S. training and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Gall has performed a valuable service in bringing this situation into focus and in revealing to the public facts which have been hidden too long. His well-written and perceptive essay and review should be given our fullest and most careful consideration—particularly as we will soon be acting upon the Foreign Assistance Act. I present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD and commend it to our colleagues' attention:

SANTO DOMINGO: THE POLITICS OF TERROR

(By Norman Gall)

We know that many who are now in revolt do not seek a Communist tyranny. We think it's tragic indeed that their high motives have been misused by a small band of conspirators who receive their directions from abroad. To those who fight only for liberty and justice and progress, I want to join in . . . appealing to you tonight to lay down your arms and to assure you that there is nothing to fear. The road is open to you to share in building a Dominican Democracy and we in America are ready and anxious and willing to help you. —Lyndon B. Johnson, May 2, 1965.

President Johnson's military intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 was as momentous as it was cruel and politically mistaken. We can see it, along with our enlargement of the Vietnam war in the same year, as part of a disastrous expansion of the powers of the American Presidency and of its sense of "global responsibilities." When a force of 23,000 US troops landed in Santo Domingo in May to reverse the course of the Santo Domingo civil war they served to rescue a repressive military establishment from an apparently successful popular revolt that was trying to restore constitutional rule. We can now see that the high priority the US gave to social progress in Latin America, an idea implicit in the Alliance for Progress, has been replaced by what appears to be an expanding and recurrent pattern of control by terror.

Professor Jerome Slater's political study of the 1965 intervention and the eighteen-month US military occupation that followed is derived from his use, on a not-for-attribution basis, of "a great number of papers, memoirs, and documents which are not now in the public domain," as well as off-the-record interviews with US and OAS officials. However, all this new material adds little or no support to the official rationale for the intervention—that the Dominican Republic was at the brink of a possible Communist takeover. Instead it provides further evidence of double-dealing and cruelty after the US troops were sent in.

Because he relies so much on classified official documents, and because of his otherwise limited knowledge of Dominican affairs, Slater tends at times to bend over backward to give credence and legitimacy to the official US view in a number of, at best, highly doubtful instances. Nevertheless, he concludes that although "there was some risk that out of an uncontrollable revolutionary upheaval Castroite forces might emerge victorious . . . the risk was not yet sufficiently great to justify the predictably enormous political and moral costs that the intervention entailed."

The effect of the intervention was to restore to power in Santo Domingo the political *apparatchiks* of the long and brutal dictatorship of Rafael Leonidas Trujillo (1930–61). Of the costs Slater writes at the end of his book:

". . . the steadily worsening political terrorism . . . has recently [1970] reached crisis proportions. Scarcely a day goes by without a political murder, a "suicide" of a jailed political prisoner, the disappearance of a political activist, or, at the very least, a case of police harassment of the political opposition. Most of the victims are Communists or Castroite radicals, PRD activists [of ex-President Juan Bosch's *Partido Revolucionario Dominicano*], or former constitutionalists, although recently even anti-Balaguerists on the right have been attacked.

"While there has been a rise in leftist counter-terror, with machine-gunnings of isolated police and soldiers increasingly common, the main culprits appear to be unregenerates in the police and, to a lesser extent, the armed forces. It is not clear what [President Joaquin] Balaguer's role is in this, but although he has condemned what he calls the "uncontrollable forces" behind the violence and on several occasions has shaken up the police leadership, there is a growing feeling among moderate Dominicans that he is encouraging the rightist terrorism or, at best, has been inadequate in his response to it."

In recent years there have been more political murders in the Dominican Republic than in any comparable period during Trujillo's dictatorship, with the sole exception of the reign of terror that followed the swiftly

crushed invasion from Cuba in 1959, organized by Fidel Castro.[1] The Santo Domingo newspaper *El Nacional* last December 30 filled a page and a half of newsprint with the details of 186 political murders and thirty disappearances during 1970.[2] The Dominican terror resembles the current wave of political killings in Guatemala (see my "Slaughter in Guatemala," *NYR*, May 20, 1971) in that the paramilitary death squads are organized by the armed forces and police, which in both cases over the years have been given heavy US material and advisory support. The death squads themselves are partly composed of defectors from revolutionary political factions.

The political terrorism in Santo Domingo, however, seems now to be directed not so much against well-known politicians, as is the case in Guatemala. Rather it is used to control the Santo Domingo slum population, which was the main force that defeated the Dominican military in the 1965 revolution. In the proliferating ramshackle slums and squatter settlements that spread northward from the ancient churches and plazas of downtown Santo Domingo, there is continual patrolling by uniformed military and police units, as well as by plainclothes agents on motor scooters. Each barrio has been infiltrated by government intelligence organizations. (Moreover, many taxi drivers are police agents, like Haiti's Ton-Ton Macoutes.) Since much of the killing seems to be done almost capriciously by these patrols,[3] the effect of the terror has been an undeclared, all-night curfew in the slums.

On a recent visit to Santo Domingo I found that, owing to the general fear of assassination, heavily populated slum areas of the old rebel zone, whose intense street life in the past resembled New York's Forty-second Street or Tokyo's Yoshiwara district, were virtually deserted after 8 P.M. Although these killings have aroused little in the way of active popular resistance, a twenty-four-hour general strike was called last November. The outlying barrio of Los Minas—a heavily PRD slum which was invaded by squatters after the Trujillo assassination in 1961 and which today has more than 100,000 inhabitants—was shut down after six residents of the barrio were murdered within a week. According to one feeble old man in the barrio who was questioned by a reporter at the time. "The situation had gotten so bad in Los Minas that the men felt compelled to stay at home and send the women out to find the day's sustenance, because their lives were not worth a piece of rotten fruit." [4]

The night before Los Minas was shut down, President Balaguer, a crafty and tenacious political maneuverer who was Trujillo's last puppet president, told a press conference at the National Palace that the strike at Los Minas—

". . . is illogical and absurd because what the citizenry should do is . . . associate itself with the authorities to counteract the terrorism. As I have said many times, this is a fight in which all sectors of society should participate. For if an exact version of each deed could reach me and the Government, one could establish responsibility more easily and the Government could punish these acts of terror.

"I have denounced the irregularities inside the police, and I have confided to many persons the purification of the police.[5] So far this has not been achieved and I completely agree with the editorial in today's (newspaper) *Listin Diario* about this: the imperious need to purify the police, so that its services are efficient and to end these criminal acts that are filling the country with blood." [6]

Political assassinations continued steadily for four years after 1966, when, with US occupation forces still in the country, Balaguer was elected to his first four-year term. In 1970, during Balaguer's campaign for reelection, the terror sharply increased. A great many voters abstained from this election after the Dominican constitution had been changed to allow Balaguer to run for a second consecutive term. Then, in the last six months of 1970, after Balaguer had begun his second term of office, new plans for police action were circulated among the intelligence and security agencies of the Dominican government, which are honeycombed with officers of Trujillo's old secret police, the SIM (*Servicio de Inteligencia Militar*). These plans were the basis for the most sustained and enveloping system of terror since the fall of the Trujillo dictatorship.

The head of the Department of Intelligence of the National Palace is Manuel A. Perez Sosa, former chief of the SIM. On August 2, 1970, Perez Sosa received a letter of resignation from one of his subordinates, Miguel A. Perez Aybar, who explained that "I have taken this step so as not to lend myself to the events that I understand will occur and will do great injury to the Supreme Government." On the same date Perez Aybar also wrote Balaguer that "I have decided to resign because I am your friend and because the plans of the Department of Intelligence are disastrous for your labor of Government, and I do not wish to be an accomplice to the murder of men who are going to be assassinated without any cause."

A few months ago a new kind of terrorist organization was organized by the police. Known as *La Banda*, it is made up mainly of former members of the Maoist *Movimiento Popular Dominicano* (MPD), the most militant party of the Dominican left, which last year tried to form a United Front of all political factions—including dissidents on the extreme right—to oppose Balaguer's re-election. The MPD is said to have carried out the kidnapping, in March, 1970, of Lt. Col. Donald J. Crowley, the US air attache in Santo Domingo, by the "Unified Antireelection Command." Crowley was exchanged within sixty hours for twenty Dominican political prisoners, the most prominent of whom was the MPD Secretary-General Maximiliano Gomez, who were flown into exile. Since then most of the principal MPD leaders have been gunned down by the police, and Gomez himself died of gas poisoning last month in Brussels under mysterious circumstances.

Meanwhile, many MPD youths have been arrested and pressured into joining the police terrorist bands. On April 20, 1971, six youths who said they were members of a terrorist organization called *Joventud Democratica Reformista Anticommunista* were granted political asylum in the Mexican embassy in Santo Domingo. All but one of them were age eighteen or younger. Before taking refuge in the embassy they issued a statement to the press saying that they had been recruited by the police after they were arrested and accused of "a series of deeds that we did not commit." They identified the leader of the terrorist bands as Police Lt. Oscar Nuñez Peña, who they said was a bodyguard of Gen. Perez y Perez, the police chief. "In this way," the youths said, "they [the police] want to get their hooks into many revolutionary militants." They said the police told them that "this is a declared war against the Communist. The bands will be organized in all the barrios of the capital and what has been done so far is an experiment to acclimatize public opinion." According to their statement, the group was given three Thompson machine guns and a car to carry out its assignment in the "April Plan" which was drafted by the police.[7]

On June 7, another member of *La Banda*, Fernando Aquino Mateo, also known as Sierra y Sierra, obtained asylum in the Mexican embassy. Before he entered the embassy Sierra y Sierra said in an interview that he had been jailed several times after fighting on the constitutionalist side in the 1965 revolution, and had been beaten up in jail so many times that he finally agreed to become a trustee at La Victoria prison, where, he said, he beat and tortured other inmates. He also said he witnessed the death by beating of Oliver Daniel Mendez Guzman, twenty, whom Police Chief Perez y Perez said had escaped from jail on May 5. The dead youth was taken from jail in a sack by a police colonel, Sierra y Sierra recalled, "I imagine that they threw him into the sea, because I have not read in the press that his body appeared anywhere."

He explained that he had joined *La Banda* after his release from jail, May 19, and had sought diplomatic asylum because he had been ordered by Police Lt. Nuñez Peña to kill Felix Alburquerque, the PRD Secretary-General of the taxi drivers' union UNACHOSIN, and Radhames Gomez, the managing editor of *El Nacional*. Before obtaining asylum Sierra y Sierra had lived in a squatter settlement called Katanga, next to Los Minas. One of his last acts as a member of *La Banda*, he said, was to arrest Juan Almonte, the PRD leader of Los Minas, under orders of a police sergeant who said that "if nobody sees us take him prisoner, we should kill him." [8]

Almonte had recently made a series of accusations of corruption in the operations of the national lottery, and had won an election held by the union of lottery ticket sellers—certified by the Labor Ministry. He had, however, been stopped at gunpoint by the old union leadership from taking over the union headquarters. In an interview shortly before his arrest, Almonte told me: "The violence in these barrios is such that even police sergeants and corporals have been killed for having become too close to the PRD. We will have a revolution soon more violent than before. Last time [in 1965] we routed the army in twenty-four hours, and when it happens again it will take less time."

According to the testimony of the youths who obtained asylum in the Mexican embassy, the police agents who organized *La Banda* were also involved in one of the most sordid political crimes in recent Dominican history, the kidnap-murder of Santiago Manuel Hernandez, nineteen, a former MPD member also known as Mangá who had been sought by the police for several weeks. Young Hernandez was shot and critically wounded inside his father's slum shack by two police undercover agents on March 26. Two weeks later, on Easter Sunday, the day before he was to undergo surgery, he was kidnapped from his hospital bed by police agents and was found dead the next morning in a roadside canefield near the town of San Pedro de Macoris, some forty miles away.

As described to me in interviews by his mother and his parish priest, a Cuban Jesuit named Tomás Marrero, the convalescence of Mangá was a lurid nightmare that moved inexorably toward death. His mother, Sra. Mercedes Hernandez de Frias, told me that when her critically wounded son was brought to the Hospital Padre Bellini in downtown Santo Domingo no blood could be found for a transfusion, since the local blood banks said they had no blood for a wounded man until they got a police order to supply it. The emergency operation to prolong the life of Mangá was performed—with police in the operating room—by recycling the blood hemorrhaging from the patient's body into a bottle and injecting it back into him. After his recovery, police guards were stationed with machine guns inside the ward, and forbade the boy to speak with anyone.

According to his mother, Hernandez was visited every day by two police plainclothesmen who stood at the foot of the hospital bed and asked how he was getting on; she said her son whispered to her after one of these visits that they were the two men who shot him on March 26. Late each night the

Footnotes at end of article.

police would turn on all the lights in the ward and search the boy's bed, on one occasion disconnecting the rubber tube through which noxious fluids were being drained from his body. When Father Marrero, who was taking turns with members of the family in all-night bedside vigils, protested to the policemen, the priest was barred from the hospital from then on. A few days later the boy's mother overheard the police guards say, "We're going to lynch this dog."

At 7 PM, on April 11, four men entered the hospital ward with stockings over their heads and handkerchiefs covering their faces. They announced that "we are from the party and we have come to liberate you," but the boy said, "I have no party," and pleaded with his mother not to let him go. As the men were leaving the ward with her son, the mother saw that beneath their hospital smocks they wore gray police trousers and black police boots. A few days after the boy's body was found, President Balaguer attributed the murder to "a struggle between two organizations of the extreme Left." [9]

The story of Mangá's death was first told to me by Father Marrero, whom I have known since the 1965 revolution, having slept in his church in the rebel zone while interviewing some of the people who fought on the constitutionalist side. He was one of some twenty Cuban and Spanish Jesuits who came to the Dominican Republic from Cuba in 1961—after nationalization that year of the Jesuit *Colegio Belén* in Havana, where Fidel Castro studied as a boy. These priests have performed remarkable work in leading the *aggiornamento* of the Dominican church, drafting the principal church documents, organizing cooperatives, literacy campaigns, peasant leagues, and the new Catholic University Mater et Magistra in Santiago, and earning the enmity of rightwing elements of Dominican society.

During the revolution I met another Cuban Jesuit, José Moreno, author of *Barrios in Arms: Revolution in Santo Domingo*, who was working with Father Marrero at the San Miguel Church, running an improvised medical clinic and distributing surplus food. The food was sent by the Americans across the cease-fire lines, while negotiations were dragging on, but in barely sufficient quantities to avoid panic and starvation among what became essentially a captive population.

José Moreno has since left the priesthood and is now teaching sociology at the University of Pittsburgh's Center for Latin American Studies. His account of life inside the rebel zone during the 1965 civil war—he was doing field research for his doctorate in sociology at Cornell when the revolution broke out—is written with more intimate knowledge and greater precision than any other study of the insurrection I have seen. Moreno's is the first objective, detailed, and plausible analysis available anywhere of the real Castroite-Communist strength in the constitutionalist camp. He shows that their forces were limited to a few well-armed and well-disciplined *comandos* of resistance fighters controlled by the Communist Party and the Castroite June 14th Movement. But these were only a few groups among a great many others. As Moreno describes the process:

"A training school was set up in which navy frogmen trained the civilians in urban guerrilla tactics. To maintain the morale of the rebel organization, [Col. Ramón] Montes Arache [the frogmen's commander and the rebel defense minister] and other officers agreed to let the civilians organize themselves into commando [neighborhood militia] units. Montes Arache realized that his job was to coordinate these units scattered all over the city and to give them leadership together with logistic and strategic support. Thus, the commandos, which had originally started as a means of self-protection and an expression of solidarity among members of informal groups, became the most powerful instrument in the hands of the rebels. By the end of May there were in the city 117 commando posts in which 5,000 men lived, ate and slept together. . . .

"On the one hand, informal groups of people from the barrio, groups of friends and relatives from the community, or gangs of "tigers" [teen-age street gangs] evolved into commandos such as San Miguel, Pedro Mena, Pichirilo, and Barahona. On the other hand some formal organizations [political parties and labor unions] already operating in public life whose leaders decided to combine their memberships with other individuals formed such commandos as San Lázaro, Poasi, and Argentina. Both kinds of groups were numerous, and both were relevant to the revolution. The first kind relied heavily on the organizational abilities of the leader, particularly on his charisma and *machismo* [manliness and bravery]. The second kind relied heavily on the organizational structure of the parent organization."

This description, I think, should help to place the Santo Domingo revolt of 1965 alongside the Paris Commune of 1871 in the world's revolutionary traditions. Both were urban, popular uprisings that were sustained by civilian militia until they were crushed by foreign troops. Both were involved in the turbulent process of peasant migration to the cities that made Paris in the nineteenth century and Santo Domingo since Trujillo's assassination in 1961 into centers of social revolution. Moreno writes very well of the quarrels, the hunger, the demoralization as the months of negotiation dragged on under US military occupation. But his book tends to lapse into sociological jargon toward the end, and it is regrettable that he did not instead simply let the Dominicans speak for themselves. I can testify that many of them not only can tell what the revolution was about with eloquence and clarity, but can also do justice to the incandescent inner life of the Santo Domingo slums.

Professor Slater writes that "the real explanation" for the US intervention "was the [US] embassy's playing on the Communist theme, compounded by the almost universal disdain and distrust for Bosch throughout the US Government." I think this is true but there are deeper explanations that are relevant both to the continuing political terror in Santo Domingo and to social conditions throughout Latin America.

Santo Domingo is one of the extreme examples of the creation of a huge sub-proletariat overnight. Its population (now 800,000) has more than doubled in the decade since Trujillo's death. It is a particularly grave case of the influx to the cities in contemporary Latin America. And it differs from European peasant migrations in the era of the Paris Commune to two important ways. First, the European urbanization process proceeded at a somewhat slower pace than in Latin America today and was sustained by a much higher degree of industrial employment.[10] Secondly, there was in Europe nothing approaching Latin America's urban squatter problem that tends to divide cities into distinct asphalt and marginal areas.[11] If the demands of those who are moving into the cities for food, jobs, and housing are in no way satisfied, they become dangerous to the regime: only terror and force will control them.

The tattered country people who came to Santo Domingo have built flimsy, clapboard shacks that sprawl away from the city's center along both banks of the Ozama River and under the Duarte Bridge. In 1965, thousands of the slum dwellers, using Molotov cocktails and small arms captured from the police, defeated elite tank and infantry units at this bridge in one of the episodes that demoralized the Dominican military and led to the US intervention.[12] This humiliation has generated in the Dominican armed forces and police an obsessive hatred and fear of the shack settlements and the dense, fetid warrens, called *patios*, of cardboard and palm-bark huts which are squeezed behind the facade of the pastel-colored wood-and-concrete houses in the interior of each city block in the *parte alta* of Santo Domingo.

The people in these slums have kept a blind and stubborn faith in their idol, Juan Bosch—pronounced Juan Bo in the liquid, Dominican rural Spanish that sounds like a Mississippi drawl. Life stops at midday when he speaks on the radio, the slow, seductive indignation of his voice blasting into the street from every shack. In a recent radio speech Bosch asked:

"Why do you think there are armed bands punishing the poor barrios of the capital? Why are there so many political murders, so many spies, so many political prisoners, so many abuses? It is for the same reason that the country has had a large commercial deficit in recent years. It is because the country does not produce enough for all Dominicans to live at least with enough food, and besides this what is produced is badly distributed. A few have much, others have enough to live on but the great majority don't even have where to fall dead."

The economic problems of these people are immense, almost immeasurable. A survey of one marginal barrio by Santo Domingo's Urban Planning Office found that only 16 percent of employable family heads had regular work, 44 percent survived by occasional odd jobs, called *chirripa*, while 40 percent were totally unemployed. Of those working full or part-time, 93 percent earned less than $100 monthly.[13] Survival under these conditions is partly in the cash economy, partly through barter, but probably most important, through elaborate and highly codified exchanges of personal favors, like tribal or communal customs in many rural subsistence economies.

Six years after the revolution, Santo Domingo is still divided into two enemy camps: the slums of the old rebel zone, and the comfortable residential neighborhoods surrounding the American embassy. I talked to an old and wise *Trujillista* politician who these days rocks on his porch a few blocks from the embassy. "In the old days, when a fire broke out in a sugar cane field, the way to fight it was to start another fire, called a counterfire (*contrafuego*). In 1965 a big fire called the revolution broke out in Santo Domingo and the terror is the *contrafuego* aimed at putting it out."

One flaw of Professor Slater's book is that he treats the 1965 intervention as an isolated episode with virtually no reference to the history of US involvement in Dominican affairs: President Grant's efforts to annex Santo Domingo, which were blocked by Congress; the US Marine occupation of 1916–24; the US receivership of Dominican customs duties from 1905–1940, when Trujillo arranged for final payment of the foreign debt, one of his proudest achievements. Nor does he mention the CIA role in the assassination of Trujillo,[14] and the US military and diplomatic maneuvering to dismantle the Trujillo political apparatus (twice US warships were sent into Dominican coastal waters to block attempts to restore the dictatorship) and to establish the provisional regime that held the 1962 elections in which Bosch won by a large majority.

A major element of the US presence in Santo Domingo since the fall of Trujillo has been the intimate relationship of US advisers with the Dominican military and police.[15] After the intervention of 1965, these advisory missions expanded enormously. In 1967 and 1968 the Dominican Republic, with a population of only four million, had the largest AID Public Safety (sic) or police assistance

Footnotes at end of article.

program of any country outside Vietnam. The second and third largest programs were respectively in Brazil (with 90 million people) and Guatemala, the two other Latin American nations where major outbreaks of right-wing terror by paramilitary death squads have occurred in recent years.

One of the most interesting documents to appear recently on the American presence in Santo Domingo was the transcript of a taped interview with David Fairchild, who served with AID in the Dominican Republic for eighteen months in 1966–67. The interview deals mainly with the frustrations and complexities of administering the vast US aid program to stabilize the Balaguer regime. Fairchild has this to say about the AID Public Safety program:

"There were six positions in the Public Safety Division of AID which were CIA officials. They were CIA employees. They were paid by AID because there was no way of keeping the accounting separate without exposing them. Their location there was unknown to other members of Public Safety. I had to become familiar with this because one of my jobs was getting the positions and the budgets straightened out. They worked with the police. There were only six of them out of 20 . . . they were in intelligence communications, management training . . . here are the figures: in fiscal '67, there were 15 (AID Public Safety officers); in fiscal '68, there were 18, of which six, one-third, were CIA." [16]

The 1965 intervention, and all the desperate, Byzantine machinations that have followed in order to justify it, not only compounded the raw and mounting tragedy of the Dominican people, but achieved the very opposite of its stated ends. Slater writes, correctly, that "Communist, or, at least, radical and extremist strength in the Dominican Republic is far higher today than it was in April 1965, in good part because of the intervention." Beyond this, the political regime that is the creature of the intervention has proved to be a revival of the era of Trujillo, with the apprentices sitting in the sorcerer's chair and practicing his brutal powers.

President Balaguer, who was placed in power by US troops and US money, pleaded in a speech at a dinner of the American Chamber of Commerce in Santo Domingo for an increase in the republic's quota for sugar exports to the US: "We depend," he said, "in full measure on the political and economic collaboration of the Fatherland of Washington and Lincoln, and we cannot allow ourselves the luxury, taken by other countries of Latin America, of shaking off the so-called yoke of North American imperialism to accept others that are, indeed, ignominious." [17] But the Dominican sugar quota is being cut by Congress, Balaguer is running out of money, and his military and political support is beginning to desert him.

It is a pity that the PRD has provided more of an insurrectional mystique than a workable political formula for ruling the Dominican Republic. Juan Bosch remains a popular leader and a man of high principles, but his erratic character makes it doubtful that he can provide the steady leadership that the Dominican people need. Still, if political terror continues it will lead to a popular explosion more violent than that of 1965.

FOOTNOTES

[1] I refer to Trujillo's killing of his own people, and thus exclude from this comparison the 1936 slaughter of some 10,000 Haitian squatters to stop the illegal migrations from Haiti to the Dominican Republic. By far the best source on the Trujillo regime is Robert D. Crassweller's excellent biography, *Trujillo: The Life and Times of a Caribbean Dictator* (Macmillan, 1966).

[2] See *"Van 216 Muertos," El Nacional,* December 30, 1970. The writer of this summary told me that after the edition went to press four more political killings occurred in the final thirty-six hours of 1970, bringing the death/disappearance total to 190.

[3] For example, on May 16, a fifteen-year-old tailor's apprentice, Belardino Beras Ortega, who had arrived from the provinces only three months before, was detained by a navy street patrol on the Duarte Bridge for not having a license plate on his bike, and was capriciously thrown over the bridge to his death by the patrol. See *"Piden a Balaguer se Investigue Muerte Joven," El Nacional,* May 22, 1971.

[4] See Miguel Jose Torres, *"Transcurre sin Incidentes Paro Actividades Los Minas," El Caribe,* Santo Domingo, November 20, 1970.

[5] There have been eight different national police chiefs in the first five years of Balaguer's rule. In what was described as a major step to purge the police, Balaguer last January named his Defense Minister, Gen. Enrique Perez y Perez, as his newest police chief, but the paramilitary violence has continued.

[6] See *"Admite Ineficacia," El Caribe,* November 19, 1971.

[7] See *"Miembros de Banda Solicitan Asilo," El Nacional,* April 20, 1971.

[8] See *"Revelan Trama," El Nacional,* June 7, 1971, and *"Bosch Ve Escandalo Denunciada Trama," El Nacional,* June 8, 1971. On page 13 of the June 7 edition, a letter from the warden of La Victoria prison to Lt. Nuñez is photographically reproduced, saying that Sierra y Sierra "was a prisoner and squeezed the communists very hard and now they are persecuting him in the capital . . . so I hope you will give him protection for me."

[9] See *"Cree Version Policial de Asesinato de Manga," El Nacional,* April 14, 1971. The same edition carried a statement by National Police Chief Perez y Perez that the killing was done by PACOREDO (*Partido Comunista de la Republica Dominicana*) which is said to be controlled by police infiltrators.

[10] See "The Poor World's Cities," a survey, *The Economist,* December 6, 1969, p. 56.

[11] See Richard M. Morse, "Recent Research on Latin American Urbanization," *Latin American Research Review,* Fall, 1965, p. 56.

[12] Slater writes that "the last detachment of surrendering Cascos Blancos [riot police], having been told they were facing a Communist rebellion, pleaded for their lives by crying, *'Viva Fidel! Viva el Communismo! Viva Cuba!'* One of the many ironies of the revolution was that Col. Francisco Caamaño, the rebel military chieftain, had served until a few months before as chief of the police riot squad. Antonio Imbert, the last surviving killer of Trujillo, had been supplying arms to Castroite groups over the years and had actually offered his services to the rebels before being named head of an anti-Communist junta by the US occupation forces. See my article "US Aides Confirm Imbert Aided Reds," Washington *Post,* June 17, 1965

[13] See Fernando A. Santana, *Barrios Marginados de Santo Domingo: Una Realidad para Actuar.* Study presented to the United Nations Conference on Squatter Settlements, Medellin, Colombia, February, 1970, p. 3.

[14] See my "How Trujillo Died," *The New Republic,* April 13, 1963.

[15] In his book *Barrios in Revolt,* José Moreno illustrates how this relationship functioned in the early days of the 1965 revolution, before US military intervention: "Antonio Martinez Francisco, a rich businessman, was the Secretary-General of Bosch's PRD when the revolution broke out. As a moderate, he sought mediation from the US embassy when the fighting started to get out of hand. His plea went unheard by US officials. On April 28, Martinez sought political asylum in the Mexican embassy, where he received a phone call from Arthur Breisky, Second Secretary at the US embassy, who asked him to come to the embassy to discuss important problems with [Ambassador] W. T. Bennett.

"Martinez agreed, and a car arrived to take him from the Mexican embassy. Inside the car he found a loyalist colonel and a CIA agent who took him at gunpoint to San Isidro [the big air force base outside Santo Domingo]. There he found the US official who had led him into the trap, as well as US air attaché [Lt. Col Thomas B.] Fishburn, surrounded by Dominican generals. He was forced to read over the radio an appeal asking the rebels to surrender their weapons."

[16] From "US AID in the Dominican Republic: An Inside View," in *NACLA Newsletter,* Vol. IV, No. 7, New York-Berkeley: North American Congress on Latin America, November, 1970. The AID Public Safety program regularly sends its officers first to Vietnam before sending them elsewhere in the world, which means that nearly all US military and police advisers in Latin America have been shaped to some extent by their Vietnam experience. However, the Public Safety programs in the Dominican Republic and Brazil have been cut back in the last two years.

[17] The speech is printed in *Listin Diario,* May 1, 1971.

A FLEXIBLE HOUSING PROGRAM FOR GALENA, ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the regulations that prohibit the use of Federal housing funds in areas of established potential floods, as determined by flood plain locations, are certainly well advised in their general philosophy. In spite of the general wisdom of such provisions, there are certain areas where preestablished communities make the application of such regulations unfair and work a hardship on the residents.

Such an area is the village of Galena, a Native village on the Yukon River in interior Alaska. This is a traditional and long-established village which owes its location originally and at the present time to the subsistence and transportation benefits of the river. So while the river is the support for life in this village, it is also a threat to its survival. The intention and the need of the Native residents of Galena is to stay.

The housing problem in Galena is acute. I have related to this body numerous times the well-known Alaska housing statistic that 90 percent of the housing in rural Alaska is substandard, with approximately 20 percent being so poor as to endanger the health and safety of the occupants. Galena experienced its share of these difficulties, and Federal funds to correct the problem are forestalled by the flood plain regulations.

The attached resolution passed by the Village Council of Galena captures the frustration felt in that village and all along the rivers of Alaska. Executive or legislative action is necessary to permit flexibility in housing programs in areas like Galena, and I would ask you to con-

sider such a solution as you read this resolution.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 71-11, OF THE COUNCIL OF THE NATIVE VILLAGE OF GALENA

Whereas, Galena recently suffered from a disastrous flood; and

Whereas, most of the villages on the Yukon, Kuskokwin, and Koyukuk rivers and their tributaries are below the 135 ft. flood plain level; and

Whereas, these villages, along with Galena, are also in the 100 year flood plain and subject to erosion; and

Whereas, there is in existance today a housing crisis in these villages and a drastic need to eliminate this; and

Whereas, ASHA and other housing programs cannot apply their programs in these villages because of the 135 ft. flood level ruling and the aforementioned problems of flood and erosion.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the Native Village of Galena that the law regarding the 135 ft. flood level be changed and other laws and rulings that hinder the building of homes in these villages, so as the peoples and communities of the three previously mentioned regions can be better served.

TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, providing mass transportation in urban areas is a major problem in America today, and one which, understandably, the Southern California Rapid Transit District serving Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties is diligently attempting to solve. However, I would like to commend SCRTD today for realizing that there are other problems—such as air pollution and equal employment for minorities—which it can help alleviate simultaneously.

Let us look at some examples of how the Southern California Rapid Transit District is working toward solutions of these other problems at the same time it is upgrading its transportation services.

This spring, with the assistance of a $5.23 million capital facilities grant from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, the Southern California Rapid Transit District began purchasing 212 new air-conditioned transit buses as replacements for units that had been in service for more than 15 years. These new heavy-duty buses are equipped with the latest type of engines designed to provide a substantial reduction in exhaust emissions. This replacement of older units equipped with less efficient emissions controls will, in itself, make a minor but significant contribution to improving the quality of the atmosphere in southern California—but that is not the only aspect of SCRTD's actions to reduce air pollution.

In addition, 551 older buses which will remain in service are having their fuel injection systems modified. These modifications will provide reductions of from 50 to 83 percent in hydrocarbon emissions, depending on which of two types of injection system was in use on the particular unit previously. The modified fuel injection equipment will also provide some reductions in emissions of nitrogen oxides and of carbon monoxide. The $202,500 cost of this program is being borne entirely and voluntarily by the Rapid Transit District.

The district is also participating in two research projects seeking additional reductions in air pollution.

The first is an effort to develop a catalytic muffler utilizing molten salts to absorb pollutants before they are released to the atmosphere. This project is funded by a $303,000 grant from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration and by contributions from the Southern California Rapid Transit District and North American Rockwell Corp. A prototype of this catalytic muffler is being developed and should be ready for testing on a bus in regular service by late summer of this year.

The second research project is the California steam bus program, to which Southern California Rapid Transit District is making a $50,000 contribution. One of the system's buses has had its diesel engine removed and Steam Power Systems, Inc., of San Diego is developing and installing a steam power plant as a replacement. After factory tests, the unit will be given extensive inservice testing and evaluation in an effort to provide safe, efficient, low-emission steam power for rapid transit buses.

Also in progress are programs involving use of compressed natural gas as an alternative fuel. This type of fuel provides a significant reduction in emissions of hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen. Although only minor modifications are required to permit its use in standard internal combustion engines, the requirement for high-pressure fuel tanks makes this fuel more easily adaptable to buses and other larger vehicles than to passenger autos.

Minority employment programs are also being developed by the SCRTD, primarily through an inhouse training program which will enable utility men to advance into the mechanics category.

Of the 203 employees in the "utility Grade," 92 percent are from minority groups—mostly blacks, but with some Mexican-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Indians. This job classification, which includes workers for unskilled jobs such as washing, cleaning, and fueling the district's buses and autos, has traditionally been a dead end position without opportunity for advancement.

Through a cooperative program between the district and the labor union, training is being provided by evening classes taught by SCRTD employees in the skilled mechanical trades. On-the-job training is provided upon the completion of the night classes. The first class of 14 has now moved into the starting pay grade for mechanics and a second class of 13 men is now undergoing on-the-job training. This program provides minority individuals with training for skilled employment, as well as assuring the district of a ready supply of personnel from which to recruit entry-level mechanics.

As the program continues, the graduates will undoubtedly progress to higher skill levels and increased salary ranges within the mechanical department.

Mr. Speaker, the Southern California Rapid Transit District is certainly worthy of praise for its efforts to provide mass transportation in the Los Angeles area, but also, for its contribution to solving the problems of air pollution and minority unemployment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED TO PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 29, I plan to offer an amendment to the public works appropriations bill (H.R. 10090) to strike $3.7 million in initial construction funds for the Tocks Island Dam project. Since this is such a complex matter, I would like to include in the RECORD supporting data which may be useful to my colleagues in their consideration of my amendment. I have included for insertion a transcript of my "Dear Colleague" letter, an information sheet, and some letters and testimony which were mentioned in the letter to the Members.

The items follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We need your help on Thursday to preserve the integrity of the Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

When the Public Works Appropriation bill (H.R. 10090) comes to the floor, I will offer an amendment to strike $3.7 million in initial construction funds for the $259 million Tocks Island Dam on the Delaware River.

Construction money should not be appropriated now because:

The initial environmental impact studies on the dam were rejected by CEQ. Others have been requested.

CEQ recommends a delay in construction until these studies are completed.

It would be irresponsible to irrevocably commit public funds to a project, the environmental impact of which is still unknown.

CEQ can only recommend sound environmental policy. It's up to Congress to make it a reality.

Additional supporting information is attached. I would appreciate your support on Thursday.

Sincerely,

PIERRE S. DU PONT IV,
Member of Congress, Delaware.

TOCKS ISLAND DAM BACKGROUND

When the Public Works Appropriations Bill comes to the floor on July 29, I plan to offer an amendment to strike $3.7 million from the Army Corps of Engineers' budget for Tocks Island Dam with a provision that the remaining funds can only be used for land acquisition and administration of the project, not for construction.

The vote on this amendment represents an opportunity for the Members of this Congress

to set a precedent for sustaining the intent of environmental law. Section 102 of the Environmental Policy Act has little substantive effect; it states that appropriate agencies should undertake the studies of projects which have potential impact on the environment, but it does not say that commencement of construction is contingent upon approval of such studies by a Federal agency. Only Congress has the authority to maintain the integrity of environmental law; by withholding funds, the Congress will give the CEQ the opportunity to evaluate fully the findings of the Corps and to exercise proper discretion.

The Tocks Island Dam project was authorized under PL 87–874 in 1962 for the construction of a comprehensive reservoir, pump-storage electric facility and recreation complex on the Delaware River just seven miles northeast of Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania. Since the passage of PL 87–874, no money has been appropriated for construction of the facilities, and the project has become enshrouded by local controversy and national environmental attention. During this time, however, the Corps of Engineers has submitted an environmental impact statement pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

This impact statement was rejected by Chairman Russell Train of the Council on Environmental Quality. In a letter to Robert Jordan, General Counsel for the Department of the Army, dated April 7, 1971, the Chairman cited the Corps' impact statement as being inadequate. He described shortcomings in five major areas, calling for the Corps to undertake a study which sought viable alternatives, not mere justification of existing plans.

On May 20th, I testified before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations, asserting my belief that construction funding should be withheld until a comprehensive environmental impact statement which considers both the primary and secondary effects of the dam has been approved by the Council on Environmental Quality. With me was Dr. William Gaither, Dean of the College of Marine Studies at the University of Delaware, who contended that no authoritative study existed which adequately treated possible downstream effects.

There are still many questions that have not been adequately answered, and I fully concur with Chairman Train's recommendation that the Corps of Engineers undertake a coordinated, multidisciplinary study of the project with the other participating agencies.

The Corps has agreed to take the lead in this investigation and, in addition, to prepare an overview of those coordinated studies for CEQ. However, before this process of study and evaluation can be completed, the Congress appears to be ready to appropriate construction funds. I personally am not prepared to make a commitment of construction funds prior to the evaluation of these studies.

I do not think that the Congress can in good conscience make the initial commitment for a $259 million construction project without first determining the propriety and feasibility of that commitment.

My amendment will not bring the project to a halt; it would allow for continued land acquisition and design funds. Construction funds could be sought in a supplemental appropriation should CEQ approve the studies before FY '73.

I do not desire to kill the project; I only want to bring some effectiveness to the environmental laws that we have. I believe this to be a test case that will determine whether the Congress can preserve the integrity of environmental law by insuring that no projects and money will be irrevocably commited without sound evaluation by a neutral, competent Federal agency.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1971.

ROBERT JORDAN, ESQ.,
General Counsel, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JORDAN: The Council on Environmental Quality has carefully reviewed the Corps of Engineers draft environmental impact statement on the proposed Tocks Island Reservoir Project and wishes to comment on some shortcomings which need to be remedied.

The proposed Tocks Island Reservoir is just one portion of a complex development which also includes the Department of the Interior's Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and a proposed pumped storage hydroelectric development. These projects involve recreation, flood control, water supply, electrical generation, and fisheries. Their impact is magnified due to their proximity to several major urban areas. These projects will have major primary and secondary environmental, social and economic effects upon the Delaware River Basin.

The Council on Environmental Quality feels that in order to adequately assess the impact of these projects, a coordinated, multi-disciplinary environmental impact statement should be developed which will cover the primary and secondary effects of the proposed Tocks Island Reservoir, Delaware Water Gap National Recreational Area and proposed pumped storage hydroelectric development. This comprehensive environmental impact statement might best be prepared on the basis of an independent, nonfederal study by such an organization as the National Academy of Sciences. Such a statement must, of course, be filed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act before construction begins.

While we feel that a comprehensive environmental impact statement should be prepared covering all aspects of proposed Federal projects in the proposed Tocks Island Reservoir area, I am making several specific comments upon your draft environmental impact statement which may assist you with respect to the overall environmental impact statement recommended:

The Corps of Engineers environmental impact statement is too brief in discussing adverse environmental impacts, the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and enhancement of long-term productivity, and irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources. This project involves many trade-offs of an environmental, social, and economic nature which should be discussed if it is to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Listed below are several areas where the analysis in the Corps draft environmental impact statement needs strengthening:

1. *Water Quality*—Water quality is not adequately discussed in the draft 102. Little data is provided from which an evaluation of water quality can be based. We understand that the Environmental Protection Agency has asked for further material and a 90-day period so that they can make their required detailed review of water quality. We support their request.

Eutrophication of the proposed Tocks Island Reservoir because of high nutrient runoffs from the Delaware River watershed is a real possibility a few years after the dam's completion. At best this eutrophication will only destroy the reservoir's proposed game fishery resources; at worst it will make the reservoir unavailable for recreation. Possible eutrophication of the reservoir should be carefully studied before construction begins.

2. *Alternatives*—The draft environmental impact statement's evaluation of alternatives tends to justify the project rather than discuss viable alternatives. The alternative of no dam is not even considered.

3. *Fisheries*—Much of the outside criticism has come from speculation as to the impact of the proposed project upon fisheries. While the environmental impact statement also speculates upon the impact of the proposed reservoir upon fishery habitats, there appears to have been inadequate study of probable impact upon fisheries. Such questions as the design of the fish ladder, facilities for anadromous fish migration during the construction period, facilities for shad fingerling passage down river, spawning bed destruction due to reservoir siltation, effect of eutrophication upon reservoir game fisheries, effect of reservoir fluctuations upon game fisheries and the effect of changes in river flow upon fish habitats below the dam should be answered.

4. *Economic and Social Trade-offs*—The Tocks Island projects involve trade-offs justifying adverse environmental impacts through social and economic benefits, yet data supporting these benefits is omitted. Cost-benefit ratios are not included. Secondary costs for road relocation and construction within the reservoir and Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and for waste treatment facilities are not mentioned. Secondary economic benefits, such as the economic impact of commercial resorts around the Tocks Island complex, are not included.

Social costs and benefits are not well discussed. The trade-off of a natural environmental centered around a free-flowing river attracting a limited group versus a reservoir-centered recreational area attracting large numbers of urban residents is a key issue. The question of land use planning in the vicinity of the project is not adequately discussed.

5. *Reservoir*—The effect of seasonal fluctuations is controversial and should be explained in detail. What will the impact be upon winter-recreational opportunities such as ice-boating and snow-mobiling when water-levels are low? What effect will the spring flood storage of an additional 6,000 acres have upon the flora of these areas? How seriously will the aesthetics of the area be impaired by reservoir fluctuations?

The reservoir itself will destroy wildlife habitat. Eight-hundred-eight acres of land will be bought to replace them. What is the ratio of wildlife habitat lost to the replacement habitat? Is it comparable? Are funds available to purchase this replacement wildlife habitat? Siltation will gradually fill up the reservoir. Has a study been carried out projecting the life of the reservoir? If so, what is the projected life of the reservoir?

The proposed Tocks Island Reservoir has been under preparation for many years, yet controversy still surrounds the project. In order to answer the questions we have raised and those raised by others, I hope that you will carefully consider my proposal to prepare a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary environmental impact statement in conjunction with the Department of the Interior, Federal Power Commission and Delaware Water Basin Commission.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL E. TRAIN, *Chairman.*

A STATEMENT TO THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HON. JOE L. EVINS, CHAIRMAN, MAY 20, 1971, BY WILLIAM S. GAITHER, DEAN, COLLEGE OF MARINE STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

Mr. Chairman, Committee Members, Representative duPont, ladies and gentlemen. I am William S. Gaither, Dean and Professor of the College of Marine Studies of the University of Delaware. By profession I am a civil engineer. With me is Dr. Kent S. Price, Assistant Dean of the College of Marine Studies and Director of our Lewes Field Station. Dr. Price is a marine biologist.

This statement was prepared in response

to Representative duPont's request for information on the possible detrimental effects of the Tocks Island project on Delaware Bay. Our preliminary assessment of the situation is summarized in the following points:

1. The effects of this project on marine life in Delaware Bay have not been thoroughly evaluated. Also, the widening and deepening of the C & D Canal, now in progress, add yet another uncertainty to understanding the effects of the Dam on Delaware Bay.

2. Due to low flow augmentation provided by the Tocks Island project (i.e. more water than the normal summer minimum flow will be released from the storage reservoir at times of low river discharge) the oxygen sag in the river will be moved downstream from its present location. This highly polluted section of the river, now near Philadelphia, will be forced downstream nearer to Wilmington.

3. In the upper Chesapeake Bay 85% of the organic nutrients move downstream in a single month with the annual flood crest, or crests, on the Susquehanna River. This provides food for marine life. While it is not established that a similar phenomenon occurs in the Delaware River, perhaps the same situation applies here. If true, then the Tocks Island project would considerably reduce the productivity of Delaware Bay since this flood control Dam would be expected to eliminate flood crests. An example of this effect is the documented reduction of sardines in the Mediterranean as a result of the Aswan Dam on the Nile.

4. The variation of salinity in Delaware Bay will be reduced. Consequences are that:

a.) The oyster predator population may increase in the upper bay and will move further upstream,

b.) Spawning patterns and the nursery grounds for young fish in the bay may change due to the change in salinity regime in the spring.

5. It is predicted that the annual harvest of 1.5 million pounds of shad will be reduced to about .5 million pounds due to the inundation of spawning and nursery habitat within the reservoir site and possibly in the reach downstream from the dam.

6. Finally, further doubt is cast on the environmental aspects of this project by Chairman Russell Train of the Council on Environmental Quality who has reviewed the Corps of Engineers draft environmental impact statement on the project and has indicated that some of its shortcomings need to be remedied. He further suggested in his letter of April 7, 1971 to Mr. Jordan, General Counsel for the Department of the Army, the preparation of a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary environmental impact statement in conjunction with several agencies, both federal and regional.

In summary, we have listed several possible detrimental effects of the Tocks Island project on Delaware Bay. If any or all of these effects materialize it could have serious consequences for the Bay. Unfortunately the installation of the Tocks Island Dam is an irreversible act even though its operation can be regulated to some extent. At the present time we do not know enough about the potential effects of the dam on Delaware Bay to make an evaluation with any degree of confidence.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared comments. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN PIERRE S. DU PONT, IV BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE TOCK'S ISLAND DAM PROJECT, MAY 20, 1971

Mr. Chairman, before I begin my testimony I would like to state very clearly my purpose for testifying against the immediate funding of the Tock's Island Dam project.

First, I do not have the information to pass judgment on the project per se. I am, however, opposed to beginning a project of such magnitude without the approval of a comprehensive, authoritative environmental impact statement by the Environmental Protection Agency. To date, the EPA has not approved any impact statement submitted by the Army Corps of Engineers. I also want to point out to members of this committee that Chairman Russell Train of the Council on Environmental Quality stated that the first impact statement submitted by the Corps of Engineers was inadequate, and that he recommended that "a multi-disciplinary environmental impact statement . . . be developed to cover the primary and secondary effects . . ." of the proposed dam. He also recommended that the statement be prepared by an independent, non-federal agency.

I would hope that your committee would not approve this project until such an impact statement has been submitted; an impact statement which clearly demonstrates the absence of any major primary or secondary ecological problems associated with the dam.

Much of the controversy over the dam has centered around the local impact; I have very little knowledge of these considerations and wish not to pass any judgments on them. I do believe, however, that the downstream effects of the dam, particularly in the Delaware Bay, have never been examined thoroughly. Upon initial study, it is apparent that the potential damage to the Delaware Bay zone is just as great and real as the potential damage to the area contiguous to the dam site.

I believe sound public policy and the spirit of the Environmental Policy Act of 1969 call for thorough consideration of the downstream effects associated with this dam project prior to approval.

No one can say with confidence what the effects will be on the Delaware Bay, and I urge your committee to defer judgment of this project until those who border on and use the Bay are assured that the downstream ecological ramifications of the dam are thoroughly scrutinized by an impartial, qualified agency.

With the assistance of the College of Marine Studies at the University of Delaware, I am able to identify five major areas which I believe must be examined prior to approval of this project.

I now present to you Dr. William Gaither, Dean of the College of Marine Studies, who will elaborate on the five areas I mentioned.

POLAND: NEW DIALOG BETWEEN RULERS AND RULED

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there continue to be cautiously optimistic reports from Eastern Europe that the leadership of Edward Gierek of Poland is having some positive results for the people.

With recent setbacks in Rumania and Hungary and Czechoslovakia, one hesitates to give these reports of a slightly more responsive government in Poland too much credibility.

But indications persist that the people are being responded to. Following is an article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on Sunday, July 25, describing some of the present-day conditions in Poland:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sun., July 25, 1971]

POLAND: A NEW DIALOG BETWEEN RULERS AND RULED

(By Edward Rohrbach)

"And it is true, for the last few months, that public affairs have become the main concern of our lives. They constitute the most fascinating subject in every—even the most restricted, even the most private—encounter . . ."

—POLISH DEMOCRATIC PARTY WEEKLY.

WARSAW.—Poles do talk about politics now. During the 15 stark years of the Gomulka regime, it was a subject not only unhealthy to discuss but—perhaps worse—uninteresting.

Inspiring the new dialog, when not leading it himself, is Edward Gierek. The 58-year-old Communist Party chief appears almost daily on Polish television and dominates the newspapers. Such exposure is not difficult with a state-controlled media, but Gierek does it by producing genuine news.

Six months after coming to power in the wake of the December food-price riots that toppled Wladislaw Gomulka, Gierek still travels the country like someone running for office.

AIDS CAUSE FOR WOMEN'S LIB

Oozing charm, he kisses farm wives on the cheek in front of photographers to both advance the cause of women's lib in Poland and reestablish the long-lost contact here between the rulers and ruled.

In touring factories he seems more the burly ex-coalminer he is, scolding sycophantic management publicly when they trot out the usual party hacks for him instead of workers with real grievances whom Gierek wants to see and listen to.

At the May Day parade this year in Warsaw, there were no giant portraits of party and state leaders, the normal petty idolatry that Communist bosses encourage the faithful to indulge in at such staged events.

Last month a member of the Politburo, Jan Szydlak, subjected himself to an hour and a half of quizzing on a new national television program called Citizens' Forum. Direct telephone lines from thruout Poland were piped into the studio.

MORE PROGRAMS ARE SCHEDULED

Most of the questions concerned housing, and Szydlak, in charge of economic affairs, promised better conditions. Often the questions were drafted in a sharp way—"What's going to be done about. . . .?" Nothing like it had ever happened before here and more programs, with other Politburo members up for grilling, are scheduled.

Despite such unprecedented courting of public opinion, Poles still view their government agross a vast credibility gap. Nevertheless, considerable interest has been stirred by new policies that will be major reforms, if implemented.

Premier Piotr Jaroszewicz has just announced a five-year plan to shift the emphasis in the Polish economy from heavy industry to consumer goods. It is aimed at fulfilling Gierek's promise that by the end of 1975 the standard of living in Poland will be raised 25 per cent.

Foreign consumer imports are to be expanded 75 per cent and wages hiked 17 to 18 per cent, double the rate of the previous period.

Meat consumption is to rise 17 pounds per capita annually, to 136 pounds a year. Probably most appealing is the pledge to alleviate the housing shortage—waiting time for apartments now in Poland is six years.

A NEW AGRICULTURE POLICY

In the boldest innovation, agricultural policy will be redirected. The goal will no longer be to force private farmers into state and collective systems.

The hated compulsory delivery quota system is to be abolished and the thrust of policy will be to encourage efficient private farmers to take over land from less productive neighbors.

Gone, too, apparently, is the hostility toward the Catholic Church, which maintains a remarkable spiritual hold over the large majority of Poles. A whole series of concessions have been granted by the Gierek government, and church-state relations, after years of bitterness, seem to be evolving toward a genuine live-and-let-live basis.

But all these "reforms" aimed at winning over a sullen people can be seen as nothing more than cynical self-interest by a new, smarter government. And it may be that Gierek does not have a choice.

If the deplorable Polish economy is not improved and the Poles' long-neglected thirst for consumer goods not soon slaked, what's to prevent another outbreak of such rioting as brought down Gomulka?

WORKERS' TACTICS WORKED ONCE

The workers "smelled blood" when they rampaged last December in Gdansk and other Baltic ports. Their tactics worked once in removing the government and now they know their power is something Gierek must fearfully recognize.

The freer hand promised Poland's private farmers, already an anomaly in the Communist world because 85 per cent of the country's output comes from that sector, may well have simply been dictated by the urgent need to produce more food, and quickly.

And fighting the church all these years has been nothing more than a war of attrition. Anyway, the new thinking in the government is that the church's moral code is useful in keeping social problems, such as alcoholism, in check.

Recent articles in the state-controlled press have even sided with Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski's concern for Poland's falling birthrate, but for a different reason, of course.

The argument can also be made that if these changes by the Gierek government were really heresy against former hard line policies, then the Soviet Union would step in. But, on the contrary, the new $100-million hard currency loan from Russians (mostly being spent to buy meat in the West) appears an approbation of Gierek's looser rein on the Poles.

BIG BROTHER TO THE EAST

After the Russian-led invasion and occupation of bordering Czechoslovakia, no one in Eastern Europe is under the illusion that the new Polish government operates on other than a short leash from Moscow.

Some observers here believe that Gierek has only been allowed a freer hand domestically in exchange for complete Polish subservience to Russia in foreign policy.

How far Gierek will go, can go, or wants to go in liberalizing Poland is apparently being determined by a commission that the Politburo, under First Secretary Gierek's guidance, has set up. Ten teams of experts are studying "the directions of modernization of the functioning of the economy and the state as a whole."

Their documentation on a broad spectrum of Polish life, covering such touchy subjects as the press and education, is to be circulated at the sixth party congress at the end of the year.

This crucial congress also will determine how much strength Gierek has in the party. His full authority in Poland will not be established until then, when he no doubt will try to push thru a central committee completely loyal to him. Gierek's long-range aim, he recently admitted, is to be the first party leader to leave office normally—that is, by retirement rather than overthrow.

RULES WITH HEAVY HAND

Meanwhile, the government continues to rule Poland with a heavy hand. Often the people don't realize it, so Communist-conditioned are they to believing that they exist for the pleasure of the state, and not vice versa. Some examples:

A college girl is afraid to leave her dormitory one afternoon without taking proper "identity papers" for fear she will be arbitrarily stopped by police.

A playwright sadly describes the four types of censorship that plague his art: self-censorship, because he knows what will definitely not pass; censorship by the publisher before printing any copies; censorship by the party to make sure the ideology is pure; and last, by the state again because it controls the stipend the playwright gets to live on and continue his work.

A woman who speaks three languages and holds what is considered an excellent job in the export business says, with a Pole's typical bitter humor: "I get the equivalent of 30 dollars a month from the state, whether I work at my job or not."

The resigned attitude of youth, so impatient in the rest of the world, is summed up by a 22-year-old actress: "We're not waiting for anything."

Then a highly educated Pole, who owns one of his degrees from an American university earned as an exchange student, talks at length over dinner about his anguish in believing sincerely that Socialism can work but knowing personally so many examples in Poland of stupid inefficiencies and downright corruption.

Edward Gierek, too, strikes nearly everyone as being sincere. He has consolidated his power at the top, most notably by engineering the meteoric descent of Mieczyslaw Moczar, once apparently the most powerful man in Poland as security chief.

LIKE GIEREK AND HIS STYLE

On the bottom, workers and peasants seem more than willing to give Gierek a chance. They like him and his style: They still identify with him.

However, Gierek's problem will be to break thru the choking centralization and crusted-over burocracy in Poland that in the past has stiffled almost all reforms instituted. This was what happened in 1956 to Gomulka when the "bread and freedom" riots in Poznan brought him into power on a similar wave of public optimism.

That is how the sad cycle has gone in Poland. When the reforms failed to materialize or were taken back, the people become disenchanted with the new leadership. Then, in order to bridle their discontent, repression returns, often worse than before.

History has been cruel enough for the Poles.

THE CONTEXT OF PEACE EFFORTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as this country's Ambassador to the United Nations for 3 years, Arthur Goldberg is well qualified to discuss efforts to bring peace to the most volatile spot on earth, the Middle East.

Peace, he points out, must be negotiated by the parties directly concerned and not imposed by outsiders.

Mr. Goldberg, writing in the May–June 1971 issue of Vista, the official magazine of the United Nations Association, documents the debate in the UN Security Council surrounding its adoption of Resolution 242.

I am inserting that article at this point:

THE CONTEXT OF PEACE EFFORTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

It is a natural temptation for one who, as United States Ambassador to the United Nations, for three years played a key role in the debates and negotiations involving conflict and peace in the Middle East to offer his personal blueprint of how peace can best be achieved.

I do not propose to yield to this temptation. It is one thing to express concern about the situation in the Middle East and to voice the fervent hope that a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab states will be achieved—better sooner than later. It is quite another thing to profess a monopoly on the prescription which thus far has eluded Israel, the Arab states, Ambassador Jarring and governments, including my own and Great Britain, in attaining a peace agreement.

Accordingly, in lieu of a blueprint, I wish to offer some general observations about the road to peace in the Middle East. Most of these relate to expressions emanating from my own country. I have noted some similar attitudes from Great Britain.

Perhaps the best way to start is to recall the principle that guided my government, and others at the UN during the long period of debate and negotiations following the six-day war and culminating in the unanimous adoption of the critically important Resolution 242 by the Security Council on 22 November 1967. This is what I said at the time, not once but repeatedly: "To return to the situation as it was on June 4, 1967 is not a prescription for peace, but for renewed hostilities."

I believe that this principle was accurate then. I believe it is accurate now. And, as an American, I express the fervent hope and expectation that our respective governments will remain faithful to this principle derived as it is from the history of the last two decades.

I think it is appropriate to recall also what my government, immediately after the June war, said about the nature of a peace settlement in the Middle East: In the words of President Johnson, "But who will make this peace where all others have failed for 20 years or more? Clearly the parties to the conflict must be the parties to the peace. Sooner or later, it is they who must make a settlement in the area. It is hard to see how it is possible for nations to live together in peace if they cannot learn to reason together." I am not aware that the British Government in any way disagreed with or disassociated itself from this formulation when made.

Again, I believe that this insight was right then. I believe it is right now. As an American I again express the fervent hope and expectation that our governments will remain faithful to this insight.

Finally, we might also recall another principle agreed upon by our governments, namely that others can and should help, but their contribution should be "to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement." That is the exact language of Resolution 242 of 22 November 1967; it is also Ambassador Jarring's mandate, and is also binding on both our governments which were principal architects of that resolution.

In light of these principles, the concept recently bruited about in the Four-Power discussions in New York and elsewhere of a Big-Four Power UN peacekeeping force, including American and Soviet "fighting forces" is, in my opinion, a nonstarter, completely lacking in substance and fraught with

the most dangerous possible consequences. It is true that this proposal has been somewhat blunted in the last fortnight by a welcome declaration of Secretary of State Rogers that my government would not support such a proposal unless both Israel and the UAR agreed. Perhaps this moots the proposition since it is inconceivable to me that Israel would or should accept it, in light of the tragic experience of 1967. But whether Israel accepted it or not, I would, nonetheless, be opposed to such a proposal on the basic ground that participation by the Soviet Union and the United States in particular, or the big powers in general, through contingents of fighting military forces under a UN peacekeeping umbrella would be contrary to America's interests, Britain's interests and the interests of world peace.

I think it therefore essential that those governments and statesmen seeking to help the parties resolve this dispute, as well as responsible commentators, should recall the history and language of Resolution 242, since all seem to agree that this resolution is the key to a peace agreement between the parties. If the dramatic events preceding and occurring during the six-day war of early June, 1967, have dimmed in public recollection, this is doubly the case with respect to Resolution 242. In early April, for example, the New York Times reported a meeting between Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin and Secretary Rogers, following which the Soviet Ambassador told newsmen that it is up to Israel, if peace is to be achieved, to accept the November 22, 1967 resolution and implement it. The Soviet Ambassador seems to have a lapse of memory. Israel has accepted the resolution. The important thing to recall, however, is that the Security Council, when it adopted the Resolution, did not adopt the Soviet version of it, and with good reason. Moreover, the resolution is not self implementing but depends ultimately upon agreement of the parties.

Resolution 242 was not adopted in a vacuum. It was the product of months of debate and negotiation at the United Nations extending from May 1967 before the war actually broke out, until November 22 of the same year, the date of its adoption.

In May of 1967 the late President Nasser of the UAR moved substantial Egyptian forces into the Sinai, ejected the UN peacekeeping forces, reoccupied the strategic and previously demilitarized Sharm-el-Sheikh and proclaimed a blockade of the Strait of Tiran.

These were ominous measures. Israel, which under American pressure had withdrawn its forces from Sinai and Sharm-el-Sheikh in 1957, had consistently affirmed that a blockade of its ships and cargoes seeking to pass through the Strait of Tiran would be *casus belli*. Moreover, faced with divisional forces of well armed UAR troops on its borders and increasingly provocative statements by Nasser and other Arab leaders, Israel had little choice but to order mobilization of its largely civilian army.

It was justified concern which, therefore, prompted the Western powers, including our two countries, to take the initiative in convoking the Security Council in an attempt to avert a conflict by restoring the situation.

These attempts in the Security Council and through private diplomatic channels failed because of Arab objections supported by the Soviet Union. Apparently, whatever the reason, both were ready to risk war rather than reestablish the conditions which had previously prevailed in the area.

It was only on the second day of the war, after it became publicly apparent to all that Israel for all practical purposes had already won the war, that agreement was reached in the Security Council on a simple resolution calling for a ceasefire.

The ceasefire resolutions which were ultimately adopted during the tense days of the war differed dramatically, however, from previous resolution of the Council in the Israeli-Arab wars of the preceding nineteen years. In the earlier resolutions, the call for a ceasefire was usually accompanied by a demand for a withdrawal of troops to the positions held before the conflicts erupted. In June of 1967, however, no withdrawal provisions were incorporated as part of the ceasefire resolutions. This was not by accident but rather as a result of the reaction by a majority of the Security Council to what had occurred.

As the debates revealed, the Council was unwilling to vote forthwith withdrawal of Israeli forces because of the conviction of a substantial number of the members of the Council that to return to the situation as it was before the June 1967 was would not be a prescription for peace but a formula for renewed hostilities. Proof that this was so is provided by the action of the Council with respect to a resolution pressed at the time by the Soviet Union. The Soviet representative offered a specific resolution not only reaffirming the Council's call for a ceasefire, but additionally, condemning Israel as the aggressor and demanding a withdrawal of its forces to the positions held on June 5, 1967 before the conflict erupted. But this resolution of the Soviet Union, although put to a vote, did not command the support of the requisite nine members of the Security Council.

The unwillingness to support the Soviet resolution for a withdrawal of Israeli forces to the positions they held before June 5, 1967, was based upon the conviction of a substantial number of the Security Council members that the withdrawal of Israeli troops should this time be in the context of a just and lasting peace settlement putting an end to the state of belligerency which had prevailed for two decades resulting from the Arab States unwillingness to acknowledge and respect Israel's sovereignty and right to live.

The Soviet Union did not allow the matter to rest with its defeat in the Security Council. It called for a special session of the General Assembly which convened on June 17, 1967. It is important to recall that the General Assembly also refused to adopt by the requisite two-thirds majority a resolution offered by Yugoslavia and several other members and supported by the Soviet Union and the Arab states, differing somewhat in tone but not in substance from the prior Soviet resolution.

With the adjournment of the Special Session of the General Assembly in September 1967, the matter once again reverted to the Security Council and again became the subject of further public debate as well as intensive private negotiations. These finally culminated in the November 22 resolutions.

The resolution offered by the British Representative, Lord Caradon, stemmed in substantial degree from the General Assembly resolution of the Latin Americans and a United States resolution offered to the resumed Security Council meeting. The unanimous support for this resolution was the product in considerable measure of intensive diplomatic activity by the United States and Great Britain both at the United Nations and in foreign capitals throughout the world. This is not to say that the various Latin America countries, India and others were not actively engaged in the negotiations and diplomatic activity, but it cannot be gain said that the United States together with Great Britain took the lead in the adoption of the November 22 resolution. Impartial observers reported at the time that the United States' role was the primary one. As its representative. I now confirm the validity of this observation.

It should be noted that before the vote on the November 22 resolution, the Soviet Union offered a draft resolution again calling for withdrawal of Israeli troops to the June 5 lines. It did not, however, press this resolution to a vote. Then, and only then, was the stage set for the adoption of the November 22 resolution.

It is to the text of the resolution that I now turn, since it is the text of the resolution, illuminated by its legislative history, which expressed the will of the Security Council.

It is of great significance in interpreting the resolution that it does not specifically require Israel to withdraw to the June 5, 1967 lines. Rather, it enunciates as a principle "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." The word "all" does not precede "territories" in this formulation or principle. Nor does the article "the" precede "territories" in the English text which was the negotiated document. This was not accidental but was the product of negotiated design.

Coupled and linked with the withdrawal provision is the enunciation of the deeply-held conviction by many UN members: the time had come for the termination by the Arab states of all claims of a state of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment by them of Israeli sovereignty and its right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. In this linkage, the Security Council realistically acknowledged that the Arab states could not be left free to assert the rights of war, as they had been doing, while Israel was being called upon to abide by the rules of peace. While the resolution speaks in terms of respect for the sovereignty of all states in the area, it is obvious that its main thrust is to obtain acknowledgment of Israel's sovereignty somthing the Arab states have been unwilling until now to do.

The resolution further affirmed the necessity for guaranteeing freedom of navigation of international waterways in the area, of achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem, and for guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every state in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones. In light of reports concerning the role of the Security Council, and particularly its four leading permanent members, in connection with the peace settlement, it is important to note that the language of the resolution speaks in terms of guarantees rather than imposition.

While the provisions relating to withdrawal, renunciation of belligerency, freedom of navigation and settlement of the refugee problem are numbered paragraphs 1 and 2 in the resolution, they are all stated in terms of principles for a settlement. The really operative part of the resolution is in paragraph 3 which requests the Secretary General to designate a special representative to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the states concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement.

It is this paragraph pursuant to which Ambassador Jarring was designated to undertake his delicate mission. It is his mandate and sets forth the ultimate object of the whole enterprise, namely, to help bring about agreement between the parties to ensure a just and lasting peace in the area. The concept of a just, agreed upon and lasting peace in which every state in the area can live in security is emphasized and repeated throughout the resolution. It cannot be disputed that this concern is the very essence and goal of Resolution 242.

Given this diplomatic history, it is appropriate for me to take note of some recent developments. President Sadat of the UAR has advised Ambassador Jarring that his government is willing to sign a peace agreement with Israel, although this offer is conditioned with reservations not embodied in the November 22 resolution. And Israel, of course, has long stated its fervent desire to

conclude a peace treaty with the UAR. In this connection, I would like to emphasize the value of patience in the resolution of grave diplomatic dilemmas such as this. Patience and fortitude can bring their own rewards. In the years following the 1967 war many diplomats adhered to the view that the UAR would never agree to sign a peace agreement with Israel under any circumstances. Israel's insistence upon a peace agreement led to charges of unrealism and inflexibility on its part. But events and the recent offer of President Sadat have, at least to some extent, justified Israel's patient resolve on this point.

And not only has Israel proved to be right in this respect, but I have always believed that, given the opportunity through appropriate negotiations, Israel will effectively discredit the all-too-prevalent conception, held even among some friends, that Israel is inflexible and unwilling to display magnanimity for peace. The concessions to date made by Israel in the search for peace are too often overlooked.

Israel wanted to start with direct negotiations but agreed to begin with indirect negotiations under Ambassador Jarring's auspices.

Israel wanted the Jarring talks to be held on the foreign minister's level, but agreed to begin on the ambassadorial level.

Israel wanted the discussions to be held close to the Middle East, but agreed to commence in New York.

Israel wanted a restoration of the agreed-upon ceasefire with an indefinite duration but agreed to resume negotiations through Ambassador Jarring with the ceasefire limited by a unilateral declaration of the UAR.

Israel wanted the removal of missiles and sites constructed in violation of the ceasefire understanding arranged by the United States, but agreed to proceed with the talks despite the Soviet and UAR breach of this understanding.

These are not insubstantial concessions. In my view, they reflect the fervent desire of the government and people of Israel for the long sought goal—a just and enduring peace in the area.

In light of these considerations, I welcome the assurances of my government that Israel will not be pressured in the search for a just and lasting peace which will serve the interests of Israel and its Arab neighbors. It is precisely such a peace that is mandated by Resolution 242.

The time has long passed when great powers can or should impose their views on small states. Greatness alone does not assure a monopoly on wisdom. Rather, all powers and people genuinely interested in a settlement in the Middle East should lend their influence for a negotiated peace treaty between the parties to the 1967 conflict. In this uncertain world, no one can guarantee that anything done today will endure forever. But I am strongly of the conviction that there is no other way to lasting peace in the Middle East than the way in which nations throughout history made peace which lasts—through negotiated agreements between the affected parties reflecting both magnanimity and a true and realistic recognition of the needs and interests of those directly concerned.

SECOND DISTRICT OPINION POLL HEADING TO 227,000 HOMES

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the 1971 Second Congressional District Opinion Poll is now being delivered to residents of my District, and, for the first time, persons between the ages 18 and 20 will be taking part because of the recently ratified constitutional amendment extending the vote to younger citizens.

This year's poll includes nine questions ranging from national policy on the war in Southeast Asia to the need for reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government and revenue sharing. The questions, which I prepared with the assistance of the Library of Congress, will enable me to gain insight into the thinking of the people of the Second District on many of the major issues to be coming before us in the 92d Congress.

Since its introduction in 1964, Mr. Speaker, the Second Congressional District Opinion Poll has become one of the largest samplings of public opinion in the Nation. Each year the poll draws as many as 50,000 responses, and because the poll utilizes a punch card it is possible for business machines to accurately count the opinions of all who participate.

This year's poll will go into 227,000 homes and each questionnaire provides room for both husbands and wives to respond.

For the information of my colleagues, I would like to present the format which I utilize:

IF MARRIED, BOTH HUSBAND AND WIFE MAY PARTICIPATE

1. Do you favor federal income tax revenue-sharing with local and state governments?

2. Do you favor reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, consolidating 7 Cabinet Departments into 4?

3. Should the Indian Peaks area northwest of Boulder, Colorado be accorded National Wilderness Area status?

4. Do you favor proposals for an all-volunteer military, except in times of grave national peril?

5. Do you favor increased U.S. diplomatic contact with Communist China?

6. Do you support the Administration's plan to end the war in Southeast Asia?

7. Should the Administration be required by Congress to bring home all U.S. troops from South Viet Nam before the end of this year?

8. Would you favor Congress requiring the withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of 1971 if it meant the probable Communist takeover of South Viet Nam?

9. Would you favor Congress requiring the withdrawal of all U.S. troops by the end of 1971 without guarantees for the timely release of U.S. prisoners held by North Viet Nam?

Your age group: a. 18–29 b. 30–54 c. 55 and over.

Political affiliation: A. Republican B. Democrat C. Independent.

Occupation Head of household: A. Bus. or Prof. B. Indus. worker C. Government D. Farmer E. Student F. Retired.

WHO TO TRUST?

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this month, as we celebrate the 195th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and are just 5 years away from our Nation's bicentennial, one of the basic provisions of our Constitution; namely, the freedom of the press, is in the forefront of national discussion.

The unpopular Vietnam war has been the backdrop for many confrontations between groups within our country—young versus old—poor versus rich—conservative versus liberal—civilian versus police, and so forth.

Now in the forefront is the battle between the news media and the Government.

Ever since the famous John Peter Zenger case, prior to our Declaration of Independence, when publisher Zenger challenged the Governor of New York as being lazy, the press and the Government have crossed swords on many occasions, but never have the blades been so sharp, or clashed so loudly as they have in recent years.

The past good-natured give and take between two of the most powerful elements of our society has now changed into bitter attacks upon each other. These charges leave many in our Nation bewildered and even suspicious.

Although poll after poll indicates that the average person does not generally believe everything he reads in the paper or hears on the broadcast media, other polls also indicate that the average American does not trust his Government officials.

In recent weeks two important instances brought the Government in direct conflict with the press. First, the printing of the "Pentagon Papers," which the Government alleged to be secret because of national security, were printed by certain powerful newspapers. The Government moved to enjoin the publication of the papers but the Supreme Court by a 6-to-3 decision allowed their continued publication.

Second, proceedings were brought against the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., and its president, Frank Stanton, for contempt of Congress based upon the television program, "The Selling of the Pentagon" for the failure of Mr. Stanton as president of CBS to provide certain newsclips and other information in connection with the show as required by the congressional subpena.

With regard to the "Pentagon Papers," even though the Supreme Court held in favor of the right of the newspapers to print the papers, which under the circumstances I believe was proper, the decision nevertheless does not relieve the news media of its responsibility to use caution in the disclosure of matters which might well involve our national security.

It is unfortunate that many Government agencies, particularly the Defense Department—has over the years overindulged in the practice of classifying certain information as "secret," "top secret," "restrictive," thereby prohibiting their subsequent publication, or even statements concerning such information. This "gag rule" method has not only been imposed on the news media, but it has also been imposed upon various Govern-

ment officials including Members of Congress.

Although I feel there are times when information should be kept secret or confidential there are too many instances when Government agencies put their classification stamp on documents and other information for political reasons or for reasons other than protecting our national security.

In the past, when we were at war, certain news was suppressed by way of censorship and generally the news media and the public trusted their Government in statements made by officials.

In Vietnam, however, the press has been given almost a free hand to report what they see which results in not only some inaccurate news reports, but at times some of the news is reported in a manner which certain correspondents wish it to be interpreted, rather than honest and factual. Fortunately, this type of reporting has not been the general rule of the news media in Vietnam and the press and other correspondents should be commended for this.

Because of the issues raised, various subcommittees of the House, including the Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member, held hearings on two of the issues resulting namely;

First, how and when the United States should get out of Vietnam and;

Second, how much access should the Congress and the public have to information on the war.

As might be expected, there were many different suggestions and little unanimity. There were 41 measures setting specific dates for withdrawal, from immediate withdrawal of our troops; to withdrawal within 6 to 12 months; to staged withdrawal and so on.

On July 7 the House, by a vote of 261 to 118, killed a resolution of inquiry (House Resolution 492) which would have dircted the Secretary of State to give Congress documents on the policy governing U.S. military operations in Laos.

As to the proceedings against Frank Stanton and CBS, the House on July 13, killed a move to cite Mr. Stanton for contempt of Congress by a roll call vote of 226 to 181, which sent the motion for contempt back to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The contempt citation raised several questions since CBS is a network agency and since television is subject to regulatory powers. The network argued their right to withhold the matters from congressional investigation on the basis of their protection under the constitutional guarantee of free speech. The facts of their case were, therefore, different from those involved in printing the "Pentagon Papers" since in the case of CBS, it was the company which was withholding information. The real question was whether or not CBS actually had abused its right of freedom of speech and had acted in a responsible manner.

Since television is a member of a Federal regulated industry, the charges were subject to review by the Federal Communications Commission, but nevertheless the Supreme Court had decided in a previous case; namely, Rosenbloom against Metromedia, Inc., that the electronic media were entitled to the same first amendment protection as the written press in private citizen libel suits.

The first amendment then is not a protection to be used as a shield by the press, but it does limit the Government's authority. In direct terms it prohibits enactment of any law "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

After reading the full testimony of the proceedings against Mr. Stanton and CBS, as well as the committee reports, I decided to vote against the contempt proceeding for even though I feel freedom of speech and of the press is sometimes abused, most of the press and other news media have stayed within the bounds of reporting ethics.

In addition, although the Government has the power to regulate the public airwaves, I do not feel that either side proved that more than protection is granted to one by the Constitution and that the Government has the right to demand that the broadcast news media, although granted protection, makes its news coverage fair and impartial.

NOTHING FOR SOMETHING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as we public officials are aware, the term "pork barrel" usually refers to the giving away of something for nothing. However, as far as the subject of pork and beans is concerned, the opposite would seem to be the case. It appears as though the manufacturers of this product have, for a long time, been giving nothing for something.

An article in the July 22 issue of the Washington Post describes the results of a study on canned pork and beans undertaken by Bess Myerson Grant, New York City's Commissioner of Consumer Affairs. Her analysis revealed that fully one half of the samples contained only 1 percent or less pork, and that one national brand—"Campbell's Home Style Pork and Beans"—contained no pork at all.

One might be tempted to say that, in their desire to "bring home the bacon," these manufacturers have been less than totally honest with the public.

The Food and Drug Administration currently sets no minimum pork requirements that must be satisfied for a product to be advertised as "pork and beans." Yet, similar products, such as franks and beans are required to contain at least 20 percent meat.

This is another instance in which the consumer is denied the information needed to make a knowledgeable choice. The Food and Drug Administration should immediately set a minimum pork requirement for products advertised as "pork and beans."

It is high time for the consumer to stop paying "something for nothing."

Mr. Speaker, I am now entering the article in the RECORD:

EATING LOW ON THE HOG

(By Carole Shifrin)

First the hot dog came under attack for having too much fat and not enough meat. Then we were told Wonder Bread did not build strong bodies 12 ways.

Now, another American institution—pork and beans—is under fire.

New York City's consumer affairs commissioner, Bess Myerson, yesterday charged that an analysis by her department of 10 brands of canned pork and beans showed half of them contained only 1 per cent or less of pork. None of the cans tested had more than 7 per cent pork, and one brand, "Campbell's Home Style Pork and Beans" contained no pork at all, she said.

A spokesman for Campbell's, however, insisted that its "home style" pork and beans had about 2 per cent pork in it. "It does have ground pork," he said. "You can't see it with the naked eye."

He said there was "no attempt on anyone's part to deceive" the consumer. The Food and Drug Administration had not set up standards for pork and beans, he said, and has told industry that it has "for years been recognized by consumers generally that the designation pork and beans is a common name for an item which "contains very little pork."

"If the product contains no pork at all, the FDA should forbid the use of the word 'pork' on the lable," she contended, "unless it appears in a phrase such as 'beans, without pork,' or 'beans in a sauce with imitation pork flavoring.'"

Miss Myerson said the brands of her department analyzed, and their pork content, are:

A&P (Sultana) Pork and Beans in tomato sauce—.94 per cent pork.

Ann Page Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. Pork 'n' Beans in tomato sauce—labeled as "Pea beans . . . cooked in savory tomato sauce with pork—1 per cent pork.

Ann Page's Boston Style beans with pork and molasses sauce—3 per cent pork.

B&M Brick Oven Baked Beans made with small pea beans—7 per cent pork.

Campbell Soup Co. Pork & Beans with tomato sauce tender hearted—1 per cent pork.

Campbell Soup's Home Style Pork & Beans—with label reading in part, "to conventional pork and beans, we've added . . ."—no pork.

Co-op Beans, water, pork and tomato sauce—with a label reading beans . . . with just the right amount of pork—.75 per cent pork.

Heinz Company Pork 'n' Beans in tomato sauce—4 per cent pork.

Krasdale Fancy beans with pork in tomato sauce—with a label reading "fancy beans with pork in tomato sauce"—.8 per cent pork.

Stokely-Van Camp's Pork & Beans Prepared with tomato sauce—labeled the "original pork and beans with tomato sauce"—.75 per cent pork.

WOMEN SUFFER MOST FROM UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, my sister, Congresswoman GRIFFITHS, read to you an article describing the plight of women in Detroit who evince a higher unemployment rate than men, and who face tremendous difficulty in finding jobs. This dilemma is not limited to Detroit. All over the country, the

unemployment level of women tends to be at least 3 points higher than that for men. The assumption that women work only for extra money or to relieve boredom is unjustified for the 15,055,000 women who are heads of households and the sole source of support for their families. For those women who do have working husbands, many women work to raise their families above the level of poverty. And even for those women whose husbands do earn a substantial amount, it makes no sense to decide that the husband's work is automatically more important, and that he is entitled to be retained rather than an equally or more competent woman.

My office has received scores of letters from all over the Nation informing me of desperate situations, and complaining of inattention or lack of solicitude from their own representatives in Washington. This is a serious charge. I hope that my colleagues in Congress are not so hypocritical as to speak out with concern on employment, while ignoring the very persons that are hardest hit. I hope that my colleagues in Congress realize that they represent unemployed women as well as unemployed men, employed women as well as employed men. And I hope that my colleagues will join me in doing everything within our powers to alleviate this desperation.

I include a letter which I recently received from a woman from West Virginia which is typical of the nationwide pleas that my office has received:

MARTINSBURG, W. VA.,
July 15, 1971.

MRS. BELLA ABZUG,
Congresswoman, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ABZUG: If this letter reaches you directly, I would like to say honestly it is a plea for help. I am a woman of forty-two, with a college degree in office management and public relations which I worked at for fifteen years. I have reared a daughter, a lovely young woman, put her through college and now she is a teacher and married. Unfortunately I must support myself. I do not qualify for unemployment. I cannot receive welfare which I ask for as a last, degrading resort because I was told I was able to work. How do they think I could ask for welfare if I could find work? I am told I am too old when an office job comes up and they hire the younger girls. I can assure anyone, Mrs. Abzug, I am quite capable of managing a business. I am so sick and tired of begging for work which is stupid and degrading for two months. I applied for two waitress jobs at $1.15 per hr. and could have kept them both had I been more receptive to the men who owned the places. Why can't we be allowed to work without this. I have seen so much of it it sickens me.

I have written both my congressman and senator and have received only a Civil Service form in return mail for who knows what. Mrs. Abzug, no help. *Unless* one has been in my situation one cannot perceive of what you have to take to keep a job. I could probably come to Washington and support myself very well. I know no one and I have no money to hold me until I should acquire something I am suited for. Mrs. Abzug, I am a highly capable woman and would be an asset to any business. Something must be wrong with a state of the union which will allow some of the discriminations to go on toward women in my situation. Mrs. Abzug, I would like very much to belong to the organization at which you spoke to just recently in Washington—I am not sure (League of Women Voters?) If dues are involved, perhaps I can get same.

Mrs. Abzug, there must be many women in my position and age group who are hit with the same frustrations every day. As for me, I am fed up with it and would like to do something about it. I would appreciate any help you can give me. Thank you for reading my letter, and your time.

Most sincerely,

DOROTHY ALGER.

P.S.—If you wish to use this letter as an example, please do so. It is damn time they took their heads out of the sand.

STRIP MINING CURBS NEEDED

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in some 25 States of this country, strip mining activities are being carried out. These activities spell the despoilation of large areas of attractive countryside—areas which are difficult and expensive to reclaim and which may well be lost forever.

Our colleague from West Virginia, Mr. HECHLER, has taken the lead in focusing national attention on the environmental consequences of strip mining. In this regard, I commend to my fellow members the following editorial from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of June 16, 1971.

[From St. Louis Post Dispatch, June 16, 1971]

FOR CURBS ON STRIP MINING

With a bill whose legislative progress literally represents a race against the forces of destruction, Representative Ken Hechler of West Virginia is seeking to outlaw strip mining for coal everywhere in the United States. The Hechler bill is obviously a far-reaching measure. But the practices it deals with are so ruinous and their long-range consequences are so irremediable that Mr. Hechler's complete prohibition may be the only means to save vast sections of the American landscape.

Using giant earth-moving machines that can decapitate mountains and gouge out their slopes, strip miners rip out the coal with an abandon that does incalculable harm to land and people. As Mr. Hechler has pointed out, this method of mining ruins topsoil, destroys the habitat for wildlife, pours acid and sediment into streams, laying waste huge areas of valuable timber, causing floods and landslides that wreck the homes of poverty-stricken mountain residents; and even where reclamation has been attempted the land has been hopelessly scarred and drained of its productiveness.

The threat from strip mining is growing because of the nation's voracious demand for coal to generate electric power and the increasing use of monster bulldozers, giant power shovels and great augur drills (which actually waste coal because they often destroy the roof supports needed to extract the remaining deposits by shaft mining). About a third of the country's annual 560,000,000 tons of coal production is now obtained by this ravaging method. And it is also being applied to other minerals so that in time it could be employed in every state with devastating results.

With half of the states having no compulsory laws for reclaiming stripped land and with many state laws being poorly enforced, the need for congressional action is urgent.

Because of the profits involved and the jobs affected, lobbying opposition to the Hechler bill is mounting. But the measure has steadily gained bipartisan sponsors, who now number more than 80 from 25 states, including Representatives Metcalfe, Mikva and Yates of Illinois.

Protection of the land requires passage of something like the Hechler bill, with provision for a phased shift to deep mining or other extractive processes and accompanying measures to safeguard the environment. At the very least stripping should be immediately outlawed in areas, such as steep slopes where damage is greatest and where restoration of the land is virtually impossible.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there are some in our country today who say that the Statue of Liberty has become a fallen angel and the American dream, a tarnished hoax. I cannot disagree more strongly and was deeply moved by an essay, entitled "The American Dream," written by a long-time personal friend, Municipal Court Judge Earl Cantos. One of San Diego's distinguished citizens. Earl is the son of Greek immigrants who made a new life for themselves and their children in America. Earl sincerely believed the American dream and he is today a living example of what he writes. I take great pleasure in sharing Earl's essay with my House colleagues and know they will find it as poignant and meaningful as I.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

What is the American Dream? Is it something new today, or something left over from yesterday? Is it a replay grown old and useless, or a bright new picture of strength and promise? Is there such a dream to be dreamt, and then to come true? There is, and it is as diverse as the sum total of fifty States, and as strong as a blend of two hundred million parts to the whole.

The American Dream is a vision that is many things expressed in many ways, by many people, all of them saying that it is the need to be free to pursue one's hopes; the faith to seek something more for family and children, the desire to reach for the stars, and maybe even, to become President, In short, to dream the impossible dream, believing that it can come true.

The American Dream is . . . the image, the spirit, the substance of America.

All that we are, or hope to be, lies in a deep rooted dedication to a spirit of fair play and independence and of love of country, that is a part of each American citizen.

This individual and collective dedication is expressed in daily word and deed. Every day in some way each of us gives something to the Image, Spirit and Substance of our country. However small, what we give in sum total with all Americans, becomes what our country is to us, and is to the world. Because of this, each of us must act with restraint; with understanding; with dignity, and with pride and honor.

The Image of America is that which we create as citizens in our daily lives.

The Spirit of America is embedded in Faith in God and Country and the obligation to demonstrate by deed the belief in Rule of Law. It is the right to be free and the duty to be responsible.

The Substance of America is people, and in being part of the well-spring which offers opportunity, ideals, education, morality, and hope. It is how we treat one another and our institutions.

This Image; This Spirit; This Substance; is our Country's bloodstream! The very life of the United States of America is how we speak; we act, and we feel about our Country.

The American Dream is the American Truth, and can be expressed with resolve and pride in just one way: By living daily this thought . . . I AM MY COUNTRY.

THE NIXONOMIC CURE FOR INFLATION: 11 PERCENT UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's incompetence in handling the Indochina war appears to be exceeded only by its incompetence in handling the economy.

There are a number of significant steps President Nixon could take: He could institute wage-price controls. He could stop pouring out national treasure into the bottomless Southeast Asian pit. He could bring at least half of the troops home from Europe. He could reorder Government budgetary priorities in general.

But he has refused to do any of these things. He has refused to do anything at all about the substance of the problem, but instead has launched what we might describe as a one-two punch against the image of the problem. Punch No. 1 is the announcement, with maximum fanfare, that he is going to seek economic expansion, that he is a "Keynsian" and is willing to allow a certain amount of inflation in order to get the country moving. But because the war is still continuing, wage-price controls are not imposed, et cetera, the economy does not even expand enough to keep up with population growth, and inflation goes through the ceiling. So then the No. 2 punch is offered as the magic cure; hold down inflation at all costs, and allow a "tolerable level of unemployment."

Well, Mr. Speaker, inflation is not being held down, and employment is not tolerable. In the two northernmost counties of my district, Sutter and Yuba, unemployment is now 11.1 percent. This may be tolerable to Mr. Nixon's millionaire friends, but it is not tolerable to the people of Sutter and Yuba Counties, and it certainly is not tolerable to me.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "Unemployment Hits 11.1 Percent," from the Yuba Independent-Herald:

UNEMPLOYMENT HITS 11.1 PERCENT

More people were looking for work in Sutter-Yuba last month than either the month before or a year ago.

Employment figures of the Department of Human Resources Development for June show an 11.1 percent unemployment rate, up from 10.2 percent for May and 10.6 percent a year ago.

There were 3400 people out of work in June out of a total work force of 30,525. In May there were only 3025 out of work but the total work force was also smaller, only 29,575.

The breakdown into types of employment is not yet available, but according to Joe Heller of the local HRD office, June agricultural employment is generally down below May. In May the number working in agriculture rose from 2,900 in mid-April to 4,675, with the peak of the peach thinning occurring a few days after the middle of the month. Harvest worker requirements should begin to reduce the unemployment rate within the next ten days.

Manufacturing employment was 125 higher in May than in April and should continue to rise. Gains from April to May were in lumber and wood products while those from last year were in food processing where there was an increase in the processing of vegetables.

The general trend which in May showed an unemployment drop from April has now reversed itself. Although agricultural employment should improve the figure in July, it may not improve it enough to counteract the increase in the work force generally encountered at this season.

HEARINGS COMMENCE ON EMERGENCY STRIKE LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to appear as the leadoff witness before our Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on emergency strike legislation. As I pointed out during my testimony, legislation that I first introduced on this vital subject now has the bipartisan support of 54 other colleagues in the House. I am most grateful for this strong expression of agreement on a controversial and complex issue that this Congress must resolve.

I would like at this time to include my complete statement presented this morning:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES HARVEY

Mr. Chairman, as a member of our distinguished Committee, I have long been aware of the problem now being studied at these hearings. National railroad strikes have been recurring with all-too-familiar regularity since I first came to Congress almost eleven years ago. Each time, to prevent economic hardship and to protect the public welfare, Congress has enacted temporary, eleventh-hour solutions; today, we are seeking to develop permanent legislation—a revision of law that will preclude ad hoc legislation by future Congresses.

I believe sincerely that if Congress fails to act soon, then we who serve as Members had better "bone up" on how to run the railroads, because this Congress and future Congresses will be in the railroad business. "Nationalization" used to be a dirty word. More and more thought, however, is being given to such Government action by both railway labor and management as a result of the problems they face. I do not believe this is what our country wants or needs. I believe we in Congress have an obligation to give our free enterprise system a chance to work.

These hearings are particularly timely, and the need for a permanent solution to protect the public is particularly obvious. The difference between the current, so-called selective strike by the United Transportation Union, and a complete, national strike is almost impossible to discern. Since the court rulings imposed no effective limits on selective strikes, about one-fourth of the revenue ton mile capability of the Southeastern rail region and one-sixth of the Eastern rail region, has been struck. In the Western region the figure is now over one-third, and will increase to one-half if the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe is struck, as threatened.

While the strike is generally accepted as a basic right of the American worker, it is clear that the "selective strike," as currently practiced, is little improvement over the national strikes which have occurred in the recent past in the railroad industry. What is needed—and what is provided in the legislation which my cosponsors and I propose today—is that the right to a selective strike be circumscribed with appropriate safeguards for the public interest. Both the burden of unlimited selective strikes, and the threat of nationalization require that this Congress find a solution to rail industry disputes.

It is predictable that testimony before this Committee will take two courses. Representatives and friends of organized labor will present arguments for unrestricted union action, such as we now are experiencing. The railroads, on the other hand, will seek legislation more favorable to their position. Clearly, we need a compromise solution, one that addresses itself to the realities of a very complex situation. It must be an equitable solution and one that is favorable to the Administration, for they will have the burden of enforcing it.

We need this solution quickly. At present, the nation is confronted with a strike involving one union in the railroad industry; on October 1st of this year, the temporary legislation passed last May will expire and another union will be free to strike.

In recent years, the outcomes of such rail strikes have been fairly predictable: The threat of a complete stoppage of rail transportation forces the President to turn the matter over to the Congress. There the substantive details of the individual dispute are settled, in whole or in part, in committee and on the Floor of the House and the Senate, the unions are required to resume their jobs, and the nation's railroads again operate.

This time, however, the circumstances are somewhat different. The Supreme Court, by refusing to overturn a district court ruling, has affirmed the right of the railroad unions to strike selectively. As we all know, since national bargaining between the union and all of the carriers has broken down, and all provisions of the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted, the United Transportation Union has now elected to strike four of those carriers, threatens to strike six more this Friday, and another five on August 6th. It is no longer required, however, to shut down all of the nation's carriers simultaneously. The presumption here was that, since a major part of the rail transportation system would still be operating, there would be no national emergency and no need to involve the Congress in order to terminate the strike. Eventually, a settlement arrived at between the disputing parties themselves would presumably bring the selective strike to an end.

There is much to be said for this approach to settlement of rail industry labor disputes, particularly if current labor-management procedures and precedents in other industries are used as the norm, and if proper safeguards are applied. It has been the advent of national bargaining and a presumption that all carriers had to be struck, together with a public antipathy to such nationwide strikes, that have led to the unique situation in which the rail industry finds itself. Any possible remedies, such as the judicial ruling for selective strikes, which will preserve the benefits of national bargaining without inducing the national strike/Con-

gressional settlement syndrome, should by all means be given serious consideration.

The public interest, however, is still not met under the present new selective strike situation. That is, the resulting economic impact on business and commerce, as well as the general disruption of public affairs, is such that public opinion will not long permit the Administration and the Congress to stand idly by. In addition, under present law and judicial rulings, any selective strike is very apt to escalate to a full, nationwide strike. This could occur either as a result of careful move and counter-move by the carriers and union managements, or uncontrollably through individual carrier lockouts or wildcat strikes as the situation deteriorates across the country.

Now it must be admitted that the concept of public interest is one which has never been, and may never be, satisfactorily defined. For example, a major auto manufacturing strike such as we recently experienced, or a shutdown of the steel industry, may well be fundamentally more disruptive of the country's well being than would stopping the nation's trains. Whether any one of these is to be considered a national emergency, however, depends on many factors, including the decisions of the Chief Executive, as well as the mood of the public.

Consequently, we can never hope to see laws written which will specify exactly to what degree a union can strike, or precisely when management is justified in a lockout. It may be that some day we will, in fact, proceed beyond today's acceptance of the strike and lockouts as tools of legitimized economic warfare in the settlement of questions of working conditions. But until that new day dawns, we need somehow to find a balance between three contending rights: That of the individual to work only under conditions acceptable to him, that of management to operate its business in an efficient and profitable manner, and that of the public to be protected from undue disruption of its affairs due to conflicts between the first two rights.

I believe that there are solutions to the problem. Certainly, the present law covering the railroad industry has not worked, as evidenced by the number of times the Congress has been required to intervene. And the recent interpretation of the right to strike selectively cannot be the final answer, since escalation to a national shutdown is highly probable, and may be occurring right now. What is needed is twofold. First, a revision of law which will restore the incentive to the parties to undertake serious collective bargaining and to reach settlements without, each time, resorting to Congress. Second, a revision of law which will enable the President, if and when negotiations nevertheless have failed, to take administrative actions until a resolution of the conflict is achieved.

With regard to this latter point, a key requirement is flexibility. Certainly, no one administrative procedure will be appropriate for all of the different situations and the wide variety of substantive issues which will arise in the future. The President must, therefore, be provided with a variety of tools with which to work. And, if these tools are in fact sufficient, he must be given the power—indeed, he must be required—to use them judiciously but inexorably until the dispute at hand is settled.

But this very flexibility, which is so necessary when finally needed, is also the key element in avoiding the need for its use in the first place. For almost every knowledgeable observer agrees that it has been the certainty of governmental action which has, in the past, contributed most to the failure of collective bargaining in the railroad industry. A situation is needed in which neither party can foresee that the Government will intervene to their potential advantage. Then, and only then, can the usual procedures of collective bargaining move forward fruitfully.

What solutions have been proposed to remedy the present, unfortunate situation? Several distinguished Members of the House have proposed solutions which are contained in the various bills now before this Committee. Since the bill which I and my cosponsors introduced adopts many of the best points of these various bills, I would like to take a few moments to describe and compare their various approaches.

Let me illustrate with the first chart how the Railway Labor Act functions with regard to major disputes concerning changes in pay, rules, or working conditions. If the labor-management bargaining conference fails to solve a dispute, the National Mediation Board is required to use its best efforts to bring them to agreement. If it fails, and if either party then refuses to submit the dispute to arbitration, the parties are then required to retain the *status quo* for a period of thirty days.

During this period, the President may create an Emergency Board to investigate and report within an additional thirty days. After the report, a third waiting period of thirty days is provided, after which the parties are free to resort to "self-help." That is, the carriers can institute changes unilaterally, and the unions can strike, either nationally or, now, selectively.

Among the various measures before the Committee, the one which will most drastically affect not only the major dispute provisions, but also the entire Railway Labor Act, is the Administration bill, H.R. 3596. This bill would transfer rail and air labor relations bodily from RLA to the Taft-Hartley Act. Then it would add new provisions to Taft-Hartley to cover major disputes in the entire transportation industry. This approach is somewhat over reactive, in my view. There are many useful provisions which have evolved over the years under RLA, and they probably should not be scuttled wholesale. In addition, I believe the record shows that the maritime, longshore and trucking industry problems are all unique—and surely are all different from those of rail and air—and should not be linked together in new legislation.

The major provisions of the Administration bill are outlined on the second chart, where three presidential options are shown. The first option, Partial Operations, would have a committee decide how much each railroad should curtail operations to simulate the pressures of a strike. The approach is bureaucratic in the extreme, and would have the effect of having the Federal Government involve itself in the details of a pseudo-strike, hardly a situation to encourage collective bargaining settlements.

The other two options provided in the Administration bill are very promising, and I will defer speaking to them until later. A major limitation to the bill, however, is contained in the provision that only *one* of the options can be selected by the President in any dispute. If that selection fails to achieve a settlement, there would be no recourse but to send the dispute back to Congress. This flaw is so major that I cannot emphasize too strongly how this provision undermines the whole idea of improving the present law. If we want to encourage collective bargaining and remove the Congress from the role of arbitrator, the President must be free to find solutions within the administrative process.

The bills supported most strongly by the railroad unions, H.R. 3595, is outlined on the third chart. It quite simply modifies RLA by providing that, when all other provisions have been exhausted, the unions are free to strike either nationally or selectively. On the one hand, provision in law for a national strike would prohibit either the President or Congress from intervening, and the public interest would seem not to be adequately protected. On the other hand, the right to strike, while in accord generally with practice in other industries, needs both balance and safeguards. H.R. 3595, while permitting strikes, effectively removes from the carriers the balancing right to institute work rule changes (as they are doing in the present strike) or to lock out.

An essential requirement in any attempt to reduce strife in the railroad industry, and to encourage the peaceful settlement of disputes, is that a careful balance between the parties should be fashioned. The main effect of this bill would be to place almost unlimited power in the hands of one party to the dispute. For this reason, although I accept the strike as an inherent right, I cannot support the bill as it is written.

A third bill before the Committee, H.R. 2357, is that introduced by Congressman Pickle. This bill is a strong one in that it enables the President to choose sequentially from among several options until the dispute is settled. I strongly endorse this provision, and I have adopted it in my own bill. The options in H.R. 2357 are shown on the fourth chart, and include governmental seizure and operation of struck railroads, as well as compulsory arbitration. While I have no quarrel with compulsory arbitration in principle, I am aware of the strong feelings on the subject in the rail industry. Seizure, on the other hand, I feel is too drastic a measure, and I trust that the Committee can fashion a bill which will achieve all of our objectives without requiring such an extreme provision. Unfortunately, this bill makes explicit provision for turning disputes over to the Congress, and I feel that, if such an option is included, *all* future disputes will end up that way.

Another bill pending before this Committee is H.R. 5347, introduced by Mr. Dingell. This bill would amend the RLA to permit the President to create a special board to assist in the resolution of disputes. Once established, this board could require the carriers to make a final offer of settlement, which would then be offered to the employees. If a majority of the employees accepted this offer, it would become final and binding; if rejected, the unions could then make a counteroffer, which the carriers could accept or reject. At the end of 60 days, if no settlement had been reached, the President would be authorized to direct any carrier or carriers into operation to protect the public health and safety. In short, Mr. Dingell has combined a modified form of final offer selection with a modified version of seizure in an effort to resolve the dispute.

Now, I would like to mention the major provisions of the bill my cosponsors and I have introduced. As I have suggested earlier, I believe RLA should be retained as enabling legislation, and I have added three options for Presidential action as shown on my last chart.

First, I would suggest that selective strikes be permitted by the President unless he finds, in a particular instance, that they would cause immediate imperilment of the national health and safety. However, this option must be circumscribed with appropriate safeguards to insure that the resulting shutdown of transportation does not immediately result in, nor escalate to, a situation which the public refuses to countenance.

In particular, our bill would require that any settlement arrived at between the union and any struck carrier must be offered, intact, to all of the other carriers who had participated in the national bargaining. This will help avoid any tendency to "whipsaw" by gaining successively better settlements from each carrier, in turn. In addition, the limitations on the selective strike are more firmly drawn, so that no more than 20% of the nation's rail service would be affected at any one time, regardless of the number of simultaneous disputes.

As a second option, I would, of course, permit the President to call for additional time at the bargaining table. Many instances will arise where the vagaries of calendars and of argument will require only more time to resolve.

Third, I would adopt the novel suggestion put forward by the Administration under the title of Final Offer Selection. This process, not yet tried anywhere to my knowledge, holds the promise of eliminating the divisiveness of compulsory arbitration while providing an extremely strong impetus to collective bargaining, and an assurance to the public that a final resolution of the dispute will be achieved. What this proposal provides is that, after the parties have bargained to their best ability, each puts forward a final offer which constitutes a complete and binding agreement. Then one and only one of these offers will be selected, complete and intact, by a board composed of public members. The essence of this procedure is that each party is induced, first to resolve as many issues as possible during bargaining, and, second, to make the most reasonable possible final bid on all outstanding issues. For the selection board, which is charged with the public interest, will select that final offer they find to be most reasonable in view of the facts of the situation.

In addition, I imagine that there are other options which might be given to the President to increase the flexibility of his response. In particular, I would like to stress the sequential aspects of my bill, which would permit the President to choose from among the three options until a solution is reached. As I mentioned earlier, the Administration's bill, on the other hand, permits the President one and only one option. However, the important point is that the Administration must be given the power to deal with labor disputes which threaten the nation, to deal with them fairly, and firmly, so that Congress does not have to be involved in each individual dispute, and so that the public interest will be protected.

The legislation that I have sponsored embodies the three major points that I have just mentioned. Since May 13, 1971, when I first introduced my proposal as H.R. 8385, I have received bipartisan support of 54 of my colleagues in the House. My bill has been reintroduced with minor technical modifications on June 14th as H.R. 9088 and H.R. 9089, on July 1st as H.R. 9571 and on July 15th as H.R. 9820.

The broad support that my proposal has gained is both personally gratifying and significant, for it indicates the depth of feeling that exists in the House for permanent rail strike legislation. Naturally, I am very pleased that our House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has initiated hearings on this important subject. I look forward to the emergence of sound and equitable legislation that will serve the interests of all the people.

COSPONSORS OF EMERGENCY STRIKE LEGISLATION

(H.R. 8385, H.R. 9088, H.R. 9089, H.R. 9571 and H.R. 9820)

John B. Anderson (Ill.), Garry Brown (Mich.), James T. Broyhill (N.C.), J. Herbert Burke (Fla.), Elford A. Cederberg (Mich.), Charles E. Chamberlain (Mich.), Harold R. Collier (Ill.), Barber B. Conable, Jr. (N.Y.), R. Lawrence Coughlin (Penna.).

John Dellenback (Ore.), Edward J. Derwinski (Ill.), Samuel L. Devine (Ohio), John N. Erlenborn (Ill.), Joe L. Evins (Tenn.), Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen (N.J.), Bill Frenzel (Minn.), Louis Frey, Jr. (Fla.), James R. Grover, Jr. (N.Y.).

Tom S. Gettys (S.C.), Gilbert Gude (Md.), Seymour Halpern (N.Y.), Michael Harrington (Mass.), James Harvey (Mich.), Craig Hosmer (Calif.), Edward Hutchinson (Mich.), William J. Keating (Ohio), Hastings Keith (Mass.).

Norman F. Lent (N.Y.), Sherman P. Lloyd (Utah), Delbert L. Latta (Ohio), Robert McClory (Ill.), Paul N. McCloskey (Calif.), John Y. McCollister (Nebr.), Jack H. McDonald (Mich.), James D. McKevitt (Colo.), F. Bradford Morse (Mass.).

Charles A. Mosher (Ohio), Thomas M. Rees (Calif.), J. Kenneth Robinson (Va.), Howard W. Robison (N.Y.), Edward R. Roybal (Calif.), Herman T. Schneebeli (Penna.), Fred Schwengel (Iowa), Keith G. Sebelius (Kan.), Garner E. Shriver (Kan.).

Robert T. Stafford (Vt.), William A. Steiger (Wisc.), J. William Stanton (Ohio), Charles Thone (Nebr.), Guy Vander Jagt (Mich.), Victor V. Veysey (Calif.), G. William Whitehurst (Va.), Lawrence G. Williams (Penna.), Bob Wilson (Calif.), Clement J. Zablocki (Wisc.).

THE GREAT CHOICE ON VIETNAM AND THE DRAFT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a particularly perceptive article written by Washington Post staff writer, Spencer Rich, shows the rising strength and present leverage in the Congress of those who believe that our Nation will be more secure—not less—when it gets out of Vietnam and turns from the draft to a volunteer army.

We have reason to be deeply grateful for the leadership that has brought to bear in the Senate on those vital issues by the distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, by Senator ALAN CRANSTON of my own State of California, by Senator MIKE GRAVEL of Alaska, and by others of both parties.

I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

THE GREAT CHOICE ON VIETNAM AND THE DRAFT

(By Spencer Rich)

An elaborate game of legislative "chicken" is being played on Capitol Hill over the two-year draft-extension bill and the Mansfield end-the-war amendment.

The question is who will back down first: the Nixon administration, or the soft-spoken but redoubtable Senate Majority Leader, Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.)?

The military draft expired June 30 and the administration wants it extended for two years. But the bill is deadlocked in a House-Senate conference because the President insists that the Mansfield amendment—expressing Congress' desire to end U.S. participation in the war within nine months provided prisoner release can be arranged—be dropped from the final measure.

The Mansfield amendment is not absolutely binding on the President in a legal sense, because it would not cut off funds for U.S. operation in Indochina once the nine-month withdrawal deadline is reached. But the presidential signature, as the price of letting the draft continue, would constitute a moral commitment which Mr. Nixon could contravene only at his grave political peril.

The Nixon administration position has been that any deadline would make it unnecessary for Hanoi to negotiate and would thus destroy the U.S. bargaining position in Paris. The Mansfield camp responds that the time has come to get out, as fast as possible, before the war destroys the cohesion of U.S. society, without waiting until the future of South Vietnam has been guaranteed.

Speculation on Capitol Hill is that renewal of serious negotiations in Paris, plus the President's surprise announcement of a planned visit to mainland China, may somewhat weaken Mansfield's hand. They may lend fresh credence to the President's claim that no congressional deadline is needed because he is moving toward an Asian settlement.

It is possible that the conferees, who are to meet again Tuesday, might simply mark time for a while to allow negotiations to go forward in Paris. Some real progress there might make the Mansfield amendment superfluous—or might even move Mansfield to withdraw it.

But that is off in the future. Mansfield said Friday that the China announcement is not causing him to back down.

Right now, Senate conferees, duty bound to uphold the Mansfield amendment which passed the Senate 57 to 42 on June 24, are at an impasse with the House conferees who, with strong backing from the administration, have refused to accept any language which has a definite end-the-war date.

In the struggle, Mansfield holds several powerful cards. He, himself, has consistently voted against extension of the draft, which he regards as unfair and unnecessary. Therefore, he is immune to appeals that he jettison his amendment in the interest of getting the Selective Service extended.

Further, the Majority Leader stands to benefit from a newly awakened love of the filibuster on the part of Northern Democrats and liberals of both parties.

At one time, the filibuster was the tool primarily of Southern opponents of civil rights legislation. But William Proxmire (D-Wis.) used it at the end of last year to kill the supersonic transport plane. And a bloc of doves employed it at that time to force into law provisions barring use of U.S. ground combat troops in Laos, Thailand and Cambodia and restricting U.S. financing of foreign "mercenaries" fighting in those countries.

Mansfield himself is neither leading nor directly encouraging any filibuster against the draft bill. During initial Senate debate on the measure, Mansfield helped engineer the cloture vote that ended a seven-week talkathon. But it is highly questionable that he would do so on the conference report if his amendment were emasculated in conference.

It is widely believed in the Senate that if the draft bill returns from conference without end-the-war language acceptable to Mansfield, it may be impossible to obtain cloture against a possible new filibuster led by Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) and Mike Gravel (D-Alaska). Enough Senators may be angry enough either about the draft or the war to simply refuse to allow a final vote. This is by no means certain, but it is a strong possibility.

"We have leverage to either get the Mansfield amendment or delay the draft endlessly," said Cranston in an interview.

"I'm going to stay right in there and filibuster and they'll have to get a cloture vote to stop me," said Gravel. He said he is so opposed to the draft that he will filibuster whether the Mansfield amendment is retained in conference or not. But he conceded that, if Mansfield is satisfied with the final version of the bill, the administration's chance of breaking the filibuster would be very good.

A complicating factor, however, is the anger of some senators over the fact that the draft bill conferees rejected the Senate's military pay raise scale, adopting the lower scale proposed by the House.

Administration loyalist Gordon Allott (R-

Colo.), sponsor of the Senate version, said he will try to send the bill back to conference to get the higher pay scale adopted.

If Mansfield has some strong trumps in the head-to-head combat, so does the President. The longer the impasse over the draft bill last, the more the administration may be tempted to mount a compaign accusing Mansfield and others of (1) threatening the success of the Paris peace talks by holding out the hope to Hanoi that Congress will give it, in the Mansfield amendment, all it wants without having to bargain, and (2) endangering the nation's security by holding up the draft.

Although some Capitol Hill sources with access to the Pentagon report the armed forces able to get along nicely for months before feeling any draft "crunch," the argument is likely to be made that "things are getting tight" and "we need the draft urgently now." The administration does have power to draft up to 5 million men, up to 35, who were previously settled men with jobs and families and this would be politically difficult. The White House has declined so far.

In the absence of a breakthrough in Paris, what the struggle basically comes down to is how long each side can afford to hold out. At some point, the argument that Mansfield is selfishly holding up the draft in order to force his own amendment into the bill will begin to have some political impact in the Senate. Mansfield will then start feeling the heat, particularly since the majority leader is supposed to advance legislation rather than hold it back.

At the same time, there is some feeling among senators that the Nixon administration has been stalling the conferees to avert a defeat. Some believe they may even try to stall for months, for fear the amendment could harm President Thieu's chances in South Vietnam's October election. Moreover, even some Senators who oppose the Mansfield amendment don't consider it so damaging to the administration that, if the need for the draft became truly pressing, the amendment couldn't be accepted with "reservations."

"It's a sense of Congress thing and therefor the administration is only in as much of a bind on the draft as it wants to be. Any time the President wants, he can take the amendment and announce that it's only an expression of sentiment and not binding," said one Senate source.

This outcome is not likely to appeal to the administration. The Mansfield language still sets a date for the world to see, even if not binding. So unless the Paris talks show real progress, the game of chicken on Capitol Hill will probably have to be played down to the end: a cloture vote to see who has the muscle. Then, perhaps, a real search for a compromise will begin.

LOOKING AHEAD

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the membership a special report that I first issued this morning during the opening of hearings on emergency strike legislation before our House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce's Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics. It is what I referred to as the "timetable" issued by the United Transportation Union relative to present and future strikes against the carriers. It is possible, according to present plans, that when Congress is expected to adjourn on August 6 for its summer recess, practically half of our Nation's rail service will be halted. Such a situation, as now anticipated within the next 10 days, would be intolerable. In essence, we would have the adverse effects of a nationwide strike on our hands as Congress begins a vacation.

I would like to close with the insertion of my complete statement on the subject of "Current and Future Effects of United Transportation Union Strikes Against Railroads." The statement follows:

CURRENT AND FUTURE EFFECTS OF UNITED TRANSPORTATION UNION STRIKES AGAINST RAILROADS

(By Congressman JAMES HARVEY)

When Congress closes on August 6th for its summer recess, at the same time it is probable, according to the present "timetable" issued by the United Transportation Union, that practically half of our nation's rail service will be in limbo, too.

Just consider the following information and facts. The United States is divided into three railroad regions—Eastern, Southeastern, and Western—and, as set forth in H.R. 9088 and H.R. 3595, this means respectively the carriers represented in the Eastern, Southeastern and Western Conference Committee.

Those carriers currently under strike, their region and the approximate percents of the revenue ton miles in that region they carry as follows:

As of July 27th:

Carrier, region, and percent ton miles carried

Norfolk Western, Eastern	16
Southern Railway, Southeastern	26
Union Pacific and Southern Pacific, Western	30

Again, on July 30th, these additional carriers will be added to the "strike list":

Carrier, region, and accumulative percent ton miles carried

Bessemer & Lake Erie Eastern	17
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe; Duluth, Missable & Iron Range; Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railway, Western	43

Then, on August 6th, five additional carriers will be struck—as Congress is scheduled to commence its summer recess—to bring the accumulative percentage of ton miles carried to the following:

Carrier, region, and accumulative percentage ton miles carried

Baltimore & Ohio; Chesapeake & Ohio, eastern	43
Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific; Missouri, Kansas, and Texas; western	55

Thus, on August 6th, the following situation by a regional basis would exist:

Region and number of carriers, and accumulative percentage ton miles carried

Eastern, 4 Carriers	43
Southeastern, 1 Carrier	26
Western, 8 Carriers	55

It should be noted that if the U.T.U. carries through with its announced plans to strike the above mentioned lines simultaneously, the effect on the revenue ton miles carried will far exceed labor's own definition of selective strike as contained in H.R. 3596, where the aggregate is limited to 40% of the revenue ton miles in any region.

Needless to say, the effect on revenue ton miles, as now announced by the U.T.U. by August 6th, not only is far greater than would be permitted under H.R. 9088—the Harvey bill—but far exceeds reasonable definition and acceptance of selective strike guidelines. In essence, we would have the adverse effects of a nationwide strike on our hands.

THE PENTAGON PAPERS—WERE THEY NECESSARY?

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding political editors in the State of California is Mr. Harry Farrell of the San Jose Mercury-News and Ridder Publications.

Mr. Farrell has written a very incisive and searching article which questions the fact that the Pentagon papers should have ever been prepared in the first place. Believing this article to be of great importance to all Americans, I am pleased to include it in the RECORD:

WERE THEY NECESSARY: PENTAGON PAPERS

(By Harry Farrell)

In all of the uproar over the Pentagon Papers, we have seen no answer—and expect to see none—to the elementary question, why were they written in the first place?

Most accounts seem to agree that the preparation of the 7,000 pages of Vietnam War history was ordered by then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who has elected to remain silent on the whole storm.

Analysis—But apparently some 4,000 pages of source documents were turned over to a team of 30 or 40 "officials and analysts," who wrote 3,000 more pages of analysis, some of it highly subjective.

Whether the Pentagon papers contain anything that will give aid and comfort to our enemies at this late date is a question we cannot judge.

But certainly the top secret documentation that went into them would have been prejudicial to American interests if exposed to public scrutiny when the papers were written.

We can think of no security policy more foolish, therefore, than to turn the government's closely guarded secrets over to a platoon of "officials and analysts" for a rewrite job. These compilers, most of whom remain anonymous, obviously included a lot of professorial and think-tank types like Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, who finally pulled the plug on the whole business.

Does anyone with the faintest glimmer of understanding about how government works really believe that military and state secrets could remain secret, with such goings on?

Any cub reporter knows that he can, with a little effort, find out anything that happens inside a "secret" meeting attended by more than three people.

Back in World War II, when we were building the first A-bomb, our security went in the other direction. It was so tight that even Vice President Truman didn't know the project was in the works. His first word of it came to him after he was President

Too far—That was probably going too far in secrecy, but now, it seems, we have turned about 180 degrees.

The narrative nature of the Pentagon papers makes for fascinating reading, even today.

They quote a McNamara memo to President Johnson, for instance, as saying (after the secretary visited Vietnam and escaped a Viet Cong assassination plot):

"Full security exists nowhere, not even behind the U.S. Marines' lines, and in Saigon and in the countryside, the enemy almost completely controls the night."

Little wonder!

If all our top secret papers about the way we were running the war were making the

rounds of a crew of Washington rewrite men, does anyone really doubt that Hanoi knew everything we were thinking.

We don't even have to impute disloyalty to anyone in raising such a question as this. With dozens of people knowing bits and pieces of the "big picture," surely the enemy could put it together like a jigsaw puzzle from the most innocuous leaks.

But even if, by some miracle, there were no leaks on the Pentagon war study, the question remains, "Who needs it?"

Expensive—It must have cost a small fortune to prepare. Then it was printed and bound in the early months of the Nixon Administration, and apparently forgotten until the Ellsberg caper.

Now it's out in the open.

Its publication has perhaps opened the nation's eyes to the fact that it was being misled, but at the same time our government has lost the confidence not only of its own citizens but of the world.

As far as we can see, the Pentagon papers make no one a hero. They constitute an engrossing scenario that makes almost everyone involved look like an unprincipled villain. The image rubs off onto the present administration, though it was not even involved.

And this image is probably not fully justified. The decision making process in matters of war and peace is a tough one, and what appears in a narrative to be weakness, vacillation, stupidity, or even bad faith may simply have been the agony of choosing what seemed the best course on the basis of facts at hand.

FIGHT TO SAVE FORT SHERIDAN GAINING

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished senior columnist of the Waukegan, Ill., News-Sun, George Crawford, has expressed his support for the fight being led by our colleague from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY) to retain Fort Sheridan in whose 12th Congressional District this historic military post is located.

I am confident that the cooperation that has been evidenced by Chicago's Mayor Daley, the Chicago Association of Commerce & Industry, and which has come from other highly respected sources, reflect the overall interest in Chicago and in the Midwest to retain the prestigious Fort Sheridan, which was established originally on land privately donated for military purposes.

The News-Sun comment, which appeared on July 17, follows:

HELP SAVE FORT SHERIDAN

Help in the fight to save Ft. Sheridan as a military institution came from an unexpected quarter when Chicago (and Mayor Richard Daley runs Chicago) decided to send a committee of leading Chicagoans to Washington to urge retaining military personnel at the historic old fort.

The Chicago move came as Sen. Adlai Stevenson was pressing to get the Defense Department to move out of Sheridan and turn the area over to recreational or housing use, possibly a home for the aged.

The stance of A-III is, of course, strictly political as he continues making every effort to capture the support of the liberals, those who oppose anything to do with the military, and those who would have the government provide everything desired by the poor and charge the bill to the taxpayers.

Daley's move to keep the military at Ft. Sheridan is one of good business for the entire area, and jobs for people in Illinois and Wisconsin.

When it comes to business and the benefit of all in the Chicago area, Mayor Daley doesn't hesitate to oppose the theories of Adlai.

TRIUMPH IN POSTAL BARGAINING

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 19, the first collective bargaining agreement among Federal employees occurred when the Postal Service signed an agreement with seven different postal employee unions. This agreement demonstrated the wisdom of the Congress in its passage of the Postal Reorganization Act and is a harbinger of changes that may soon be occurring throughout the echelons of State and local government.

The New York Times, in an excellent editorial on July 22, commented on the meaning of the postal contract and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

TRIUMPH IN POSTAL BARGAINING

The agreements covering 650,000 postal workers represent a victory for collective bargaining in its first critical test in the newly created United States Postal Service. They mark a splendid start for this semi-autonomous public agency. They also indicate that a statutory requirement for compulsory arbitration as the end of the line in labor disputes can serve as a spur to effective bargaining, rather than as its death knell, provided both sides are animated by a genuine desire to make independent decision-making work.

Much credit for this refreshing outcome in a period when bargaining in private industry is providing few occasions for cheers belongs to Assistant Secretary of Labor W. J. Usery Jr., whose blend of resourcefulness, indefatigability and good humor repeatedly kept the postal negotiations from foundering. His determination to achieve an accord through voluntary means not only prevented a repetition of the wildcat walkouts that disrupted the mails last year but pointed a road that can be of inestimable value in all branches of Federal, state and city labor relations.

New strength has been added to the year-old plea of Mayor Lindsay and New York City's Office of Collective Bargaining for revision of the local laws governing disputes in municipal employment to require arbitration as the windup point if direct negotiations fail. Enactment of such a requirement would provide potent stimulus to both civil service unionists and elected officials to resolve their differences. In that way third parties would not automatically make decisions on wages, working conditions and even basic governmental policy, which often is determined by the provisions of agreements covering the schools, transit, police and fire protection and other key services. Under the conception so ably demonstrated in the postal bargaining, the role of impartial arbitraters would take on its proper dimension—a final resort to assure equity while guarding the community against crippling tie-ups.

Admittedly the new post office agreement provides generous pay increases, a total of $1,710 for each worker over a two-year period. For the average postman this will mean roughly 20 per cent on top of the 14 per cent the postal workers got in two stages last year. But, even though these pay boosts undoubtedly will touch off pressure for additional increases throughout the regular Federal civil service, it is clear that no public agency can expect to hold the line on wages while the wage-price spiral is zooming skyward in the private economy without effective White House restraint.

By the standards emerging in telephone, railroads, aluminum, cans, newspapers and, now, copper, the postal wage settlement is eminently reasonable. This is especially true since the contract gives the Postal Service a free hand to introduce automated equipment and generally to bring some desperately needed efficiency into mail handling.

The postal example ought to lead to a settlement of the inexcusable strikes the United Transportation Union has been conducting against recommendations of a Presidential emergency board for the abolition of ancient featherbedding practices. The locomotive engineers and other rail unions have recognized that these measures for greater efficiency are essential to true job security in this ailing industry. The selective strikes the trainmen are calling to block modernization are in sorry contrast to the enlightenment just displayed by the postal employes. They are not only wrong-headed; they may eventually prove suicidal.

GAS SHORTAGES NEXT WINTER

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the critical situation faced by natural gas consumers in my State of New York is pointed up by a recent recommendation of a Public Service Commission examiner that a priority list of gas customers be established. This is necessary, the examiner told the commission, "to assure the best possible use of existing and future supply in order to minimize the effect of any shortage upon the consumer."

The examiner's decision is the result of a proceeding initiated by the New York Public Service Commission a year ago to determine what, if any, restrictions should be placed on gas distributors to meet potential shortages of gas supplies. Public hearings were held, with testimony being received from gas distributors, pipeline companies, the commission staff, and other interested parties.

Examiner Bernard L. Feeney concluded from the testimony that—

The availability of gas, especially additional supplies of new gas, is generally in short supply at the present time. It appears also that the problem of adequate gas supply will continue for some years in the future, although there may be intermittent periods in which supplies are sufficient.

The examiner pointed out that the Public Service Commission has jurisdiction, upon finding that a natural gas shortage exists, to conserve the available supply of gas for domestic consumers, and thereafter, for persons or corporations already receiving service. The law also permits denial of the use of gas for new customers or additional gas for present customers for the period of a supply emergency.

Some gas distributors are already curtailing gas service to conform to these procedures. However, Examiner Feeney recommended that the commission set up a sequence of priorities for undertaking service to new customers or making substantial additions to service of existing customers.

First on the list of recommended priorities is domestic gas consumption for essential uses. Following, in order, are: commercial use of less than 200 Mcf per year and medium-size and large public authorities; industrial use where special qualities of gas are required for process use; total energy uses; commercial use above 200 Mcf per year, industrial feedstock uses, industrial space heating uses, and other industrial uses including boiler fuel for electric generation; unessential uses, such as yard lights.

The examiner also recommended that the following additional actions should be taken:

(1) The commission staff be directed to institute studies of rate structures as a device "to discourage less desirable use of gas."

(2) The commission require the development of additional gas storage and the maintenance of an adequate inventory of gas, as supplies permit.

(3) The commission issue an order directing gas distributors to discontinue all promotional activities designed to increase gas consumption.

(4) Gas distributors be required to file annually with the Public Service Commission a report listing the gas supply available and requirements expected for the following 2 years.

The seriousness of this situation in New York was made clear by tabulation submitted by gas distributors showing forecasted requirements and estimated volumes of gas supply under contract for the years 1970 through 1974. While the volume varies from company to company, it was concluded that some consumers may have to go without gas sometime during the 1971–1972 heating season. The best estimate of the volume of this deficiency is 26 Bcf this year and 50 Bcf in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, there is no instant solution to this grave problem. The longer term solution lies in the discovery and development of new gas reserves. Only in this way can the interest of consumers and potential consumers of natural gas be protected.

The incentive of gas producers to go out looking for additional gas supplies has been whittled down because of the uncertainties implicit in their sales contracts with interstate pipelines. Under existing law, the Federal Power Commission can come back to a contract it has previously approved and order changes in its provisions. The producer simply does not know where he stands.

H.R. 2513, which I introduced early in this session, would make sales contracts between gas producers and interstate pipeline companies binding on all parties once they are approved by the Federal Power Commission. It is in no sense a decontrol bill. Contracts covering the sale of gas in interstate commerce would continue to be submitted to the commission, which could either approve them, or approve subject to stipulated conditions, or disapprove.

My bill would simply place the stamp of lasting validity on such contracts once they are approved by the commission. The uncertain climate in which gas producers must now operate would be improved and their incentive to search out new supplies of gas would be sharpened.

That is what is needed to help prevent hardship among the gas consumers of my State and elsewhere.

TRIBUTE TO DR. VICTOR R. SLEETER

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Victor R. Sleeter, a distinguished citizen of my home community of Lake Bluff, Ill., was honored recently at a gathering of friends for his 40 years of residency and community service.

At this celebration—which took place Sunday, July 11, 1971, at the Fort Sheridan Officers' Club—Vic and Dolly Sleeter's many friends paid tribute to them personally, to their daughter, Ellen, and her family, and to his professional career as a highly respected dentist, to his musicial and other cultural talents, and to his many contributions of public service.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to participate in this celebration, at which our long-time friend Elmer B. Vliet delivered the principal eulogy—at the conclusion of which a brief resolution was adopted by the assemblage of more than 250 persons.

Mr. Vliet's remarks and the resolution follow:

REMARKS BY ELMER B. VLIET

Ladies and gentlemen: Our subject is the entity whom we know as Dr. Victor Rudolph Sleeter. I'm to tell things about him you haven't yet heard. In doing this, we'll be guided by Alfred E. Smith, the "happy warrior" of the 1920's, who often said, "Let's examine the record," and also, "Let's not waste radio time."

On July 10, 1903, our subject appeared on earth. Astrologists would say he was born under the sign of the crab. Wally Phillips on WGN radio says this about crabs:

"Individuals born under this sign are *outstanding* in *crafts* that require *painstaking, careful handiwork.* They are the 'chosen ones' of all signs. They are lucky in love and good-natured. If you are a crab you will find great happiness with anyone, anywhere, at any time, doing anything.

"Conversely, however, it is not recommended you marry another crab because these fortunate moon children are usually out of work and you'd both starve to death."

So, with great foresight, Victor, the crab, married Dolly who is a bull. Both have thus prospered and found happiness.

Here is a list of some other crabs. You can decide just how well their talents match those of our subject:—Richard Rodgers, Nelson Eddy, Rembrandt, Dave Garroway, Stephen Foster, John Quincy Adams, Jack Dempsey, Calvin Coolidge, Julius Caesar, Mary Baker Eddy, Louis Armstrong, George M. Cohan, and the United States of America.

In 1931, Dr. Sleeter brought Dolly and baby Ellen to Lake Bluff. A depression was in progress. Undaunted, he set up his dental parlors on the second floor over the store at the corner of Center and Scranton. That is now an antique shop.

We old timers soon learned that Lake Bluff now had an able and genial dentist. We climbed the 25 or more steps straight up the long golden oak stairway that led to his heavenly haven. There, without benefit of either a feminine assistant or air conditioning, he skillfully cared for our needs. The landlord let him use an adjoining vacant room for his hobbies. There, in his spare moments, he rebuilt clocks and organs and he also worked on models—ship models, that is.

We visited his emporium every six months—for good luck—and good dental practice. If we had bad luck, we climbed the long golden stairway more often.

At birth Victor must have already been endowed with many inherent skills and talents. We know, that by diligent study and practice, he had developed them to a high degree before he came to Lake Bluff. Here they blossomed forth to benefit and bring pleasure to all who knew him.

Others have described some of these blossoms. Now we'll tell of some others.

When we "examined the records" many interesting exhibits were uncovered. Some of these are portrayed in a display of pictures mounted on an easel.

One picture is labeled "Child Care—A TV Dental Program". This was sponsored by the Chicago Dental Association. It also reminds us of other services Dr. Sleeter has given: The many years when he gave a half day each week caring for the children's teeth at the Lake Bluff Orphanage; his 38 years of active service on the board of the Lake County TB Association which included several years as its president; a term as chairman and many years on its executive committee; his contribution to the mouth guard program for football players at the high school; and many other ways he has used his professional skills in serving community needs.

Now I would direct your attention to another picture in the display. It is marked "American Legion Minstrels of 1937". In this Dr. Sleeter was the top man—the interlocutor—the man who always asks the right questions to evoke the proper answers. He had taken this same part in several earlier legion minstrels and always gave a top notch performance. Socrates guided discussions by asking good questions. Now Victor, with this superb training and rich experience, was prepared for his stellar performances in great books discussions—and for village board deliberations, that were soon to follow.

By 1939 Dr. Sleeter had become a well known and highly regarded citizen of Lake Bluff. The village board, needed new talent and he was persuaded to become a trustee candidate. The campaign circular that year has this significant statement:

"Victor R. Sleeter has been a practicing dentist in this community for many years. His sincere interest in the welfare of the village has been demonstrated on many occasions. He will conscientiously perform his duties as a trustee with all of the courtesy, enthusiasm and intelligence for which he is noted."

No truer words were ever written. He did exactly that.

In 1943 he was nominated for a second 4-year term. It was then stated that "Victor R. Sleeter's work as chairman of the finance committee has been particularly helpful in maintaining the sound financial position of the village."

In 1947 he was elected village president for a 2-year term. He thus served 10 years on the village board—from 1939 to 1949. They were critical and trying years—a period that began as the depression was ending. Then came the war years and after that inflation and the baby and building booms.

During these years there were many changes. Older officers retired. New ones had

to be appointed. First a village attorney; later a public works superintendent. And a police chief; finally, a new chief of the fire department. The need for a resuscitator in the village was felt. Dr. Sleeter chaired a committee that raised funds and bought it.

At times there was a bit of bickering on the board which Dr. Sleeter's courtesy and intelligence served to subdue. Thus, he helped the board meet its problems constructively in a way that earned citizen support.

As new homes kept springing up, a larger police force was needed. This required a police tax levy which was approved by the voters in December 1946.

By 1948 a new fire engine was sorely needed to replace the old 1926 pumper. After diligent effort one was acquired from war assets for $3,500. How is that for economy? A picture of this truck with village board members and firemen is on display.

However, despite all efforts to curtail spending, expenses kept going up due to inflation. The board was compelled to seek an increase in the tax rate. Despite unreasoning opposition. The tax increase was approved in December 1948.

Like most others who have served on local boards, Dr. Sleeter derived his satisfaction from public service faithfully performed with no thought of being thanked. He has given generously of himself without self-seeking. So long as we have enough persons like him, America will continue to be great.

But public service does bring some happy moments. Take a look at the picture of Dr. Sleeter and Charlie Helming. Mr. Helming had served the village with zeal and loyalty as fire chief for 36 years. This picture was taken at a men's affair where old Lake Bluff pictures were shown and a "Song of Lake Bluff" was sung. It had been written in 1914 and Vic played the accompaniment. The words weren't so hot but we had lots of spirit.

A better Lake Bluff poem was written in 1894 by an 18-year old girl named Grace Cloes. Her grandfather had settled here in 1836. Here's her first verse:

"On the shore of Blue Lake Michigan
Is a little town—Lake Bluff,
And all who wish to go there
Must be made of right good stuff."

Surely Victor was made with an abundance "Of Right Good Stuff". And he came to the right town at the right time.

Finally, I propose that we adopt a resolution extending our thanks to Dr. Sleeter. However, before reading this resolution and having it put to a vote, one more fact should be revealed.

In 1939 when Dr. Sleeter became a village trustee, a young man named Robert McClory had been village clerk for two years. He continued in that office another year and then was made village attorney. In 1962, after serving 12 years in successive Illinois general assemblies, he became our representative in Congress and has been serving us in that office ever since.

We are delighted that Congressman McClory and his lovely wife are here for this celebration. I wonder, Bob, if you would care to give testimony in behalf of our friend, Victor, and then be good enough to cosponsor this proposed resolution and ask the master of ceremonies to read it and put it to a vote.

A RESOLUTION

Be It Resolved that:

We, Friends and Fellow Lake Bluff Citizens of Victor R. Sleeter, D.D.S., assembled at Forst Sheridan, Illinois, this 11th day of July, 1971, to celebrate Dr. Sleeter's Forty Years of Outstanding Contributions to our Community, do herewith

Extend to Dr. Sleeter our true and heartfelt thanks for bringing his many skills and talents, his genial and generous spirit, and his lovely family to Lake Bluff in 1931, and for

Dwelling amongst us these Forty Years during which he has given so ably and so generously to so many of our institutions and organizations and to so many of us.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL AND FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD CHAIRMAN OPPOSE EXCLUSION OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK FROM UNIFIED BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING REVIEW

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out on the House floor recently, the exclusion of the Export-Import Bank from the budget invites other agencies to seek similar refuge from congressional oversight and an accounting of their operations to Congress.

The New York Times in a recent editorial pointed out that the Comptroller General and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board have opposed this trend and reemphasized the importance of including all Government lending agencies in the Federal budget.

The editorial also observes that the exclusion of the Export-Import Bank from the budget would undermine the unified budget concept approved by Congress and thus open the door for other Federal loan programs to escape congressional review and budget examination.

This is a dangerous trend and dangerous precedent, Mr. Speaker. While the Export-Import Bank wishes this exclusion, I do not regard the action of the confrees in allowing this exclusion to be either wise or sound. It is an action of escapism.

There is a constant and continual effort to erode the constitutional legislative powers of Congress and unless the Congress stands firm against this trend the country will be the losers.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the editorial from the New York Times in the RECORD herewith.

The editorial follows:

UNDERMINING THE BUDGET

Senate and House conferees, completing a bill to expand the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank, have agreed to permit the bank to supply credits for shipping American goods to Communist countries including China. President Nixon would, however, retain the power to decide whether to let the bank make particular loans to Communist countries.

This will give the President the flexibility he needs in using trade as an adjunct to his policy for normalizing political relations with mainland China and other Communist states. In this context it would now make sense for the Administration to re-examine the numerous categories of commodities which it is willing to sell in East-West trade.

By imposing far more rigid standards on itself than its allies have done, the United States has simply shut itself out of markets without any impact on Communist countries or gain to national security. The Administration should call upon the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to propose a new list of strategic goods that they wish to exclude from East-West trade, and decide whether this country will accept that list or continue to impose stricter limits upon itself.

Although the Export-Import legislation will provide welcome support both for East-West trade and for American exports generally, at a time when the American trade position has been weakening as a result of low productivity and climbing prices, the bill has one highly undesirable feature: it excludes the Export-Import Bank's loan disbursements from the limitations of the Federal budget. This would establish a precedent that could be applied to many other loan programs, such as those of the Veterans' Administration, the Small Business Administration, College Housing and Rural Electrification, which now total more than $50 billion in outstanding loans.

In 1967 the bipartisan President's Commission on Budget Concepts strongly recommended that all loan programs of agencies whose capital stock is owned by the Government should be included in the budget, in order to help Congress make priority judgments about national programs, weigh the fiscal impact of the entire Government lending and spending activities and facilitate full public disclosure of all Government programs.

The unified budget concept was accepted by both the Johnson and Nixon Administration. In opposing the exclusion of Export-Import loans from the budget, both Controller General Staats and Federal Reserve Chairman Burns have re-emphasized the importance of the basic principle of including all Government lending activities in the budget.

It will be unfortunate if so useful a piece of legislation as the Export-Import bill becomes a means of undermining the unified budget concept and opening the door for other loan programs to escape the budgetary process. This would take the nation back toward the familiar and depressing old game of budgetary cosmetics and concealment, designed to distort budget expenditure totals and to shrink the deficit figures. Once that door is opened, the rush will be on to convert other spending programs into lending programs that could escape public and Congressional attention and control.

BILL MILLIAS' ESSAY ON OUR FLAG

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter in the RECORD a prize-winning essay written by Bill Millias of Antioch, Calif. His essay, "Respect and Love for Our Flag," describes the role of our flag in American history and in the life of the individual citizen. Bill is a young American not yet out of elementary school. His perception of his country and his love for its flag attests not only to Bill's perception but to concerned parents and teachers who have helped develop his character and ideas.

The essay follows:

RESPECT AND LOVE FOR OUR FLAG

Our flag has flown for many years. Our flag represents all the people in the United States. Everybody should respect and love our flag.

The love and respect of our flag should never die. In all the schools of our country students repeat the Pledge of Allegiance each day. Every school you pass by has our flag flying. Over banks, city halls, and fire stations our flag is always there. When there are holidays, flags are raised all over town.

In the first and second World Wars, many men had fought and died for our country. During World War II, seven Marines raised our flag over Iwo Jima while still in battle.

Before sporting events we repeat our pledge to the flag and sing the National Anthem. In the front of the parades, we use the National Guard to carry the flag.

Whenever another state is admitted, there is a star added to the flag. If one of those stars was removed, the United States would never be the same again.

When Neil Armstrong landed on the Moon, the first thing he did was plant our flag on the Moon and salute it. When he put that flag on the Moon, he showed that the United States was the first to land with a manned spacecraft.

I love my flag for what it represents. Nobody should burn it or rip it up as a protest to our country's actions. Our country should stay united forever.

A CALL FOR CONFIDENCE

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, in a time when there is a great deal of pessimism about the economy of our Nation, it is refreshing to read of a businessman who has confidence in the capacity of the country to lift itself out of financial doldrums. Last week, a constituent from my District traveled to Washington to discuss with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE), Mr. John Auten of the Department of the Treasury, and me a proposal he has to encourage increased consumer spending. The gentleman was Mr. Walter Liberman, executive vice-president of Franklin Furniture in Syracuse.

Mr. Liberman came to Washington at my invitation after I read an article in the Syracuse Herald American in which he espoused optimism for the economy of this country.

The article follows:

[From the Syracuse Herald American June 13, 1971]

LIBERMAN CALLS FOR CONFIDENCE

(By Kenneth F. Sparrow)

Confidence . . .

That is the basic ingredient needed to snap the nation out of the prevailing adverse economic conditions.

Wilbur Liberman, executive vice president of Franklin Furniture Co., asserts that renewed public confidence would unleash savings hoards and bring back prosperity and greater job possibilities.

"We have the best product in the world to sell—America," he said. "And, we have the greatest sales force in the world to sell it."

Liberman feels that confidence has been stifled by the negative aspects of statistical reports. For example, emphasis is placed on the fact that there is a 6 percent unemployment rate.

"The optimistic aspect is that 94 percent of the working force is employed—and at the highest wages in history," he asserted.

The problem of how to instill confidence in the people of America is a complicated one. People are running scared. They will regain confidence in the economic system only when unemployment slackens off, when the threat of major layoffs is removed and when interest rates reach a more realistic level.

Liberman takes the position that consumers must be induced now to spend money for goods they need, but are planning not to buy until economic conditions improve.

"If they draw on their savings (bank deposits are the highest in history), the spending will revitalize the economy and create more jobs which in turn will strengthen the economy," he said.

He suggests that President Nixon make a public statement urging consumers to go about the business of optimistic daily life.

PESSIMISTIC NEWS REPORTING COULD LEAD TO DEPRESSION

"I am sure that if those people who have money would spend just a small amount of that money on goods and services they need, that spending would offset many of the economic reversals that have occurred in our economy," he said.

"I must stress one point, a point which I, a lifelong retailer, understand so well. People are afraid to spend. They are being scared by the incessant tide of negative and pessimistic economic news reporting.

Liberman agrees with high officials in Washington that "the government, the unions and the banks all are partially responsible for the recession."

"A great deal must be done and done quickly to avert a depression," he added, saying that he has some of the answers to part of the cure and is willing to go any place at any time to discuss his theories with the proper people.

He asserts that "strikes now are un-American and serve only self interests. They further decrease the competitive position of the United States in world markets and add to inflation, layoffs and job uncertainties."

Liberman terms America as a sleeping giant. "The purchasing power of America is staggering," he said. "It is so gigantic that if consumers gain confidence and start to make those long deferred purchases, there would not be enough people to man the factories and stores, nor would there be enough factories to manufacture the merchandise.

PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION URGED TO STIMULATE BUYING

"Remember, 94 percent of the working force is working for the highest wages in history!"

In his opinion, a presidential proclamation would instill confidence in consumer buying. He also suggests that the President should meet with union leaders regarding a one-year non-strike moratorium. If people could dispel the fears of layoffs and strike, they would gain confidence.

Confidence in our economic system is the one ingredient that is needed to spark an all-out consumer buying trend. There is plenty of money stored up in savings of one kind or another.

"Run a fire sale, a going-out-of-business sale or an auction sale and people will always find money to make purchases," he declared.

Liberman knows from experience that this is a fact. Several years ago he staged a prosperity sale in Franklin Furniture's eight stores. In the first six hours, 3,900 customers flocked into the stores and the total volume of business in that period was the largest in the Syracuse firm's 40-year history at that time.

Advertisements and store window banners proclaimed that "Business is Good at Franklin," "Buy Now—Create Jobs," "Back to Work Prosperity Sale."

It would work again, he said. "A surge of spending will serve to activate the economy and create jobs in a trend toward greater prosperity."

CRLA PROGRAM VINDICATED

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have included today in the RECORD the National Legal Aid and Defender Association abstract of the Commission Report on the California Rural Legal Assistance program. The Commission report is a complete vindication of the make-up, activities and purpose of the CRLA and a complete refutation of the indiscriminate and unrounded charges directed at it by Governor Reagan and OEO Director Uhler.

It is with great satisfaction that I include this abstract in the RECORD. I earnestly request the attention of the Congress to the contents so that they may see how closely a vitally needed program can come to being terminated because of an irresponsible and personally motivated action of one who feels no sympathy for its purpose.

NLADA ABSTRACT OF COMMISSION REPORT ON CALIFORNIA RURAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE*

A. FINDINGS RE: CRLA

The Commission of three State Supreme Court jurists appointed by OEO to investigate Governor Reagan's charges against CRLA held twenty days of public hearings in ten California communities, heard 165 witnesses, reviewed hundreds of exhibits, and came to this overall conclusion:

"The Commission finds that CRLA has been discharging its duty to provide legal assistance to the poor under the mandate and policies of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in a highly competent, efficient, and exemplary manner." (p. 88)

CRLA's legal staff

"The evidence from all sources made it clear beyond peradventure that CRLA attorneys are legal craftsmen of the first order. In addition, they are thorough, intelligent young men dedicated to vindicating the legal rights of their clients. . . . [The Commission quotes testimony from a former California Assistant Attorney General William Bradford who handled major cases against CRLA:] "I would say . . . these are the best litigation lawyers I've ever run up against, and I've run up against the best of them. . . . [The Commission continues in its own words:] Perhaps even more important in the present context, Mr. Bradford stated that the CRLA attorneys not only conducted themselves "absolutely" ethically, but were "perfect gentlemen"." (pp. 73, 60, 61)

CRLA's caseload—The Commission praises CRLA's works on cases it variously terms "class action", "law reform," "impact cases", and "suits against the government". (pp. 30–45) It specifically recognizes the value of CRLA's reform efforts in the areas of health benefits, (p. 39) food programs, (*Ibid.*) voting rights, (pp. 39–40) school lunch programs, (pp. 40, 43–45) educational opportunities, (pp. 41–43) and employment (p. 62). But the Commission points out:

"This discussion of impact litigation should not obscure the fact that the over-

*The Commission was comprised of: Robert B. Williamson, Former Chief Justice, Maine Supreme Court, George R. Currie, Former Chief Justice, Wisconsin Supreme Court, and Robert B. Lee, Associate Justice, Colorado Supreme Court.

The full text of the Commission's conclusions are reprinted in the Congressional Record, July 1, 1971, 23390–23403.

whelming bulk of CRLA's work is handling the routine problems of the poor, known in the parlance of the legal assistance attorneys as "service" cases. . . . The routine matters comprise a large percentage of the matters handled, 95–98% of the total number." (pp. 34, 35)

CRLA's litigation record

"CRLA's record of litigation is outstanding. Of the court cases decided in 1969–70, CRLA clients received favorable judgements 84% of the time. Of the administrative decisions rendered, CRLA clients received favorable rulings 88% of the time." (p. 34)

CRLA as an organization

"The Commission has been most favorably impressed by the internal controls adopted by CRLA to insure that the highest of professional service is rendered to its clients; that it is institutionally so organized as to operate efficiently with proper financial control maintained; and that the conditions and restrictions of its OEO grant and applicable Federal Statutes are observed." (p. 72)

B. FINDINGS RE THE UHLER REPORT

The California Evaluation, often called the Uhler Report after its author Lewis K. Uhler, was a 283 page document which purported to justify Governor Reagan's veto of CRLA. The Commission has these things to say about it:

"It should be emphasized that the complaints contained in the Uhler Report and the evidence adduced thereon do not, either taken separately or as a whole, furnish any justification whatsoever for any finding of improper activities by CRLA. . . . [Furthermore] the Commission expressly finds that in many instances the California Evaluation has taken evidence out of context and misrepresented the facts to support the charges against CRLA. In so doing, the Uhler Report has unfairly and irresponsibly subjected many able, energetic, idealistic and dedicated CRLA attorneys to totally unjustified attacks upon their professional integrity and competence. From the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits received in evidence and the Commission's examination of the documents submitted in support of the charges in the California Evaluation, the Commission finds that these charges were totally irresponsible and without foundation." (pp. 83, 84)

Regarding some of the more serious charges brought against CRLA, the Commission found as follows:

1. *Labor Union Ties:* "the facts found do not support the allegation of any improper CRLA tie with any labor organization." (p. 83)

2. *Prison Disruptions:* "The Commission specifically finds that any charges of impropriety with respect to activities within the prisons are completely baseless. . . . After hearing Commission finds that role of CRLA at Soledad has not been destructive but, on the contrary, proper and constructive." (p. 82, Appendix A., p. 2)

3. *Criminal Representation:* "Allegations of improper CRLA representation of persons accused of crimes likewise proved to be unfounded. . . . [Relevant] guidelines were treated by CRLA's Director as more restrictive than the statute. . . . In most instances, CRLA's attorneys had obtained waivers of the guideline prohibitions even in instances where not required to do so by OEO guidelines. . . . Additionally, although there appeared to be no statutory or OEO prohibition against CRLA attorneys handling criminal cases on their 'own time', this practice also was forbidden without specific permission." (pp. 83, 54, 55)

4. *Solicitation:* "the Commission concludes that the charges of solicitation contained in the Uhler Report are without foundation." (p. 57)

5. *Confidential Memorandum:* "A copy of a confidential memorandum from CRLA attorney Robert Johnstone to Martin Glick, CRLA Director of Litigation, which had been publicly released, was admitted into evidence at El Centro. Because of inferences of misconduct which were drawn from this memorandum, the Commission received extensive evidence on the matter covered therein. The Commission wishes to emphasize that the evidence adduced completely exonerates CRLA as an organization of any wrongdoing." (p. 84)

C. CRLA REFUNDING

Based on the Commission findings, CRLA has been granted, with Governor Reagan's written approval, an increase in funds through 1972. None of the twenty-three special conditions attached to the grant require changes in CRLA's current policies and procedures and therefore in no way interfere with CRLA's capacity to render the highest quality legal services to its clients.

J. T. BOND RECEIVES 50-YEAR LEGION AWARD

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion was chartered in 1919 and Mr. Jones T. Bond of Greensboro, Ga., became a member of that organization in 1921. Recently, he was awarded the 50 year pin and scroll in recognition of his 50 years of active and continuous service, the first person to ever receive the honor at Post No. 84 of the American Legion.

For Mr. Bond, the ideals and purposes of the American Legion have not been merely words on paper, but have been a way of life he has followed during his many years of dedicated service to his organization, his community and his country.

In honor of the recent occasion and in tribute to Mr. Bond, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article from the Greensboro Ga., Herald-Journal:

J. T. BOND RECEIVES 50-YEAR LEGION AWARD

Jones T. Bond, of Greensboro, has been awarded the 50-year pin and scroll for his 50 years of continuous service in the American Legion. These presentations were made by the Vice-Commander of Georgia Department of the Legion, Mrs. Mary B. Howard.

The occasion was a Ladies' Night dinner hosted jointly by M. C. Overton Post No. 89 of the Legion and Adams-Walker Post No. 4259 of V.F.W.

ILLUSTRIOUS SERVICE

The history of Legionnaire Bond's service to the Legion and his country was read by General Hughes Ash, along with a tribute from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company from which Mr. Bond retired a few years ago.

General Ash also presented a beautiful pot plant to Mrs. Bond on behalf of both posts, commenting upon and commending Mrs. Bond, a charter member of the Auxiliary, for her outstanding services to and support of veterans' affairs.

82ND DIVISION'S TRIBUTE

Colonel Lester A. Webb, USA-Retired, of Gomer, Ga., represented 82nd Division Association. Comrade Bond served overseas with this Division in World War I. Colonel Webb read greetings from Hon. Tom Dennard, President 82nd Division Southern Branch WWI. After suitable complimentary remarks of his own, Colonel Webb read a beautiful tribute from Ira L. Greenhut, Secretary of 82nd Division Association and on behalf of the Association and presented Comrade Bond the beautiful medallion of "Defenders of American Liberty."

UNIQUE OCCASION

This is the first 50-year Service Award to be received at our local post. We are grateful for the long, faithful, productive years of service which Jones T. Bond has given to his fellow Veterans, his community, his State and his Nation. This delightful and richly deserved occasion truly bespeaks that it is more blessed to give than to receive. Both posts are most grateful to all who joined in the hard work to put on this affair and appreciate the splendid group which turned out to witness this high tribute to one who so richly deserved it.

WATERSHED PROJECT IN FRANKLIN PARISH, LA.

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. C. L. Traver, chairman, Board of Supervisors of the Northeast Soil and Water Conservation District to Mr. Richard K. Yancey, assistant director, Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission concerning the watershed program in Franklin Parish, La.:

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Winnsboro, La., July 7, 1971.

Mr. RICHARD K. YANCEY,
Assistant Director, Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission, Baton Rouge, La.

DEAR MR. YANCEY: Some months ago I read a statement that you had made concerning a watershed project in Concordia Parish, which prompted me to remark that Mr. Yancey is probably a pretty fair biologist but forgot to study economics. The statement you made before the subcommittee in Washington has confirmed the latter part of this statement, but cast some doubt about the first part.

Your long list of economic value of wildlife and fish is insignificant when compared to the production of farm products from the same area. Try it.

As for myself, I love these huge bottomland hardwood forests, and I am reasonably sure that some areas have been cleared that should not have been. However, most of these lands that I have seen were not overly productive of timber or wildlife. The *owners* cleared them because they are more valuable as cropland. They furnish employment, add to the general economy of the area and contribute tax revenue to pay for operation of schools and other facilities.

You made a great effort to blame the small watersheds for the clearing of bottomland hardwood forests, but you have no facts to prove it. Take my native parish (Catahoula) for example. It has no small watershed program, yet more land has been cleared here than in any other parish in the state. Most of this land was cleared by big corporations who contribute relatively little to the local economy as compared to small, locally owned farms. Tensas Parish, on the other hand, has a watershed program and most of the land is still locally owned.

As for the total wooded acreage in the state, compare the acreage in 1950 to that of 1970 and you will find very little change. The Soil Conservation Service and districts

have caused many more acres to be forested than they have caused to be cleared. It is simply a matter of proper land use and economics.

Do you know what the climax forest type for the hills of North Louisiana is? It is hardwood, not pine. There are millions of acres of hill land that, if properly managed, will produce good pine and hardwood timber and wildlife, and is not adapted to farm crops.

You quoted impressive figures as to hunting days, etc., in this state, but you failed to mention that a vast majority of these were on someone's farm or in the hill country.

You shed crocodile tears over fishing destroyed by channelization, but failed to mention the thousands of acres that have been created by Soil Conservation Service or the recreational facilities that have been created within easy reach of hundreds of thousands of people. You also failed to mention that hunting in the big bottomland hardwood forests is largely reserved for those who can afford to belong to a hunting club or own a camp.

Most of the productive hunting in this state is done on farm land and in the hill country. The Soil Conservation Service and districts have contributed immensely to development of desirable wildlife habitat on many of these farms.

I happen to own several small farms and they support more wildlife and fish than the figures you quoted on the big swamp lands and also they produce some pretty fair crops. On one 150 acre farm, I have practically every form of wildlife and waterfowl and all native birds that exist in the state and some pretty good fishing.

In the process of earning a degree in forestry at L.S.U., I learned a few things about ecology, but they also taught economics. I have spent most of my life in conservation work, including U.S. Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, and La. Forestry Commission and am now serving as chairman of the board of supervisors of the Northeast Soil and Water Conservation District. We are presently in the process of developing plans for two watershed projects in this area, but find ourselves handicapped and probably stopped by the Wildlife and Fisheries people.

If you people succeed in stopping these programs, you will have done tremendous harm to the economy of Franklin Parish. If you succeed in your efforts in Washington, you will prevent millions of dollars from coming into this state and this will not help the hunting and fishing, but will harm the economy of the state. The land of this state that is adapted to production of farm crops and is privately owned will be cleared and cultivated as surely as night follows day regardless of the fate of the small watershed programs.

There is a definite need for coordination of efforts of the Wildlife and Fisheries people with those of the Soil Conservation Service, but land use will be determined by land capability except in cases where it is controlled by public bodies.

I believe that the two proposed watershed programs in Franklin Parish could lead to tremendous economic development for the area. I also believe that it offers a wonderful opportunity for coordinating the efforts of the technicians of the Wildlife and Fisheries Commission and the Soil Conservation Service. I believe that the knowledge and talents of all these people should be used to develop this area to its full potential for all purposes.

If you succeed in stopping the small watershed program you will have done a tremendous disservice to the people of this state and in the long run you will help Wildlife and Fisheries very little, if any.

Very truly yours,

C. L. TARVER,
Chairman, Board of Supervisors.

REMARKS OF DR. RAYMOND L. BISPLINGHOFF, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. JONES or North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 of this year, East Carolina University located in Greenville, N.C., had a graduating class of approximately 2,000. The faculty and the graduates were fortunate to have as their commencement speaker Dr. Raymond Bisplinghoff, of the National Science Foundation.

I have heard so many favorable comments on Dr. Bisplinghoff's speech, that I secured a copy of it and after reviewing it carefully, I am convinced that it deserves to be repeated, and I can think of no better medium than inserting this outstanding speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF DR. RAYMOND L. BISPLINGHOFF

President Jenkins, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class:

In thinking about the assignment President Jenkins gave me for addressing you today, I decided to follow the example of a New England commencement speaker I heard several years ago who gave a graduation speech in terms of a series of propositions. The only difficulty of following this example was that I had to come up with some proposition. As I thought more about his address, all I could recall was that it was brief, very brief. I resolved that my first proposition must surely be that a graduation speech should, above all, be brief.

Having adopted a style and a first proposition from a northerner, I decided to turn to a southerner from another era for the second. In June of 1826, Thomas Jefferson was invited to come to Washington for the fiftieth anniversary of our independence. He could not accept and shortly after writing a letter, declining the invitation, he was dead. In that letter he wrote of—"the small band, who joined with us that day, in the bold and doubtful election we were to make for our country, between submission or the sword."

It is hard to realize in 1971 that the Declaration of Independence was one of the most politically inflammatory documents of all time. It established the proposition which I take as my second—*Man is inherently capable of governing himself.* What an extraordinarily radical proposition! So radical, it would be illegal to say it in public even today in much of the world.

Jefferson, living and writing in a simpler age than our own, was contrasting the American political experiment with the proven principles of European monarchy. Today, that proposition, while as politically viable as ever, needs to be extended to the more subtle tyranny of contemporary events. Jefferson's America, inhabited by only a few million souls, insulated each from the other by slowness of communications, permitted forms of social freedom that we may have now lost. But in surrendering these freedoms—or feeling that we have—we often make the assumption that the march of events is beyond our control.

Every year our population grows, our environment deteriorates, our cities become more blighted, ground transportation in the great urban corridors becomes less reliable, the power and communication networks become increasingly taxed, nuclear weapons proliferate and we feel that technology is depersonalizing us and our world. The world has changed greatly from that of Jefferson. Despair has impelled many to turn their backs on a rational approach towards the world's problems, and to seek comfort in a return to oversimplification and superstition.

But this is a surrender, or in modern terms, a cop-out. Man is inherently capable of managing his affairs. The environment, the city, and overpopulation are the affairs of man. That these problems are, in many ways, the inevitable by-products of progress is a point I will not argue. But I will not concede that they are insurmountable obstacles. They are but a job that can be done if we turn to it. Events are not beyond our control, if we have the skills and the will to take an active part in controlling them.

A third proposition is a corollary to the second—*Self-government requires education.* Jefferson said, "Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves, therefore, are its only safe depositories. And to render even them safe, their minds must be improved." He believed in that corollary—he regarded his role in founding the University of Virginia as more important than his service as President of the United States.

Today, more than ever, the ability of man to govern himself, in the face of the extraordinary complexity of 20th century life, demands an education capable of dealing with that complexity. Some present problems can perhaps be traced to the failure of education to keep pace as society has grown more complex. To be sure, the man of average education today not only has a deeper grasp of the principles underlying the work that he does, but he also has an education which, in sheer volume, far surpasses that of Jefferson's contemporaries. One great difference may be that Jefferson's contemporaries learned most of what they needed to know, not in schools, but as apprentices in the school of life. We may have wandered to one side of the main track in our placing so great an emphasis on long years of formal education, often highly specialized, to the exclusion of experience.

When I say education, I do not mean just education supplied by institutions. Of course, we can and should reflect updated considerations in contemporary education of our young people. However, the specific problems that you will face in middle age are not known today, cannot be foreseen, and you will not have been educated for them. To the extent you will be educated 20 years from now to deal responsibly with the problems you will face then, you must draw upon a base of general education which has taught you to think and reason. But this places on us all the responsibility of continuous improvement of the mind and an understanding of contemporary events. Too many of us, I am sorry to say, were described by the American playwight, John Mason Brown, who observed: "Part of the American myth is that people who are handed the skin of a dead sheep at graduation time think that it will keep their minds alive forever."

It has often been observed that in education the currently relevant is not likely to prove relevant in the future. This was borne out at the institution where I spent so many years, MIT, during the preparation for founding the Sloan School of Industrial Management in the early 1950's. A group of the faculty interviewed the presidents of a number of American corporations, putting to them the question: "What would you like us to teach men who, in time, might be your successors?"

These men were interviewed separately, but there was an extraordinary convergence in their answers. They all agreed that it would be unwise to teach them how to run a business. "Leave that to us," they insisted. Next they urged: "Try to teach them something about history and the process of change." They explained that industrial life was changing so fast in relation to our society that some feeling for where we had been

and where we might go was essential. Then they pleaded: "Try to teach them to communicate." It emerged that one of the greatest weaknesses they felt was lack of men who could write clearly and to the point. Finally, they advised: "Try to teach them something about human beings. We doubt that you can, but try anyway." They were conscious that the heart of their job lay in dealing with people rather than machines. In advocating that we teach men something about history and change, writing and people, they pierced through and identified what we should all ultimately acquire from our education, whatever its technical subject matter. This is understood by the faculty of every great university, and should be understood by you as you get on with the never ending business of education for the balance of your lives.

But one of the most disturbing trends of today constitutes a fourth proposition—*We are severely questioning the ability of rationalism to solve our problems.* Partly, we are demanding greater consideration of human values in the planning of our technical systems. To that extent, I salute it. However, part of it is an embrace of anti-intellectual return to superstitution. This is self-defeating. Rejecting science and the rational approach towards problem-solving as anti-humanist, is a rejection of human dreams at the least, and dangerous at the worst.

My point is twofold. First, it is the nature of man to look at the stars and wonder. But there is another element. Man has always been a great manipulator and modifier of his environment. That his manipulations of the last 200 years have resulted in a degradation of that environment is beyond argument. But the answer to our problems does not lie in turning our backs on the system which, only among other things, produced these problems. Only a moment's thought on what that really means shows what a shallow idea it is.

Every generation, including our own, considers itself the most threatened in history. As change accelerates, the impact of that change becomes greater, and the apparent crisis more grave. I do not subscribe to the theory that human history will end with our generation, or that it is even likely. Rather, today is a time that has its own problems, many of which are so large that we must get on with the job of doing something about them. I will even concede that many of the problems we have today are hangovers from yesterday's incomplete solutions, like pollution. Although some lawmakers act as though they discovered it, many scientists and engineers have been working on it for years and we find the American humorist O. Henry, a native North Carolinian, describing a Nashville drizzle in 1890 as "London Fog, 30 parts; malaria, 10 parts; gas leak, 20 parts; dewdrops gathered in a brickyard, 25 parts; odor of honeysuckle, 15 parts."

My last proposition is that *we need to rededicate ourselves to rationalism and education if we hope to make self-government work in the future.*

But, I warn you this is not an easy road to travel. Greater understanding will be needed by each of us of the current issues, whether they be scientific in their content or humanistic, or both. We can settle for no less if we wish to make Jefferson's principle survive in the years ahead.

Alexis de Tocqueville recognized the challenge that confronts all Americans in a perceptive observation early in the 19th century. He did not question our resolve and capability to act effectively when the goals could be clearly perceived or when there existed an easily understandable external threat or physical disaster. He questioned the outcome when citizens were asked to judge more subtle issues so complex and far removed from their daily lives that they could hardly understand their nature and long-term implications. Many of the pressing domestic issues that confront our country today fall within this category.

Let me return finally to the environment because it is such a good example. We want clean air, clear water. But these are not to be obtained by stopping technology or even denouncing goals set in another time. They can be obtained by changing technology—to the extent that technology takes into account the highly complex science of ecology, and fits into it. If we are to have all this and a humane society, the decisions that will put such technology on stream must be ratified by a public which understands at least the basis of both the technology and the ecology.

But I will repeat that this depends not only on scientists and engineers being more humane, but on a society of people who understand this aspect of the world around them and on both groups having a better grasp of the process of change. If we can do this, and there is every reason to believe we can, there is no cause to despair. We will have taken the largest stride toward learning how to govern ourselves as well in the 20th century as in the 18th.

But, I assure you, it will all depend, in the final analysis, on the well-informed and active participation of each of you, wherever you live and whatever you do.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 12th anniversary of the passage by Congress of the captive nations resolution. I am pleased to join with so many of my colleagues in this commemoration.

Unfortunately, the Iron Curtain continues to exist, to the detriment of those who reside behind it. While we have penetrated it to a limited degree, the deprivations that are the hallmark of the totalitarian state still must be endured by the residents of those nations. Perhaps the worst aspect of their lives is the inability to have a voice in the political life of their countries. Alien as that is to those of us who are privileged to live in the United States, it is a fact of everyday life in the Communist countries.

Life has improved somewhat for these people since the end of World War II. It scarcely could have gotten worse. But the betterment of material circumstances is no compensation for the absence of personal freedom.

We know that the yearning for liberty persists, so deeply imbedded are its roots in the captive nations. The regimes in power are fully aware of this fact as well as their repressive actions frequently illustrate.

This annual observance by the United States serves to encourage the hopes of those many peoples that one day they again will be able to join the ranks of the free world. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to participate in the House's commemoration of Captive Nations Week.

COMMENDATION FOR OUR NURSING HOMES

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is facing an unusual paradox. Because we are a thriving, healthy people, we live longer. This longevity, however, has created a health crisis, because, as we grow older, we are more likely to suffer from illness.

In fact, the vast majority of nursing home residents are older persons. Half of the patients are over 75 years of age; one out of three is 85 or older.

The vast majority of nursing homes in this country, although they face many problems, are doing a commendable job meeting the health care needs of the elderly. I believe that one group of health-care facilities stands out and should be recognized for its dedication and excellence.

This group is the Metropolitan New York Nursing Home Association, which has 90 member homes in the five boroughs of New York City. The association, whose homes have a total bed capacity of 12,500, has earned a reputation as a forward-looking group, always sensitive to the physical and emotional needs of its patients, many of whom yearn for "TLC."

"TLC" is "tender loving care," and the association's members are not embarrassed by using this old-fashioned phrase. TLC is an integral part of the modern, well-equipped licensed nursing homes in New York.

The Metropolitan New York Nursing Home Association is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the welfare of the aged, chronically ill, and the disabled. It assists its member nursing homes in their continuing efforts to meet their community responsibility and, as their representative, it coordinates their activities with governmental and professional organizations and agencies.

I think it is important to point out that a handful of nursing homes do not always live up to the highest professional standards. The association is doing its utmost in urging these few institutions to upgrade the caliber of their facilities and programs, and deserve recognition for their worthy efforts.

It is the policy of the association's members to admit and to treat all patients without regard to race, color, or national origin. The same requirements for admission are applied to all patients. There is no distinction in eligibility for, or in the manner of providing, any patient service.

The motto of the Metropolitan New York Nursing Home Association is therefore particularly apt: "Homes to Enjoy . . . Not to Endure."

I would like to commend the officers of the association for their dedication to the goal of bringing quality health care to their patients. They are: Meyer Temkin, president; Nicholas Demisay, first vice president; Ernest Dicker, secretary;

Moses Braunstein, recording secretary; Daniel Resnick, treasurer; Eugene Hollander, honorary president; and Irwin Karassik, the executive director.

The facilities in the Metropolitan New York Nursing Home Association are prime examples of the national trend of vast improvements in geriatric care.

For example, during the last 10 years, nursing homes have progressed as much in quality and sophistication as hospitals have in a generation.

Nursing homes have become an integral part of the health care system in the United States. Several types of facilities come under this broad category offering various levels of care.

A mere generation ago, the nursing home which provided anything more than simple custodial care was the exception rather than the rule. Now, nursing homes are fully equipped, well-staffed facilities geared to meet the needs of the individual patient/resident, and especially so in the area of geriatric care.

I believe that these improvements in health care, as exemplified by the Metropolitan New York Nursing Home Association, should be known to the Congress, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I have commented on them today.

THE 1925 GENEVA PROTOCOL: TIME FOR ACTION

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a matter of vital importance that has been neglected and postponed by this Nation for more than 45 years. I am speaking of the "Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous, and Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare." In substance, the 1925 Protocol calls for the prohibition of the initial use of all bacteriological and chemical instruments of war.

I need not remind my colleagues that this country has consistently led the struggle to avoid the devastating effects of not only chemical and biological warfare, but nuclear warfare as well. Just recently the current administration decided to destroy our stockpiles of certain chemical and biological weapons. This coupled with our continuing efforts to reach at least a partial agreement with the Soviet Union on nuclear disarmament, amply demonstrates our desire to work for a safe and peaceful world.

Why is it, then, that it has taken us so long to join with the other nations of the world and voice our support of the Geneva Protocol? It is seemingly because we would like to retain the military use of teargas and herbicides while at the same time disavowing any intention of ever using other chemical or biological weapons. There is deep dissension about whether the protocol's wording allows for any such exceptions. The basic problem, then, centers around the protocol's term "Other Gases." Does this encompass tear gas—a relatively minor and, perhaps, even humane gaseous "weapon"—and herbicides, which destroy foliage without, in and of itself, destroying human life? While the majority of the signatory nations have chosen to interpret this term as all inclusive, our present and preceding administrations have chosen the opposing view, and wish to receive the consent of the Senate with the understanding that the language of the protocol does not include tear gas and herbicides. While the Nixon administration has found this position most compatible with the prior use of these chemicals by our forces in Vietnam, the present level of usage has declined to such a degree that it is now foreseeable that the use of tear gas and herbicides as a military weapon can be phased out without requiring major adjustments by remaining troops.

It has been constantly pointed out, in testimony given before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that our military leaders no longer view the use of tear gas as vital to our military operations. The point has also been made that the more frequently tear gas is used, the less effective it becomes—due to the enemy being forced to wear protective equipment, thus neutralizing the adverse effects of the gas. These facts tend to eliminate a major reason for our lack of action in the past.

We are, therefore, faced with a decision: Do we continue on our present course and insist on a restrictive interpretation? Or do we join with the majority of nations and ban the "first use" of all chemical and biological agents in warfare? We must remember that many nations, within and without the United Nations, look to this country for guidance and encouragement when initiating a foreign policy. Prof. George Bunn, in a recent edition of the Wisconsin Law Review, presents a compelling argument for the ratification of the protocol in this matter:

EFFECT ON REDUCING LIKELIHOOD OF GAS AND GERM WARFARE

The best reason for United States ratification is the increased attention and effectiveness it would give to the protocol as a barrier to the first use of chemical and biological weapons.

Our failure to adhere to the protocol has repeatedly been called to the attention of other nations by the Soviet Union and its allies. All other nuclear powers, including China, and all other major industrial nations, except for Japan, are parties. For these reasons, our accession would be regarded as important by other countries.

The 1966 United Nations resolution dealing with the protocol renewed interest in it as an instrument for maintaining continued retraint on poison gas and germ warfare. Probably as a direct result, some 12 developing countries have become parties since 1966. Our ratification would give further impetus to the effort to secure adherences.

As indicated earlier, the basic prohibition of the protocol appears to apply to nonadhering states. But many of the emerging African and Asian nations do not regard themselves as bound by rules developed as the result of practices of "colonialist" powers. Only adherence to the protocol is likely to be regarded by them as producing a serious inhibition upon their first use of gas or germ warfare. Yet these same states could acquire chemical and biological agents with much less difficulty than they could acquire nuclear weapons. Indeed chemical and biological weapons have sometimes been called the poor man's atomic bomb. The most recent use of poison gas was, after all, in Yemen. Neither that country nor Israel and Jordan are parties to the protocol. Among the emerging countries of Sub-Saharan African, only nine have joined, all within the last five years. Mainland China and India are parties, but Japan and many less developed countries are not. Latin America currently has the fewest number of parties of any major region of the world. In my view, United States adherence to the protocol would stimulate wider acceptance of it by countries in these areas, and would enhance its credibility as a deterrent to the first use of poison gas and germs in war.

The present world situation is such that this step in lessening the threat of chemical and biological warfare is sorely needed. It is imperative that this protocol be acted upon; that we join with other nations of the world and stand behind this agreement; and that those nations of the world that are not now committed to these principles be pressed to join the United States in affirmation of this important document.

THE DECLINING DEFENSES OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July, 27, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Phyllis Schlafly Report of July 1971 presents an excellent summation of the current defense situation. This report gives a few of the reasons which probably influenced the current head of the Strategic Air Command, Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, to state in testimony before the Senate Committee on the Armed Services that—

This country is in greater danger today than it was at the time of Pearl Harbor or at any time, in my judgment, since the 18th century, but the danger isn't generally recognized.

The Schlafly Report follows:

HELL-BENT ON NATIONAL SUICIDE

Americans are justly proud of having a system of government that guarantees more freedom than any nation in the world ever enjoyed. Let us always remember that our American freedom includes the freedom to commit suicide. In the opinion of our best informed citizens, this is exactly what we are doing. Here are four warnings which have gone largely unreported by most of the press.

GENERAL LE MAY'S WARNING

General Curtis E. LeMay, the great commander who built up the Strategic Air Command as our first line of defense, on February 24 in Santa Ana, California predicted that within 18 months the Soviet Union will serve a "capitulation-or-else" ultimatum on the United States, and President Nixon will have no choice but to surrender and succumb to Soviet demands.

Asked what he meant by the words "or else," General LeMay replied that "or else" means an attack by "nuclear weapons." Continuing, he said:

"While the United States is wasting money

on TNT for use in the jungles and rice paddies of Southeast Asia, Russia is spending money on what today is the finest strategic weapons system in the world. We have become a second-rate power, and our whole military establishment is rapidly going downhill because our weaponry—both offensive and defensive—is outmoded. . . . Like it or not, we are at war with the Communists—and we'd better do something about it, fast, before it's too late."

General LeMay said the American people are deceiving themselves if they "believe we have a strong national defense system. That's what we're told, but it's not so—really. And I know."

This sensational statement by one of America's greatest living military leaders was reported in newspapers in California and Indiana. It was apparently censored out of newspapers and television and radio reports in most of the rest of the country. Five months have passed since General LeMay gave his warning about "18 months," but nothing has been done in Washington to rebuild U.S. nuclear strength.

JOINT COMMITTEE WARNING

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, made up of nine Senators and nine Congressmen, some hawks, some doves, some conservatives, some liberals, ten Democrats, eight Republicans, is one of the best informed bodies in our Government. On May 24, 1971, this Committee issued an ominous warning: The United States, unless it moves quickly to counter a rapidly expanding Soviet naval threat, faces a future in which it will have to surrender to the Soviets on all issues or risk nuclear annihilation. Any delay may mean "no future."

The 278-page report contained hitherto unpublished official reports and statements by Admiral Hyman G. Rickover and other experts on the status of Soviet and U.S. naval forces. The bald facts are these.

The Soviet Union has a sure navy of 2,009 units compared with a U.S. surface navy of 563 units. The Soviet submarine strength is 355 compared with 142 for the United States. The advantage in nuclear submarines in which we long took comfort has disappeared. Soviet ballistic missile submarines armed with Polaris-type nuclear missiles now patrol off both coasts in range of most of our urban industrial areas.

This prestigious Congressional Committee concluded that unless prompt measures are taken to build up a nuclear navy, America will have "to give in on all issues . . . There may be no future. . . . We will soon find ourselves unable to defend our national interests." The Committee urged recollection of the statement by President Eisenhower quoted on the keel of the nuclear aircraft carrier which bears his name: "Until war is eliminated from international relations, unpreparedness for it is well nigh as criminal as war itself."

BLUE RIBBON WARNING

Soon after President Nixon's inauguration, he appointed a "Blue Ribbon Defense Panel" to study the workings of the Defense Department and recommend how to make it more efficient. In the course of their investigation, seven members of that Blue Ribbon Panel become so alarmed about the inability of the United States to defend ourselves against the growing Soviet nuclear threat that they wrote a "Supplemental Statement" and submitted it to President Nixon on September 30, 1970.

Although this Statement expressly said that its purpose was to "contribute to public discussion" and result in "wider public understanding" because "the public remains uninformed and apathetic" in the face of the Soviet threat. The Pentagon suppressed it for nearly six months. When the Defense Department finally released it on March 12, 1971, no explanation was given for why it was kept secret so long.

On April 5, *U.S. News & World Report* printed a short summary of this Supplemental Statement. It was largely ignored by the press. On April 19, Congressman John G. Schmitz of California put the full text into the *Congressional Record* (page 10799). This Supplemental Statement was signed by William Blackie, board chairman of Caterpillar Tractor Company, Peoria; George Champion, president, Economic Development Council, New York; William P. Clements, Jr., president, Southeastern Drilling, Dallas; John M. Fluke, president, John Fluke Manufacturing Company, Seattle; Hobart D. Lewis, president, Reader's Digest Association, Pleasantville, N.Y.; Admiral Wilfred J. McNeil, director, Fairchild Hiller Corporation, New York; Lewis F. Powell, Jr., lawyer, Richmond.

The Blue Ribbon Statement publicly recognizes "the abandonment by the U.S. of its former policy of maintaining strategic superiority." It will be recalled that Richard Nixon, in campaigning for the Presidency, on October 24, 1968, specifically promised to restore our "clearcut military superiority." The Blue Ribbon Panel members, all of whom are Nixon appointees, tactfully refrained from mentioning this, but they make clear that the President's promise has not been kept.

A "SECOND RATE" POWER

The Blue Ribbon Statement bluntly states that the United States, as a "second rate" power, will be "subordinate to manifest Soviet military superiority. . . . The world order of the future will bear a Soviet trademark, with all peoples upon whom it is imprinted suffering Communist repressions." *That clearly means all Americans.* "In the 70's neither the vital interests of the U.S. nor the lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure."

The Blue Ribbon Statement says that our present danger "was predetermined by decisions made in the 1960's, which resulted in the reduction, postponement and abandonment of strategic defense measures and weapons systems." Of course, all readers of the Schlafly-Ward book, *Strike From Space,* knew this in 1965, *at the time it was going on.*

The Blue Ribbon Statement explodes the myth of relying on the "Sino-Soviet split," saying "the friendship between the Soviet Union and Red China has dissolved. . . . But this disunity among Communist powers does not necessarily enhance the chances of peace for the Free World. . . . Each has always proclaimed that the principal enemy is 'imperialistic America.' . . . The Marxist purpose of communizing the world remains the goal of every Communist party."

The Blue Ribbon Statement says flatly that "the reopening and control of the Suez Canal" is a Soviet objective; "this waterway [is] as important to the Soviet Union as the Panama Canal has been to the U.S." If Secretary of State William Rogers would read the Blue Ribbon Statement, he would see that he is directly serving the Soviet Union by his frantic efforts to pressure the Israelis into allowing the opening of the Suez Canal.

There has been much public debate in the last few months about the number of American troops which should be stationed in Western Europe. The truth is that whether we have 150,000 or 300,000 troops in Europe is an exercise in irrelevancy, as the Blue Ribbon Statement makes clear: "The Soviet Union has some 700 IRBM's deployed within convenient range of defenseless Western European cities and NATO forces." Note the word "defenseless." Western Europe has no strategic defense against the Soviet nuclear threat because former Secretary McNamara scrapped all our European-based IRBM's.

ICBM SUPERIORITY

The Blue Ribbon Statement warns flatly that "the Soviet Union has attained for the first time a superior strategic capability—where it counts the most—in ICBM's. . . . While we imposed a limitation on additional strategic weapons, the Soviets pressed forward to overtake and pass us. . . . More serious than the numerical superiority is the substantial megatonnage advantage enjoyed by the Soviet Union. The enormous payloads of the SS–9's have a destructive capacity incomparably greater than any U.S. missile. . . The Soviet SS–9 ICBM force alone is capable of delivering a megatonnage of nuclear warheads several times greater than that of the entire U.S. force of ICBM's and SLBM's. . . . It is well to remember that we have *no defense whatever* against Soviet ICBM's and SLBM's which *now* have the capability of killing perhaps *half of our population*—more than 100 million people—by a surprise first strike." (emphasis added)

The Blue Ribbon Statement calls attention to the heavy Soviet financial commitment to building a first-strike capability: "The trend of Soviet defense spending continue steadily upward. . . . The Soviet Union is spending significantly more than the U.S. in the buildup of its strategic offensive and defensive weapons" even though its gross national product is only half of ours.

The Blue Ribbon Statement concludes: "The only viable national strategy is to regain and retain a clearly superior strategic capability," which can be done (1) by building enough new strategic nuclear weapons, and (2) "by eschewing agreements [such as SALT] which freeze the U.S. into a second-rate status. . . . The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely to the contrary. Among the great nations, only the strong survive."

The Blue Ribbon Statement warns in the strongest language against "the danger of fatal concessions or even of a deliberate trap" at the SALT talks now going on between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in Helsinki. The Blue Ribbon Statement says that it would be "egregious folly" for the U.S. to agree to freeze strategic capabilities "at some level of specified parity" because this would actually enable the Soviet Union to "strengthen its overall military and political position."

President Nixon's announcement that he has made "a major step in breaking the stalemate" in the SALT talks is the "egregious folly" of which the Blue Ribbon Panel members warned. What was hailed as a "major breakthrough" was really a U.S. surrender of our previous position that any agreement must cover all offensive weapons and not prevent our catching up with Soviet ABM systems.

Many people ask, "why do we need more nuclear weapons when we already have enough to kill every Russian?" The Blue Ribbon Statement clarifies the reason. We have no assurance whatsoever that our weapons can kill any substantial number of Russians because of the extensive Soviet anti-missile and anti-bomber defenses. More important, the U.S. has no missiles which can destroy Soviet weapons, while the Soviets are approaching the capability of wiping out our entire missile force with their giant SS–9's.

OUR "ONLY HOPE"

Although the Blue Ribbon Statement is "respectfully submitted to The President and The Secretary of Defense," it offers not the slightest trace of optimism that they will accept the recommendations. The impression given is that the Blue Ribbon Panel members have despaired that President Nixon will fulfill his promise to restore our "clear-cut military superiority," and so are appeal-

ing over his head to the American people. The Statement repeatedly admonishes the American people to rise up and demand nuclear superiority, but never calls on President Nixon to do anything. At one point the Blue Ribbon Statement says our "only hope . . . is to assure a wider public knowledge of the facts and an understanding of the probable consequences of second-rate military status." If we fail, "there is little future for America as we know it or for our cherished freedoms."

What the Blue Ribbon Panel members are saying is: Voters, if you want America to survive in the face of the Soviet nuclear threat, it's up to you to do something about it, because the President, the Defense Department, and the Congress certainly are not doing what needs to be done.

CONGRESSMAN RIVERS' WARNING

The Congressional committee which is directly concerned wtih defense is the House Armed Services Committee. Its chairman for many years until his death this year was Congressman L. Mendel Rivers. Last September 28 he made a speech called "The Soviet Threat" which must rank as one of the most important ever given in Congress. He laid it on the line about the critical danger America faces today. Because this great speech was given the silent treatment by most of the press, we reprint here selected excerpts. The full text can be found in the Congressional Record, volume 116, part 25, page 33899.

"Mr. Speaker, never before in the 30 years of my membership in this body have I stepped into the well of this House with greater concern for the future of this Nation.

"The fears that I have are those that must be shared by every American regardless of his political or social philosophy or his economic status.

"All Americans have been given the blessed and priceless heritage of freedom—a freedom which I am convinced is in terrible jeopardy. . . .

"Consideration of the defense budget, contrary to what some would have us believe, is not a question of assigning relative priorities between defense and domestic programs.

"Decisions on the defense budget should be based on the simple question of nation survival—and nothing more.

"The issue should be 'what is required to survive?'; and not 'how should we allocate the national budget between defense and domestic programs?'

"The final measure fo our abiltiy to survive as a nation in a hostile world will not be how well we have managed our domestic resources and domestic programs, but whether or not we have avoided and frustrated the forces of evil which would draw us into the crucible of war with the Soviet Union.

"If we fail in that endeavor, we will have failed in everything.

"It is this circumstance which demands that we maintain a level of strategic and conventional military capability that will insure against any misunderstanding by the leaders in the Kremlin of our intentions to survive.

"Regrettably, the leaders in the Kremlin are now evidently unimpressed by both our military capability and our national determination to survive. . . .

"Since the deterioration of our military capabiltiy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union is no secret to the Kremlin, I believe it is high time that we tell the American people the facts of life. I plan on doing that today. . . ."

[Congressman Rivers then set forth in specific detail how the Soviet Navy has achieved superiority over the U.S. Navy, especially in submarines, modernization, speed, and surface-to-surface missiles. He spelled out the formidable Soviet naval threat in the Mediterranean, in the Caribbean, in the Atlantic, and off Cape Kennedy.]

"THE BRINK OF DISASTER"

"I cannot overemphasize the seriousness of this situation. Yet, I know that there are people in the Congress of the United States who will say 'so what?' I can only warn the Members of this House that we are on the brink of disaster and I have never before been so concerned in all the years I have served in the Congress of the United States.

"We must, therefore, acknowledge the fact that our naval vessels are today simply not capable of discharging their wartime mission requirements if called upon to do so. . . .

"The deliberate and calculated offensive plans of the Soviet Union are now becoming crystal clear with the release of information by the administration of evidence of new Soviet activity in Cuba. I have no doubt that the Soviets are now building a missile-launching nuclear-submarine naval base in Cuba. . . .

"We cannot live with this new Soviet threat at our very doorstep. We cannot permit the cities of the eastern seaboard to become hostages of the Soviet Union. . . .

"Do not be misled into believing we can make up for this frightening loss of naval superiority by relying upon a superior strategic nuclear capability vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Since 1965, the Soviet Union has engaged in a major effort to change the balance of power in this area of military capability. In that period it has more than tripled its inventory of strategic offensive nuclear weapon launchers. . . .

"In the same period, the United States has made no increase in its established level of 1,710 strategic nuclear missile launchers, and has reduced its heavy bomber strength from 780 to less than 600. . . .

"Although the 300 SS–9's will represent considerably less than half of the total inventory of the Soviet land-based ICBM's, this portion of the Soviet ICBM inventory will alone be capable of delivering a megatonnage in nuclear weaponry which exceeds the combined total nuclear weapon megatonnage delivery capability of all of our existing strategic delivery systems, including not only our ICBM force, but our Polaris force as well as our heavy bomber force. Certainly this fact alone ought to raise serious questions concerning the alleged 'defensive' posture of the Soviet Union.

"We have no counterpart for this huge Soviet nuclear weapon delivery system. . . .

"In 1965 neither the Soviet Union nor the United States had a depressed trajectory ICBM or a fractional orbital bombardment system—FOBS. Today, the Soviet Union has tested both, and could very well have operational versions of these weapons systems already deployed. Both of these developments have far-reaching implications on our defense capability.

"Unfortunately, we have nothing like these, and to the best of my knowledge, none on our drawing boards.

"Today the Soviets can launch over 200 ballistic missiles from their nuclear-powered submarines. Two years from now 400 to 500 of these Polaris-type missile launchers are expected to be operational, and by early 1974, this Soviet submarine-launched ballistic missile force will inevitably exceed the constant U.S. force we now have of 656 Polaris launchers. Further, most of our major cities are close to our coasts within short range of their potential submarine stations. . . .

"Our tactical air capability, when compared to the Soviet capability, also raises serious questions as to our ability to cope with the Soviet Union in a conventional confrontation. For example, since 1954 the Soviets have designed and produced 18 new types of fighter planes—13 of these models we have actually photographed in flight. In the same time frame, the United States has not produced a single new air superiority fighter, and actually we have not had one on order until this year. . . .

HANGS BY A THREAD

"I say to this House that the future of this Nation hangs by a thread.

"We are in a far more serious situation than many would have you believe. Our way of life is not only being challenged from within, it is being very definitely threatened from without . . .

"Now let me summarize for a moment. I have outlined to you that our former 5-to-1 margin in nuclear strategic weapons has in a few short years vanished. The Soviet Union now has a nuclear strategic weapon capability in excess of ours, and this superiority will continue to increase if we do not take dramatic action to stem the tide. We can no longer look upon our threat of nuclear war as a satisfactory deterrent to aggression with conventional arms, as we could in the two decades past. From here on if we threaten nuclear war in response to aggression, we risk our own destruction.

"Moreover, I pointed out that the Soviet Union has within a few short years negated our naval superiority. This same accomplishment is evident in other areas of conventional warfare, including our ground and air capabilities.

"As a matter of fact, while Congress is still debating the necessity for building an advanced manned strategic bomber, the B–1, we now know that the Soviet Union has already built such an aircraft, and it should be coming into their operational inventory at least 3 to 4 years before we can hope to have our B–1 operational.

HELL-BENT ON NATIONAL SUICIDE

"The circumstances of the B–1 bomber debate in this country illustrate the reasons why we seem hell-bent on national suicide. While we debate the question of maintaining our military capability, the Soviet Union quietly but openly forges ahead.

"It may be that the gap which has now been created in our defense capability can never be bridged. The Soviets have the bit in their teeth, and make no mistake about it, are both capable and determined to maintain this newly developed superiority. . . .

"In calendar year 1969, the United States spent a total of $7.5 billion on strategic offensive and defensive weaponry. During that same period, the Soviet Union expended approximately $13 billion for the same effort. Thus, it is evident that the Soviet Union in a single calendar year has spent approximately $5.5 billion more for increased strategic capability than did the United States.

"I recognize that a $5.5 billion added effort is somewhat difficult for laymen to comprehend. However, since the cost of a single Minuteman missile is approximately $4.8 million, the added Soviet effort is roughly equivalent to the procurement of a thousand Minuteman missiles.

"All of this in one calendar year. . . .

"As a matter of fact, this circumstance alone illustrates the cold and calculating master plan of the Soviet Union, who in entering the SALT negotiations hope to freeze the United States in an inferior position in strategic weaponry.

"I pray to God that the American people, and the Congress in particular, will soon awaken to these realities and recognize that the question confronting us is no longer one involving the relative allocation of priorities in spending between defense and domestic programs, but rather the fundamental question of national survival.

"We cannot as a Nation afford to spend one penny less on national defense than that amount which is required to insure that you and I, and our children, can convince the Soviets they dare not pull the trigger when a Soviet gun is placed against our heads.

"The issue, therefore, is very simply how much money must be spent to insure our survival—since if we fail to demonstrate to

the Soviet Union our determination to survive—the amount of money we spend for domestic programs will become merely an academic exercise.

"I plead, and I beg you, my colleagues who collectively have the responsibility of the security of our Nation in your hands, to ponder these facts which I have brought to you today. They are proof positive that we are in serious trouble. Unpleasant as these facts may be, you cannot ignore them, for if you do, you are failing not only your constituency but also all the peoples of the world who, in the final analysis, look upon the United States as the fountainhead and guardian of the highest aspiration of genuine freedom in this chaotic world. . . .

"These are the facts which reflect the prophetic wisdom of an observation once made by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Richard M. Nixon, when he said:

" 'If present trends continue, the United States, a very few years hence, will find itself clearly in second position—with the Soviet Union undisputably the greatest military power on earth.'

"I am afraid that the day has already arrived."

IF NOT US, WHO?

When Congressman Rivers concluded his speech, he was warmly commended by Congressmen of both parties. Congressman Durward Hall said: "What you have said today can be construed as neither hawkish, or dovish, but eaglish, that gallant and magnificent creature that symbolizes the strength and honor of this great Nation. . . . In the defense of freedom, if not us, who? If not now, when? If not here, where? I hear no answers. . . . If we do not first concern ourselves with the survival of this Nation, all the rest will go for naught."

Congressman Don H. Clausen said: "This historic and well-documented speech of Chairman Rivers could well record him as the 'jet, space, and nuclear age Paul Revere.' " Mr. Rivers responded: "I only hope that someone, somewhere in the smoldering ruins, will say, 'Old Rivers did the best he could.' "

Are you, my friends, doing the very best you can to save our beloved America from being "hell-bent on national suicide"?

THE HOLLAND YEARS

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beloved public servants from the great State of Florida is Spessard Holland. He served with great distinction as U.S. Senator, and prior to that he served the people of Florida as one of its ablest of Governors.

Recently, television station WFLA in Tampa, Fla., aired a program entitled "The Holland Years" which I know will be of interest to House and Senate Members. It is a pleasure to have inserted into the RECORD part of the public record of a distinguished Floridian. The transcript follows:

THE HOLLAND YEARS

A look at the history of our times through the experiences of former Florida Governor and United States Senator, Spessard Holland.

BILL HENRY. When Senator Spessard Holland retired from the U.S. Senate in January of 1971, it marked the conclusion of nearly fifty years of service to State and Nation . . . County Judge, State Senator, Governor, United States Senator. Over twenty-four years, approximately a quarter of a century, of this particular time was spent in the U.S. Senate, and during a turbulent period of American history. A period of change and a period of unrest. It's on this period that we would like to concentrate. As a member of the country's highest elective law-making body, Senator Holland was a very real part of that history. He rubbed shoulders with it, and he helped to shape its course in many areas. He served under five Presidents: Mr. Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon.

Senator Holland, as first the Junior and then, of course, the Senior Senator from Florida, you had occasion for personal observation and for encounter with these Presidents who helped to shape the destiny of our country. Would you share with us your impressions of them as men, and any personal antidotes you might recollect? Mr. Truman, for example . . .

Senator HOLLAND. Well, President Truman, to me, was the most decisive President under whom I served. He didn't hesitate to act, and to act promptly on important international questions. I followed him very closely in his international decisions. I didn't follow him closely in his domestic positions, and he sometimes was not very kind personally to me. But, I must say that I thought, among the five Presidents, he was the most outstanding. So far as my personal feelings were concerned toward the Presidents, I found President Eisenhower the most likeable, the most always pleasant, the most always kindly of all the five. And that is a summary at least of those two. I would be glad to answer further if you have questions.

BILL HENRY. You indicated, I believe, an area of disagreement with Mr. Truman at the domestic level, but agreement at the international level. Could you elaborate a little on that?

Senator HOLLAND. Well, at the international level, he sponsored the Greek-Turkish aid activity, which stopped Communism there . . . and I backed him strongly. He sponsored the Marshall Plan. He sponsored UNRWA. He sponsored the NATO program. He felt that we should fight in Korea, and I agreed with him. On every one of the important international decisions that he made, I backed him. I honored him that he didn't pussyfoot. He didn't avoid the problems, and they were heavy ones, which confronted him.

On his domestic problems, of course, we had grave differences on the Tidelands question. He called over a national chain network . . . he called all of us who were supporting the Tidelands Act, as guilty of daylight robbery. You may remember that I had to ask for time to reply, which I did over all the NBC stations in the nation. He found fault with my position on civil rights. He found fault with my position on many things . . . and he wasn't one who found fault in a quiet way. He found fault rather personally. So far as personal liking is concerned, I would say there was very little lost at that stage between President Truman and myself.

So far as his international decisions were concerned, I thought he was just about 100% right. And I must say, that after he ceased to be President . . . one time at Key West . . . he said that on studying the Record, he found that I had supported him 100% on international questions. He was surprised to find it, because he had gotten lost in the fact that we were on opposite sides in many domestic questions.

BILL HENRY. When Mr. Eisenhower came in as President, the nation had, of course, a former military man . . . in fact, a gentleman who had made his mark in life as a great general, then as a president of a University and then as President of the United States. He was, I imagine, an entirely different personality from Mr. Truman.

Senator HOLLAND. Oh, yes.

BILL HENRY. How did the reigns of the Presidency seem to evolve and change from these different personalities taking over the country . . . from Mr. Truman to Mr. Eisenhower . . . as you saw it from your position in the Senate at that time?

Senator HOLLAND. President Eisenhower, was not nearly so decisive. He wasn't nearly as firm a leader. The first act of any consequence that he sponsored that passed during his time was the Tidelands Act. And he was as pleased about it as if he had been a boy. The picture of his signing the Act, and then congratulating me, shows him just so pleased. He caught on only gradually to the fact that he had to make the decisions . . . and never did become as decisive as I felt a great President should be. But I liked him immensely because he was such a very fine gentleman. I think that the Senate generally felt that way towards President Eisenhower.

BILL HENRY. Again with the change of Presidents, the nation saw a drastic change in personalities from Mr. Truman to General Eisenhower to John F. Kennedy. And again I would ask you . . . How did you see the nation changing under different leadership?

Senator HOLLAND. I don't think that John F. Kennedy had ever grown up so far as his Presidency was concerned. I think he would have been a better President later, if he had lived. But he did not show the firmness of grasp which one would expect of a President, or the firmness of leadership. He was largely academic. He had an enormous learning. He had never gotten anything done in the Senate. He didn't get anything done as President. But he left a framework upon which his successor, President Johnson, got very much done.

President Johnson, of course, was accustomed to getting things done because he had been both Minority and Majority Leader in the Senate over a span of years . . . and one of the most forceful that the nation had ever known. Far the most forceful that I served under. And he really got things done. I regret that he got some of them done . . . but he did. Between the two, he was much more the leader than was Jack Kennedy.

BILL HENRY. Did you feel a closer relationship . . . Do you think some of the members of Congress felt a closer relationship . . . to Mr. Johnson because he had been a member of the club so to speak?

Senator HOLLAND. We did in the beginning. But there were many of us that were disappointed, gravely disappointed, because of the fact that he did not retain the character, the qualities, that he had shown as a leader. He trended much more leftward as President, and while I had supported him very vigorously in his race for the Presidency, both because I wanted to see a southerner elected . . . we hadn't had one you know for 100 years . . . and because I thought he would retain the qualities that he had shown as leader of the Senate. But, along with many others of my colleagues, I was surprised to find him going more and more leftward. And that was my very great disappointment in the Johnson Presidency.

BILL HENRY. Upon your retirement from the Senate, Mr. Nixon, of course, was the President, and is still serving his term . . . and the change had gone from Democratic to Republican. How did you see the change in the course of the nation?

Senator HOLLAND. Not too pronounced in the beginning. I thought that his effort to strengthen and make more conservative the Supreme Court was admirable. I hope he accomplished that end in the two appointments that he has made. I tried to help him in the two southern appointments that he made, in which we were unable to muster the majority of votes as you will recall. He, in some other respects, showed a trend toward moderation that had not been apparent in the last years of the Johnson administra-

tion which went further and further, as I saw it, to the left. Apparently now he has abandoned some of that moderation . . . and this I regret, because I think the country as a whole, is somewhere in that moderate zone between extremists in both directions.

BILL HENRY. The Presidency is the highest office an individual can hold in this nation. Mr. Truman, I believe, said ". . . the buck stops here". It's been described as "a lonely post". Mr. Kennedy said words to the effect that ". . . it's easier to be President when Congress is out-of-town". Even FDR, President Roosevelt, said words to the effect that ". . . the struggle between the Executive and the Legislative is an inherent one . . . and almost a natural one". What I am interested in, and what I am getting to, is your observation and analysis of just how powerful one man is on the nation during his tenure in office as President, as opposed to Congress which is made up of representatives from across the nation, both on the House and the Senate side. Can the tail wag the dog? Does the tail wag the dog? Do you consider there to be a reasonable and intelligent balance between the power of the Presidency and the power of Congress for the betterment of the nation as a whole?

Senator HOLLAND. I think the Constitution provides for checks and balances that exist so long as the Constitution is followed. I think that under some of the decisions of the Supreme Court in recent years, and possibly because of the divisions in both the Senate and the House which have been very apparent, there has been some loss of prestige to the White House. At the same time, I've seen the Congress stop the White House repeatedly on things which I though were unwise. I think that the theory of checks and balances in that field still lives and is still active . . . and prevails very frequently.

BILL HENRY. Would you, as a result of your experience in the Senate, like to see any structural changes in Congress as a whole?

Senator HOLLAND. Yes, I would like to see some structural changes. I have voted for reorganization acts which gave more power to the average members of committees than are exercised now by the chairmen. We got some such changes in effect during the last Congress. I can think of other matters in which, in my opinion, the Congress would be made more effective by some changes of organization. I don't think those changes will come quickly. And I think that one of the reasons for that is that so many very radical thinkers are thinking unsoundly in this field. For instance, they want the committees to elect their chairmen. To my mind, nothing could be more destructive than to have the lobbying take place among the members of a committee, and the promises and counter-promises to see which one of a committee of fifteen Senators, let's say, should be chairman. I think that would not redound to the country's good. I think it would bring about a highly political handling of the committee system. So I think there are middle ground changes which are needed. One of them I mentioned a while ago. That was accomplished in the last Congress . . . and that is the giving to the majority in the committee the right to call a meeting. There are other changes that can be made. We made the change of allowing better staff availability to both the majority and the minority in committees, which had not existed before. And there are numerous other changes that fall short of the extremism which some mighty good people, who are as wrong as they can be, feel like should be made in the committee process. I think that the seniority system, with all of its defects, is much to be preferred to the matter of lobbying to see who shall be the chairman of the committee and of the subcommittees. That I could never tolerate as something that could bring good results.

BILL HENRY. You retired from your Senate post voluntarily after a career which saw almost phenomenal records of re-election for someone in public office . . . so it certainly wasn't from fear of defeat that you stepped down. What made you leave the Senate? You served illustriously for many years.

Senator HOLLAND. Well, I thank you for the word illustrious. I hope I served creditably. Evidently the people of Florida thought so or they would have not continued to re-elect me. But, I left the Senate because at the age of 78½, and that was the age at which I left, not at the age at which I made the decision to leave, I realized that I could not count on six additional years of vigorous service . . . and I could never have tolerated being in the Senate and not being able to render vigorous service. This state requires it. This state is growing very rapidly. Has very many irons in the fire in Washington. And, of course, I had angina, which I had had about nine years at the time and which was progressing somewhat, and I thought it was a matter of common sense to get out while my credit was good and while my health was still vigorous, and, after all, while I might have a little chance to be at home in Florida. I was born here, you know. I love Florida. I like to live in Florida. My children and fifteen grandchildren live in Florida . . . all of them. I wanted to get acquainted with them, and I thought I had ample reason to leave the Senate.

BILL HENRY. Do you think there should be a mandatory retirement age for Congress?

Senator HOLLAND. No, I do not. Because, for instance, I saw this thing happen this last year. One of my most appreciated colleagues . . . I appreciated him more than most any other Senator, there're very few that I considered above him in stature . . . was John Williams of Delaware. He insisted that sixty-five was the proper retirement age, and he refused to run after he was sixty-five. Well, I think you can tell by looking at me that I am in rather vigorous health now . . . and I'm nearly seventy-nine . . . and he was fourteen years younger and had never dissipated in any way, and I thought was good for ten or fifteen years more. But, he had set that arbitrary limit, just like any law setting such a limit would fix the year.

BILL HENRY. You see it as a personal option? . . .

Senator HOLLAND. I think there should be some personal option of the individual and I think there should be some option on the part of the people of the state. I think the people of Delaware very strongly disapproved his decision to retire, and I know that every member of the Senate, who was either moderate or conservative, thought it was a tragic loss to the nation that he did retire. But he had set that limit. And any limit you set, by law, by Senate rule or otherwise, would find that it can't fit all cases.

BILL HENRY. Senator Holland, the Vietnam war, of course, has presented the United States with one of its most trying periods of history. During your service in the United States Senate, you saw this conflict born, nurtured and emerge full grown. How did it evolve? At what point, if it is out of hand . . . if you consider it out of hand . . . did it get out of hand? Just how did a war of this magnitude evolve and grow with Congress looking on, and with the American people looking on, into what is now considered a very unpopular war . . . both by the administration and by the public?

Senator HOLLAND. I think the major mistake that we made in the Senate, in the best of faith, thinking that we were doing the right thing, was the passage of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution . . . which in effect was a blank check for the use of our troops in that area of the world and in any way that the then President, or any President to come along afterwards, felt was necessary. We were, of course, a member of SEATO. We did have certain obligations, by treaty, in that area. We've seen some peculiar things happen. We saw President Kennedy and then President Johnson and now President Nixon moving under that Resolution to involve us as heavily as we are involved. But one of the most peculiar things is that the man who led in the passage of that Resolution, Senator Fulbright . . . and the debate will show that both Senator Russell and myself, and others, asking many questions during the debate, found him completely in favor of it and thinking that it was the thing to do. And later, of course, in later years, he took exactly the opposite position and very frankly stated that his reason for taking it was that he felt he had been misinformed and that his confidence had been abused in the information which had been given him. Well, I do not find fault with him, because he alone knows what information was given him. The record shows how strongly he fought for the adoption of the Resolution. The record these last three or four years shows how strongly he has fought against the continuance of the war. It just shows that well intentioned people can make mistakes and that the Senate, or any other body, being full of human beings, is fallible. And I think then is when we made our great mistake . . . when we passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

BILL HENRY. You served in World War I. You were Governor during World War II. You were in the United States Senate during the Korean Conflict. How does the Vietnam War differ from these past military engagements?

Senator HOLLAND. It differs from the first two in that from the very beginning it has not been a war to win. It has always regarded as inviolate, North Vietnam. It has not animated the men in uniform to think that they are fighting for victory . . . and certainly in World War I we thought and believed that we'd fought "the war to end all wars" "to make the world safe for democracy" . . . to use a couple of the shibboleths that were commonly used in those days. And certainly in World War II, we all know that there was a very delicate balance between the triumph of Hitler and his people and the triumph of the opposing forces when we came into the war, and for even quite a while after we came into the war. We were fighting to win . . . and we did win. That's not the case in the Vietnam War. In the Korean War, there was a sort of in between situation. We didn't care to conquer North Korea. We knew that Red China had a long frontier with North Korea, but we also knew that we were primarily responsible for the creation of Syngman Rhee's South Korea; and we had a certain number of troops stationed there to preserve the security of that area. When North Korea invaded, why I thought President Truman could not have done anything else than to have responded through our Acts of Arms. While we were not trying to conquer North Korea, we were trying very hard to preserve something which we set up, and to an extent financed, and to a great extent were interested in seeing continue as an independent democratic nation.

So there is a good deal of difference even between the Korean War and the Vietnam War . . . and all the difference in the world between the Vietnam War and the First and Second World War.

Bill HENRY. Speaking of the Korean Conflict. You were in the Senate when Mr. Truman relieved Douglas MacArthur of his command. What was your impression of that action?

Senator HOLLAND. Well, for a time, before

the facts came out, I thought it was mistaken. After the facts came out, I'm not sure it was mistaken. I've always believed in civilian rule. Our Constitution, our system of government, requires that the military be under the control of the civilian authorities. I now believe that General MacArthur had exceeded his instructions and had violated his orders as coming to him from the President . . . either directly or otherwise. At the time, I must say, it was one of the most emotional crises that I have ever participated in. When he came home, and made his appearance before the Joint Session of Congress, I had this experience . . . Senator Bryan McMann marched in with me to the House Chamber telling me about how wrong he thought MacArthur was and how right he thought President Truman was. After General MacArthur had spoken . . . and it was a great speech, an emotional speech and a tremendously impressive speech . . . as we walked out, he said, "My God, what a man! What a speech!" He didn't say he had changed his mind, but was simply overwhelmed by the magnificent eloquence and appearance of General MacArthur. It was one of the most emotional things I have ever had a part in.

BILL HENRY. In other chapters of controversy, as an insider on the Washington scene, how did you view the Bay of Pigs incident?

Senator HOLLAND. I have never been quite sure what happened. But Senator Russell, in whom I had great confidence, and I think you know a very great affection, told me that President Kennedy recalled instructions which he had given just prior to the invasion to the air forces on the carriers that were standing off the South of Cuba, so that they could not give cover to the landing force. And he felt that was a very great tragedy. If that be the case, I think it was a great tragedy. He thought it was the case. He had much more chance since he was Chairman of the Armed Services Committee and had direct contact with many of the Naval Commanders and other Commanders, to know exactly what happened than I did. But, of course, the absence of air cover made the mission of those who landed completely impossible of attainment.

BILL HENRY. In regards to the Cuban Missile Crisis, what was the atmosphere and the feeling in Washington, particularly in the Senate, during that period of time?

Senator HOLLAND. I admired President Kennedy more for what he did just at that period of time than for anything else that he did during his brief occupancy of the Presidency. I thought he showed firmness. I thought he showed fearlessness . . . and my own view was that it was either that or else we were going to be finally subjected to the great power of Russian missile attack from closeby Cuba. And to us in Florida, that would have been a most tragic thing to happen . . . and to the nation it would have been tragic. I thought that John Kennedy's greatest moment was his handling of that particular situation.

BILL HENRY. How do you view the recurring reports of a threat of a Soviet submarine base in Cuba, and the controversy over fishing rights off Florida between U.S. and Cuban fishermen and shrimpers?

Senator HOLLAND. I think they are both minor in the world picture, but very greatly irritating, and they are part of the constant probing which under the Communist philosophy they're doing and will probably continue to do, to see how strong or how weak we are, and to see how determined we are. I think they are annoyances that are a little bigger than annoyances, but I don't think they are threats of a major kind.

BILL HENRY. Speaking of our character as a nation, how we might react or might not react to a given situation . . . How would you access the change in this nation from the time you entered the Senate until the day you retired . . . nearly a quarter of a century later?

Senator HOLLAND. The principal change that I observed was the growth of what is generally referred to as "ultra-liberalism", which I generally think is "radicalism" and the loss of strength, either of voting power by conservatives and moderates or a willingness to face up to problems and come to bat on those differences. Because, after all, all semblance of party clash, except on a very few matters, has ceased to exist in the Senate. The question, there is always a question between the liberals and the conservatives, and it doesn't follow either party line as the nation well knows, and one of the things that has made service in the Senate rather disagreeable to many of us in recent years, has been our inability on many issues to stand with our own party. Our own party is divided. For a time we were very unhappy about that, then we saw the Republican Party beginning to assume the same kind of character, because they have a great many ultra-liberals now over on their side. And I think the big difference as between the time I went to the Senate when the Democrats pretty well stuck together and the Republicans stuck together, and the present situation, is the fact that the conservative powers of the nation and the liberal powers . . . and I use that word in a connotation which I don't believe in, but it is regularly used . . . that contrast has been growing all the time . . . and the controversy is so much greater between those two schools of thought now than it was when I was sent to the Senate.

BILL HENRY. Who would you select as the most memorable member of the Senate during your service . . . and why?

Senator HOLLAND. I would choose Dick Russell of Georgia. He not only had a supreme grasp of the defense problems of our nation, plus the greatest grasp of parliamentary procedure that any Senator in the life of the nation has had . . . but he had a general grasp of national problems. For instance, in agriculture . . . he was for many years, before I took it over, the Chairman of the Agricultural Sub-Committee of Appropriations. He probed and knew the strength and weakness of the nation in all fields of agriculture . . . and after all, that's the field where our nation gets its food and its clothing and much of its export goods. He had a general knowledge of our nation that was surpassed by nobody in the Senate, and I don't think was equaled by anybody in the Senate that I served with.

BILL HENRY. What, in looking back, would you select as your top accomplishments as a U.S. Senator?

Senator HOLLAND. Of course, I was proudest . . . First, of the passage of the so-called Tidelands Act under which the submerged land in the sea and the Gulf, within state boundaries, passed back . . . so far as the bottoms and anything contained in or on the bottoms is concerned, passed back to the states which had been thought to be the owners for all the years of our nation. About a hundred different examples exist where the Federal Government had come to the states and asked for authority . . . some during the time I was Governor . . . to do certain things in this area around our seacoast. When we won that Bill, won that Act, and then later it was upheld by two decisions of the Supreme Court . . . the first one upholding it as to the three mile limit in all twenty-two of the maritime states, and the second one upholding it as to the three league limit in the Gulf as to Florida and Texas . . . I was very proud because I had succeeded to the leadership of that and had handled the Act there and also in the final debate I closed the argument in the Supreme Court I am proud of that.

The other thing was the 24th amendment. I had gotten tired of simply fighting against an attempt to knock out the poll tax by statute, because to me it was so clearly unconstitutional to do that. I decided that we ought to attack the matter constitutionally as to Federal elected officials . . . that is, President, Vice-President, Senator and Representatives . . . and I offered that Amendment. I drew it myself. I offered it for 13½ years before it was ever submitted by the Congress. And then, of course, less than two years later, it was ratified by the 38th state and became the 24th Amendment to our Constitution. I am proud of that, not only on my own account, and I think I have a right to be, but I'm happy of the fact that that came upon leadership coming from the South . . . because after all, it was in the South that the poll tax system had arisen and that we had occasion to find out the evils of that system. I had participated in knocking out the poll tax as a state matter in the 1937 session of the State Legislature when I was in the Senate. I did so simply because I had seen it work too many machine politic setups in various counties in our state. And also there was the racial implication, too. But the first was the major one at that time, and later I led it largely because of the racial implications, because not only we, but before the measure was submitted to the states, seven southern states had knocked it out for all elections, and I felt I was justified in assuming leadership as coming from the South to get rid of this obnoxious device.

BILL HENRY. President Johnson once called you, and I'm quoting, "One of the five most powerful men in the Senate". What do you think led him to say that? Why did he make that remark?

Senator HOLLAND. I haven't the faintest idea. I didn't ask him to make it, and when the Press came running around to me to call attention to it, I was pleased but puzzled, because I have never claimed to have any great power. I have worked hard in the Senate, and have tried to represent Florida as I thought Florida would want me to represent it. I've also participated in things which went beyond Florida where I thought participation was needed. I was the first southern Senator to advocate statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, as you probably know. I handled the Inter-American Highway through Central America to get land access to the Panama Canal. I've done a good many other things . . . I handled the St. Lawrence Seaway . . . the financing of it . . . and attended the dedication of it, representing the Congress. Incidentally, Mary went with me, but not to see the Seaway. She wanted to see the Queen. And she enjoyed the Queen very much, and I thought she was a very lovely person myself. It really was an unforgettable day to see her and President Eisenhower together on the podium celebrating that great accomplishment which brought the midwest of both Canada and our country to the Atlantic.

BILL HENRY. You've been quoted as saying . . . "I vote the way that looks right to me". A fellow Senator was quoted once as saying of you, "He can be a stubborn as a bulldog". Now obviously what you thought was right and what others thought was right did not always coincide, and I imagine some of your opponents were in rather high places. Do you recall any specific incidents where sticking by your guns . . . where sticking by what you thought was right . . . was rather tough sledding?

Senator HOLLAND. Oh, yes. In all the civil rights fights of later years, we knew we were in the minority. Yet, one of the proudest moments I ever had was after we had been beaten by a majority, when I was handling the cloture fight after Dick Russell was unable to because of illness to handle it, the southern Senators asked me to handle it as you may remember, they then tried to change

tne cloture rule by a majority vote. I appealed from the ruling of the Chair, who was Vice-President Humphrey. Enough of the Senators who had voted against us on the early part of the issue voted with us to where we overruled the Vice-President. And that was what made it so hard in this last Congress for them to get anywhere at all in the knockout of the cloture rule. But it's not easy to appeal against the Vice-President of your own party. It's not easy to stand up against the majority of the Senate, days and weeks. On the Tidelands case, we didn't know where the majority was, but the filibuster was, I think, seven weeks . . . the record will have to speak . . . and it wasn't easy because it was only two of us that really had studied the issue . . . Price Daniels of Texas and myself. One or the other of us had to be there on the floor at every minute . . . day or night . . . and we had day and night sessions, as you may remember, 24-hour sessions around the clock. It got pretty hard. Got rough physically as well as from other standpoints. Plenty of things that happen in the Senate are not easy.

BILL HENRY. Filibuster, of course, is a time honored and also a very controversial characteristic of Congress. Do you think it should remain or be abolished?

Senator HOLLAND. I think it should remain in the limited way that it now exists under the cloture rule. You know there's been no limitation on debate until the cloture rule was adopted in 1917 . . . and it provides that two-thirds of the Senate can stop a debate at any time and bring the thing to a head. Many people think that the cloture rule is the rule under which unlimited debate takes place, but quite the contrary, it's a rule to stop debate. I have twice voted for cloture when I thought debate had gone far enough. I think it's a two-edged sword. I think it should be so considered. I think one of the weaknesses of some of our southern Senators is that they will never vote for cloture . . . but I think there are proper cases to vote to shut off debate.

BILL HENRY. You spoke a moment ago of it being rather tough under fire to buck the Vice-President. You have served under two men who have ascended from the Vice-Presidency to the Presidency while they were in office. What change takes place in a man when he becomes Mr. President? Is that something tangible that you can see? How would you describe the difference in a man who has been Vice-President and has ascended to the Presidency . . . does he change?

Senator HOLLAND. Of course, I've already said that President Johnson went much too far to the left, I thought, after he became President. I don't know whether it was the result of his becoming President or whether that resulted from some other reason.

BILL HENRY. Does the man himself become bigger . . . taller . . . stronger?

Senator HOLLAND. No, I think he is still a human being, and I've never felt that our President has descended from Heaven. I think he is elected by the people, and I think that he is one of us. I think when he gains the idea that he's above us mere humans, then that's when we're in trouble.

Now, as to President Nixon, I think he was a much sounder man when he became President than he had been as Vice-President and as candidate for Governor of California. I think he holds his temper much better . . . I think he controls his language much better. I don't know what we're going to find his record will be as President on the whole. I have already indicated that I think he is going somewhat to the left lately . . . and I don't like that . . . but, when he ascended to the Presidency, he was a much more mature man than he was as Vice-President or as a Senator . . . and I knew him well in both capacities.

BILL HENRY. How powerful and significant a force is the lobbying element in Congress?

Senator HOLLAND. I've never found it troublesome. There are many lobbyists who have helped me to gain information about the details of programs . . . whether for or against. I'm sure there are some lobbyists who go beyond the pale of ordinary helpfulness. They've let me alone pretty well, and I think there's a reason for it. I think they soon find out who has most obstinacy . . . if you want to put it that way . . . and who has least. They probably concentrate on the ones who are least obstinate. I must have been one of the most obstinate, because I didn't have trouble from them at all.

BILL HENRY. How would you analyze the changing pace of campaigning . . . say a comparison of your campaign for Governor in 1941 to campaigning today? That would cover a wide span.

Senator HOLLAND. Well, the campaign for Governor was a very personal sort of thing. I spoke in every county seat and most every town and village in the state . . . some 312 times as I remember it. Now you do most of your campaigning over this facility . . . television or radio . . . or both. And, of course, one of the reasons for that is the much greater size of the state. Then it was just under two million. Now it is just under seven million people. Frankly, I like the other style better, because you became acquainted with more people. You got in touch with more people. They had a better chance to look at you and decide for themselves whether they like you or disliked you . . . and some were on either side. I think that is somewhat of the essence of our democratic system . . . for people to make up their own minds as to how they feel toward candidates for office. I don't think they have nearly the same opportunity under the present methods of campaigning that they did in 1940.

BILL HENRY. Speaking of campaigns, do you have any predictions as to who will be squared away for the Presidency between the Democratic and Republican Party in '72?

Senator HOLLAND. I assume that the Republicans will renominate President Nixon. Excepting a rare case like that of President Johnson who removed himself from the list, it is customary, and it is regarded as a sign of weakness, if a party doesn't renominate its own President. As far as the Democrats are concerned, I'm somewhat troubled when I see the phalanx of people who are now offering for the Presidency, because so many of them are not what I regard as well-trained or safe leaders.

BILL HENRY. Who would you pin-point as your choice for the Democratic Presidential nominee . . . or is that possible?

Senator HOLLAND. Impossible. Except to say that among those who are mentioned out of the Senate right now, and I believe there are some seven that are being actively mentioned, I would put Senator Jackson of Washington well ahead of the rest for soundness and for doing his homework and for studying and working hard . . . and for being nearer a moderate. All of them are liberals, but he is not ultra-liberal. To my mind, he would be vastly the best of those who are now discussed.

Bill HENRY. You have no doubt seen many groups of visitors from all parts of our nation touring the Capitol over a number of years. Have you noticed any perceptible change in attitude over the years to the tradition and the heritage of the nation that is symbolized in the Halls of Congress?

Senator HOLLAND. Yes, I've noticed that there seems to be less respect. There are more demonstrations . . . there's more noisiness . . . there're more people crying out from the Gallery that have to be ejected. And, if I must say so, there are too many people coming there that are so carelessly dressed that they look like they have scant respect for the nation's Capitol and for those that they see there.

BILL HENRY. What is your thinking on the nation's capital as a focal point, as it has been, for protest demonstrations of various sorts?

Senator HOLLAND. I regret that it has become such a focal point, but I think that so long as they are non-violent demonstrations, so long as they don't interfere with the course of orderly government, that they're legal, and I wouldn't want to see them cut off by any abortive law . . . because I think that such a law would be abortive, and because I think it would run squarely into our Constitutional guarantees.

BILL HENRY. I believe you were one of the original members of the Space Committee . . . the Aeronautical Space Committee . . .

Senator HOLLAND. No. I served on it for a number of years, but I was not one of the original members.

BILL HENRY. But you did choose that as a committee assignment when it became available to you?

Senator HOLLAND. Oh, yes. When it became available to me, I went on that committee, and I served on it six or eight years. I can't give you the exact time.

BILL HENRY. There have been numerous cut-backs in the space program. Do you have any predictions as to the future of the space program in Florida?

Senator HOLLAND. I think that the space program in Florida will be the longest lasting and the most permanent living of the space program, because it is located at the only place from which eastern launches can be made safely across an ocean with proper policing and without crossing populated territory. While I think that the future of the space program is unpredictable at this time, I do hope that it will continue to give us more and more fruits of wisdom, because the things that have come as offshoots of the knowledge gained in the space program have been of uncalculable value to our nature . . . and there will be more and more of such things to come.

BILL HENRY. The University of Florida has named its law school in your honor. While you were a student at the University of Florida, your pitching on the Gator team was so outstanding that Connie Mack, I understand, offered you a job on his professional ball club. Now, what made you choose a career in law and public service as opposed to professional sports?

Senator HOLLAND. One thing was the question of age. I finished my academic degree at Emory four years before. I taught two years in high school, and then two years, of course, in law school. I was twenty-four years old, and I think that's a little far along to enter professional baseball. But, secondly, I never had a desire to be a professional athlete. To me, athletics, and I had letters at Emory or Florida in four different sports, is a great challenge to a normal American youth, and I think it does him lots of good, the institution lots of good, but I just never have felt any inclination at all to play for money.

BILL HENRY. The average person, I believe, feels frustrated in this complex day and time, as if their hands are tied. They can do nothing about the many things closing in on us. What can an average person do? For example, does writing a Congressman do any good . . . or is this a waste of time?

Senator HOLLAND. It does a great deal of good. Depending on the kind of writing that you do. If it is a well thought-out expression of the heartfelt feelings of the writer and in a moderate, understandable tone . . . and particularly if it is from someone known to the Senator or Representative, of course it has great weight. How could I be a friend of Bill Henry, for instance, and get a letter from Bill Henry telling me that here in this field that I happen to know a good deal

about . . . the field of television . . . I think is something that is wrong, it ought to be corrected . . . how could I possibly fail to give some weight, real weight to such an expression. There are thousands of letters which reach our offices which have no impact at all. They are written by somebody else. Some times you have hundreds of letters written in the same handwriting. You'll have dozens . . . or hundreds . . . of letters or cards in the same wording exactly . . . manifestly collective attempts to sway your judgment. I think that is wasted time and effort. I think it more or less provokes the recipient rather than influences him to rethink his course.

BILL HENRY. Senator Holland, what is your philosophy on life?

Senator HOLLAND. Well, I don't know what field you mean. I regard myself as a moderate conservative. I think I'm a liberal in many fields. I have been always deeply interested in education, as you may know. I have been a trustee at Emory, Florida Southern and Florida Presbyterian. I have been on the Board of Visitors of all three of the military academies . . . not all at the same time . . . but in different years. I have been chairman of my local Board of Trustees in Bartow when I was just a youngster over there. Education has been always a kind of hobby, if I may use that often mis-used word. I think that's in the nature of being liberal. I think that my position on getting rid of the poll tax as a handicap to free expression of one's will in voting, has been such an indication. I'm not an all-out liberal in the sense that the term is used now by so many. I certainly don't share the ultra-liberal philosophy that the nation ought to support everybody and it's all right in time of great prosperity to over-spend our revenue . . . dig ourselves deeper and deeper in debt. I think that is just as wrong a philosophy that you can possibly have.

So since I am completely incapable of deciding for myself what I am, I will just say that I regard myself as a moderate-conservative who is liberal on some fields . . . and I hope never ultra-liberal on any.

BILL HENRY. If you had it to do over again, would you select a life of elective public service?

Senator HOLLAND. Oh, yes. Yes, I've had repeated opportunities to do other things. I've had a successful law practice . . . I was regarded as a good teacher. Before that, you suggested that I had a chance to go into professional sports . . .

BILL HENRY. But your choice would still be as a public servant?

Senator HOLLAND. My choice would still be public service, because I think that if I had any forte, it was as an advocate and in the field of public service.

BILL HENRY. Thank you, sir.

We have been talking with United States Senator Spessard Holland, whose retirement in January 1971 completed nearly fifty years of public service.

I'm Bill Henry, WFIA News.

ROSENTHAL HEARINGS EMPHASIZE NEED FOR HEALTH REFORM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I recently held a full day of hearings in the Eighth Congressional District of New York, which I represent, to assess the quality of medical care which my constituents receive and to discuss ways local, State, and Federal action can improve that care.

It was a day for hearing from the people most directly involved. Too often, Mr. Speaker, here in Washington we do not hear enough from the ones who need and receive the care and from those who provide it.

One of the great problems I find with the legislative process in Washington is that there are witnesses by the dozen, but they are usually organization oriented witnesses. We do not hear often enough from the man in the street or the health professional in the community.

The testimony in Queens was well balanced, representing a wide variety of views. It left the unmistakable impression that something must be done.

One of the most important recommendations to come out of the hearings, and the one on which most persons agreed, was the need for a medical school in Queens.

I heartily endorse that idea. I feel we ought to mobilize all our forces, political, and community, to build up and develop a medical school for Queens.

With a population of 2 million, Queens is bigger than all but three of this Nation's largest cities; it is the fourth largest county in the country and has more residents than 19 States.

Yet it has only 20 hospitals, compared to more than twice that number in Brooklyn, where the population is roughly the same.

Dr. Hugh Barber, president of the Queens medical and health programs testified:

> Health needs for two million people in Queens demand health educational opportunity for students and continuing education for persons in practice.

The program conducted a study, published earlier this year under the title, "A Survey of Health Needs in Queens," which clearly pointed up the need for a teaching medical center. The study was headed by John O. Riedl, Ph.D., dean of faculty, Queensborough Community College. It recommended:

> That a Queens Health Science Center become the focal point and first priority of action in the major effort of the Queens Medical and Health Program to improve the delivery, in quality and quantity, of health care for the people in the Borough of Queens.

For years I have urged the same thing.

The president of the Queens Medical Society, Dr. Ralph Schlossman, testified at the hearings:

> The main problem in Queens is that we do not have a medical school. A medical school tends to attract good physicians to the area. There is no question but that health care in the community would be vastly improved by a medical complex centered around a medical school.

There is a physician shortage not only in Queens but nationwide. In fact, the national doctor deficiency is estimated at 50,000. Yet only one in 10 applicants to U.S. medical schools nationally is accepted.

A related problem is the return, into the American medical mainstream, of the thousands of U.S. students studying medicine abroad. Many of those students were refused admission from American medical schools because these schools are overcrowded. We must insure that these students with valuable talents and considerable formal training, be used properly when they return home.

Queens, with two large municipal hospitals, has the nucleus for starting a major medical school.

This should not be just an ordinary school. Priority should be given to training physicians who will practice in the area as primary care or family physicians. Admissions policy should be oriented toward the need for getting a broader range of students.

We should encourage, through policy, practice and possibly tuition subsidy, the enrollment of young people from less affluent families, from so-called economically and socially deprived backgrounds.

Not only should this institution produce physicians, but it also should train nurses, technicians and the vast array of other health professionals and para-professionals needed today.

A Queens medical school will do more than improve health care locally and, by providing trained personnel, nationally; it will be an asset to the community as a source of jobs, revenues, and pride.

The hearings were held June 5, 1971, at the Queens County Medical Society Building.

It was a day of discontent, or at least for expressing discontent.

The hearings revealed a great split between the medical profession and the average citizen.

After listening carefully to all sides, and based on what I have known, read and learned over many years, I came away from those hearings more convinced than ever that the time has come for comprehensive reform in the ways we finance and provide health care in this country.

There is no conceivable reason why a person should get better health care because he lives in a better neighborhood, has a better job, has the right color skin or has more money. Health care should not be made available according to conditions of economics, age, sex, race, employment, or any other factor than need.

Yet we know that is what is happening and it is inexcusable.

There is no conceivable reason why the wealthiest, most technically and scientifically advanced Nation on earth cannot also be the healthiest.

Yet we are not and it is inexcusable.

Nearly 200 persons heard doctors and others testify that in many areas of Queens there is a physician shortage, that in fact, there are in parts of Queens fewer professional medical people today than 6 years ago and the median age of physicians there increases each year while medical school enrollment remains almost static.

It was very evident from these hearings that the health-care system must be made more responsive to the needs and wants of the health consumer. It is currently run by a coalition of the medical professionals, the health industry and the insurance companies.

To be truly effective and meet the needs of the people, the Nation's health-

care system must become more consumer oriented. And that means greater consumer participation and control in making policy and operating the system.

The more we do today to prevent illness and keep people healthy, the less we will have to spend tomorrow on cures and treatment. Adequate health care is not a privilege. It is a fundamental right of all Americans.

Because I feel that what the people of the Eighth Congressional District have to say about this matter is important, I am sending a transcript of my hearings to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS. His committee is considering the entire question of reform of our medical-care system.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point my letter to Chairman MILLS and the transcript of the hearings:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1971.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman,
Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 5, 1971, I held a day of hearings in my District to assess the quality of medical care which the residents of the 8th Congressional District receive and to discuss ways local, state and federal action can improve that care.

The testimony was well balanced, representing a wide variety of views by the providers as well as the consumers of health care. There was widespread agreement that we are in a state of crisis and something must be done.

After listening carefully to all sides, and based on what I have known, read and learned over many years, I came away from those hearings more convinced than ever that the time has come for comprehensive reform in the ways we finance and provide health care in this country.

The system must be made more responsive to the needs and wants of the health consumer, who now feels and rightly so, terribly left out and, to some extent, victimized.

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of my report on those hearings and a transcript. I hope they will be useful to you and your committee in your efforts to write meaningful health care legislation in this Congress.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

PROCEEDINGS OF AD HOC CONGRESSIONAL HEARING ON MEDICAL CARE

Congressman BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL. I am here today to assess the quality of medical care which Queens residents receive and to discuss ways local, state and federal action can improve that care.

Both the health professionals and the medical consumers will be heard from.

Joining me today on the panel are Dr. Frank Cicero, Commissioner of Health Facilities, New York State Health Department; Herbert Freilich, Director of Professional Services, New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation; Dr. Lowell Bellin, Assistant Commissioner, New York City Health Department and Health Service Administration, and The Honorable Edward I. Koch, U.S. Congressman from the 17th Congressional District of New York.

All of us here today are aware of the crisis in health care, and we will be hearing more about it throughout the day. But let me try putting a frame around the picture we will see drawn for us.

At the national level: Americans last year spent $70 billion on health care—more than $325 for each man, woman and child.

We rank 13th among industrialized nations in infant mortality; 11th in life expectancy for women and 18th in life expectancy for men.

About 150 U.S. counties do not have a single doctor, and another 150 have only one physician.

Twice as many black infants die in the first year of life as whites; poor people suffer four times as many heart conditions and six times as much mental illness, arthritis and high blood pressure as their more affluent neighbors.

There is a national shortage of 50,000 physicians, 150,000 medical technicians and 200,000 nurses.

In the New York area: The cost of medical care throughout the state is experiencing the sharpest rise in two decades. It went up 10.1% from 1969 to 1970, compared with a nationwide increase of 7.4%.

The chief factor in this increase was hospital costs. Charges for private and semi-private rooms have gone up 65% here over the past three years.

Physicians' fees here rose 12.5% last year. This is partly due to a reduction in the number of general practitioners and a relative increase in the number of specialists who can command higher fees.

Let me put it another way:

There is a significant shortage of all types of trained medical personnel and of proper facilities—and the personnel and facilities which we do have are inadequately distributed geographically. Compounding this is the problem of skyrocketing costs.

What, then, should we be getting for our $70 billion a year? Everyone, all Americans, should be getting the same high quality of health care and at prices all can afford.

There is no conceivable reason why a person should get better health care because he lives in a better neighborhood, has a better job, has the right color skin or has more money. Health care should not be made available according to conditions of economics, age, sex, race, employment or any factor other than need.

There is no conceivable reason why Health care in Queens should be inadequate.

There is no conceivable reason why the wealthiest, most technically and scientifically advanced nation on earth cannot also be the healthiest.

The time has come for comprehensive reform in the financing and delivery of health care in the United States. The essential key to this reform is a fundamental shift in the emphasis from "Crisis" medicine to preventive medicine.

The more we do today to prevent illness and keep people healthy, the less we will have to spend tomorrow on cures and treatment. Adequate health is not a privilege. It is a fundamental right of all Americans.

The testimony we will receive today will be presented to the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, which is considering the entire matter of our medical delivery system.

Let me add an informal word at this point. One of the great problems I find with the legislative process in Washington is that there are witnesses by the dozen, but they're usually organization oriented witnesses and one of the greatest weaknesses in testimony taken that we utilize in Washington is that we never hear from the man in the street or the health professional or the professional in the community, so I believe this kind of community hearing where we can deliver the testimony and report that I can make from the man in the middle is innovative, useful and absolutely necessary.

I do want to add one word. We are enormously grateful to the Queens County Medical Society for its kind permission for us to use these facilities.

At this point I would like to call on my colleague, Congressman Koch, for anything he would like to say.

Congressman EDWARD KOCH. I will be very brief. I did want to say that I wanted to come here for a number of reasons. There is one area that we need similar protection.

We are dealing in one special area of health coverage here.

There is one bill, particularly, that I want to call your attention to which we are sponsoring. It is, in effect, a medical program which, no doubt, has enormous impact and ought to be extended.

In 1967, under the Social Security Act, they put in a model program, test program, called "Children Need Comprehensive Health Protection and Care Projects." There are now 65 care projects throughout the country at this time.

They come to a conclusion in 1972, and they have to be refunded. Unless they are extended by federal legislation the project which now takes care of 450,000 children in the country around the United States will conclude their work.

I have been to at least one. Beth Israel which is in my district, and it is amazing to see children and their mothers that are cared for from pre-birth until the age of 13 and without regard to finances:

The people who are involved in the program are terrified it will come to a conclusion. Beth Israel has shown great change in health care on the basis of taxation and process and registration.

We hope by the efforts of Congressman Rosenthal and others they can help those who will join to extend it.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. We are going to follow a practice, generally, with some exception of having professional witnesses who first called my office and ask them to speak first.

The first person we will hear from is our host, Dr. Ralph Schlossman. President of the Queens County Medical Society, Dr. Schlossman.

Dr. RALPH SCHLOSSMAN. Thank you, distinguished members of the Congress, panel, ladies and gentlemen. A little later I hope to share some of my thoughts on some of the problems we are here to discuss. Right now I should like to welcome you on behalf of the Queens Medical Society. The society, since its enactment a hundred years ago, has felt the need of becoming involved in areas of public health.

We are particularly appreciative that Congressman Rosenthal has chosen to bring the series into our community because we feel as he does that the chosen ones are too often separated from the people, and too often both the people who receive care and those who need care are not heard from.

Therefore, I should like to welcome you here, today.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Though we are so thoroughly parochial from Queens, our first witness is going to be from the Bronx, Dr. Victor Sidel, Chief of the Department of Social Medicine at Montefiore Hospital.

Dr. VICTOR SIDEL. Thank you, Congressman Rosenthal, Congressman Koch and members of the panel.

My name is Victor Sidel. I am Chief of the Department of Social Medicine at Montefiore Hospital and Medical Center and Professor of Community Health at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine. I have had training in internal medicine, epidemiology and statistics, and in the social sciences; my current professional work is in the area of the analysis and planning for the improvement of health care delivery. I have had extensive experience in the study of health care delivery systems in other countries, especially the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R., and in the study of health manpower.

I appear before you for two reasons: The first is an analysis which Dr. David Kindig, M.D., Ph.D. (formerly Chief Resident in Social Medicine at Montefiore Hospital and now Acting Medical Director at the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Health Center) and I did of the 1970 national health insurance proposals. In this analysis, which we did for the Conference on National Health Insurance convened in Philadelphia by the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics of the University of Pennsylvania last November, we developed criteria for the impact of national health insurance programs on the consumers of medical care and described the ways in which the 1970 bills met or failed to meet these criteria. We believe the criteria we developed are important not only because they can help us to choose the legislation which will best meet consumer needs, but also because they will permit us later to judge whether the program adopted has had the desired impact.

Since time for oral presentation today is extremely short, I will present only the criteria. The reasoning behind these criteria, and the analysis of eight proposed pieces of legislation by these criteria, can be found in the material which will be published as a chapter in National Health Insurance: Proceedings of the Conference on National Health Insurance, edited by Dr. Robert Eilers and Mrs. Sue Moyerman, to be published by Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois, copies of which I will submit for the record of these hearings.

The criteria are:

1. Consumer participation and control.

(a) A national health insurance program should have provision for the consumer's voice to be effectively built into policy-setting.

(b) The consumer's voice should be present at national, regional and local levels.

(c) Provision should be made for recompensing community representatives for their time and effort.

(d) Provision should be made for professional staff to aid the consumer representatives in their policy recommendations.

(e) Provision should be made for experimentation with different types of consumer participation and control, with appropriate evaluation of the effectiveness of the various forms tested.

2. Eligibility.

(a) There should be no limitation of eligibility by age.

(b) There should be no limitation of eligibility by area of residence or length of residence.

(c) There should be no limitation of eligibility by social class or income.

(d) There should be no limitation of eligibility by race, religion or political belief.

(e) There should be no limitation of eligibility by pre-existing medical conditions or risk factors.

(f) There should be merging of other financing programs into the national health insurance program.

(g) There should be appropriate integration of other service programs into the national health insurance program.

3. Comprehensiveness and continuity of services.

(a) All personal health services should be covered.

(b) There should be no arbitrary time limits on services, limits on number of services, or limits on total cost of services.

(c) Provision should be made for stronger linkage of the primary practitioner, the specialist, the hospital, and the after-care facility, but incentives should not be limited to any specific form of practise organization.

(d) Emphasis should be placed on health maintenance.

4. Accessibility and availability of services.

(a) There should be explicit protection of the right of all people to access to health facilities.

(b) Provision should be made for the continuing investigation of the need for health facilities in each region and local area, and support should be available for their construction.

(c) Provision should be made for the continuing investigation of the need for health manpower in each region and local area.

(d) Support should be available for recruitment and training of existing types of health workers.

(e) Special provision should be made for the development of new types of health manpower.

(f) Provision should be made for encouragement of the redistribution of manpower.

5. Costs.

(a) There should be no out-of-pocket expense to the consumer at the time of need for care.

(b) If there are to be out-of-pocket expenses they should be billed by the national insurance program to the patient; in no case should the patient be forced to pay the provider directly for the services rendered.

(c) If there are to be out-of-pocket expenses, there should be full protection against catastrophic expenses.

6. Quality control.

(a) The plan should specify quality control procedures and should indicate the methods by which they will be made effective.

(b) Quality control bodies should exist at national, regional and local levels.

(c) Quality control bodies should include lay members as well as professional members.

(d) Provision should be made for control over quality of care in non-covered institutions.

(e) Methods of enforcement of quality control should include special incentives as well as methods for withholding payment.

(f) Provision should be made for the support of development of more effective quality control techniques, including techniques for determining outcome or effectiveness.

7. Research and demonstration.

(a) Provision should be made for support of appropriate research into and demonstration of new methods for the provision of health services.

(b) Provision should be made for review bodies, including both professional and laymen, in setting the priorities for assignment of the research and demonstration funds.

In analyzing the 1970 legislative proposals, Dr. Kindig and I found that the bills which best met these criteria for the impact of national health insurance on the consumer was the Kennedy Bill (S. 4297) and the Griffiths Bill (H.R. 15779.) The 1971 Kennedy Bill (S. 3), which includes many of the excellent features of the Griffiths Bill, comes even closer toward meeting these criteria.

It is far from a perfect piece of legislation; for example, there is no provision for effective quality control, insufficient support in our view for research and demonstration of new methods for health care delivery, and insufficient emphasis on health maintenance. But in our view the cause of the consumer of health care in the United States would be well served by the adoption of this Bill or one similar to it which provides for new methods of health care provision for the United States rather than simply for new methods of financing care.

The second reason that I appear before you is my concern with what I feel to be the deterioriating quality of medical care, and the quality of life in general, in New York City. I can think of no better way to illustrate my concern than by reading to you the history of a patient presented at one of our Case Conferences in Social Medicine at Montefiore Hospital.

"Mrs. B. J. and her four children were brought to the Morrisania City Hospital emergency room on Friday evening at approximately 7 p.m. Mrs. J. is a middle-aged mother on welfare who has a psychiatric history; she has been hospitalized at Bellevue at least two times. However, in the past several years she seems to have been functioning fairly well. She has been attending the St. Luke's Hospital outpatient psychiatric clinic and is on several tranquilizers at the present time.

"She is a city welfare recipient, and she received her last welfare check on May 14. On Wednesday, May 27, having run out of money, she went to St. Luke's Hospital, and asked their assistance. She was referred to the Church Street Emergency Welfare Services, where she went that day, but she received no financial help from them at that time. She returned to St. Luke's the following day, Thursday, May 28; her physician there gave her a letter of explanation and directed her to the Mayor's Office. She went to the Mayor's Office, where she was forwarded again to the Church Street Office; again she received no assistance.

"On Friday, May 29, she returned to St. Luke's, where the physicians and nurses put together a collection of five dollars for her. She went home and cooked breakfast and lunch for herself and her four children. That afternoon she began to realize that she would not have any food for the rest of the weekend and also realized that she had been unable to get help from the existing system.

"At that point she decided that in order to keep her children from being hungry over the weekend she would give them each one of her 50 mg chloropromazine tablets. She knew these tablets made her sleepy, and she reasoned that they would perhaps stave off the children's hunger until the weekend was over. The two, four and five-year-old children got each one tablet and her 16-year-old daughter got two.

"After giving the pills she became concerned about what she had done and called the physician at St. Luke's Hospital, who notified an ambulance to bring the mother and four children to St. Luke's. However, as all city ambulances do, the ambulance instead took the mother and children to the emergency room closest to her home—the Morrisania Emergency Room. The older three children were not symptomatic but slightly sleepy from the medications. The youngest child was definitely symptomatic from the chloropromazine and was admitted for night observation. The four and five-year-old children were placed by the Emergency Child Services Agency in a Bureau of Child Welfare Shelter for an indefinite period.

About 25 health professionals, including physicians, nurses, social workers and others participated in the discussion. The group felt that it was important that the medication used by the mother was not more toxic than it was, and that she carefully chose to give a minimal dose, so that no permanent damage resulted.

One can only have the deepest sympathy for the mother in this situation. She initially stated that she did not want the Bureau of Child Welfare notified since she did have a psychiatric record and expected that they would attempt to remove the children from her home. She repeated that she loved her children very much, that she tried to be a good mother, and that at the time she gave the chloropromazine, thought that she was acting in her children's best interest.

Her action was viewed by many as an appropriate one, given the situation and her attempts to get help from the New York City welfare system. It was partly a real attempt to alleviate the hunger. On another and perhaps not conscious level, it was a dramatic

gesture designed to reach someone in power when all other attempts had failed. It is remarkable what an impoverished, borderline-functioning mother with four children, without transportation or knowledge of the system, must do in order to receive help for minimal human needs.

From a more academic point of view, there is no written description of this particular type of sociogenic disease. Childhood poisonings can be classified as accidental, as repetitive self-poisoning, or as child abuse, but clearly none of these categories are relevant here. The closest analogy might be with the psychology of suicide, considering the manipulative manner in which the mother gave the medication and then called for help. But the genesis of the attempt lies not within herself but within the society.

Reporting this case to the Mayor's office prompted the following reply from the Director of Public Assistance regarding supplemental assistance: "The current State Social Services Legislation enacted in March 1969 and effective July 1969 introduced new restrictions affecting the granting of assistance. One of these provides that public assistance funds may not be duplicated. Under these circumstances, families in receipt of public assistance are expected to manage all items of need with the grants received twice monthly.

"When this legislative program was under consideration in Albany, New York City officials spoke against the reductions in the grant, and the several restrictive elements. The Commissioner of the Department of Social Services was most articulate in his protestations while the legislation was pending. Even after the passage of the legislation he asked that a special session of the legislature convene to reconsider the program.

"That there is a need for a national and urban reordering of financial priorities is indisputable. At this moment, regretfully, there is nothing that this Agency can do with regard to the state regulated budget. Hopefully, there will be other opportunities."

Miss Sylvia Goldberger and other members of her staff said that the agency tried to respond to situations like this one but was unable to provide the human and financial support for all such cases. Nevertheless, it was pointed out that the agency and the patient's own caseworker would have been able to provide emergency funds had the client contacted them directly. For example, the social service department at St. Luke's Hospital, the main office of the Department of Social Services or the Office of the Mayor might have referred the patient directly to their agency.

Several people were struck by the defensiveness of those concerned with the patient at the Fordham Social Service Center. Rather than criticizing the system, they often blamed the patient for some of the problems, especially referring to her history of psychiatric illness ("schizophrenia") and her failure to use the "usual channels." They seemed more inclined to exonerate or at best to patch the existing welfare system than to demand any fundamental change. Several of those from the hospital or its affiliated health centers felt exactly the opposite, stating that problems such as these would continue to arise until there is a fundamental change in the treatment of the society's poor.

Robert G. Griefinger (fourth year medical student, University of Maryland School of Medicine) suggested: "I think that the dynamics of the case should be discussed on three levels. First, it is not apparent to me that the mother behaved in a dysfunctional way in light of her crisis and her available resources. Her decision to medicate her children served several useful purposes. Her rationale in utilizing this pharmacologic device as a plea for help was at once pragmatic and clever; the only side effects were that three children were fed, housed and clothed until some small help was received. Second, the blatant sociogenic aspects of this situation seem to be obscured by some, with inappropriate name-calling (schizophrenia) and unsatisfactory solutions (removing the children from the home). The priorities of American society must be drastically changed to prevent this kind of tragedy. Many specific inadequacies in the system have been pointed out; however, I get the feeling that the people from the City Department of Social Services are ignoring them.

"This leads to my third point. We need not be defensive for our acts; perhaps sad and apologetic would be more apt. In order to discuss 'what we can do' we must consider the sociologic process, and take positive action toward remedying the tragedy."

Mr. Gerald Beallor (Director, Social Service Department, MHMC) made the following concluding observations: "A medical diagnosis is not appropriate in this case, which can only be considered as sociogenic illness. Seen in this light, Mrs. J's behavior is entirely appropriate and based on sound reality testing. The patient exhausted every channel the community supposedly offers without positive results. Therefore, in spite of the fact that she had been diagnosed as schizophrenic, and in spite of her meager education, she developed a creative and well thought-out solution.

"It seems unlikely to me that I or any of us in this room could survive the South Bronx, 1970, as well as this woman and her children have. Now, she, the victim, is being 'brought to justice' with the prospect of having her children taken from her through the Bureau of Child Welfare, with their future even more clouded than before. If there is any illness in this picture, it is we who are ill. If there is any insanity, it is a society that permits the South Bronx to exist and punishes victims rather than perpetrators."

Dr. SIDEL. This illustration of the interaction between the desperately under-financed social services of our city and the increasingly underfinanced health services of our city indicates how urgent is the need for some remedial action. Much reorganization of the health care system in the United States is indeed needed; but it is a fundamental principle of public health as well as of human life that starvation kills, and we shall for all practical purposes destroy the social and health services of our city unless there is an immediate major influx of additional funding into these services. I urge you to use your influence and power to help bring this about.

Congressman KOCH. You happen to be correct. It is a problem that we have to deal with through contact and the rules presently available on welfare are the same. We may change them, adequately, but change them, nevertheless.

What I am interested in, were these facts brought to the attention of Mr. Sugarman with respect to how this woman was dealt with by City agencies who were charged with the obligation of them, and if so, what were their responses?

Dr. SIDEL. It really was called to their attention but the Director of the Welfare Department in which this patient had been registered joined in with the conference and told us their problems.

They told us of their underfinancing. They told us of the incredible case load of each of their welfare offices. They told us of the welfare rules of the City which make it impossible for them to give adequate support to the people who need it, desperately. They told us of the difficulty of treating people, especially on an emergency basis, and they are in a trap as are the citizens.

What is needed is not only to strengthen them but to bring about a change in the whole philosophy.

Congressman KOCH. By this time it should be in effect in the whole welfare system. It is inconceivable to me that there is no service over the weekend and there was no money, and there were three or four children at home. I don't discuss that as accessible to the policy assigned to one caseworker.

Actually, have you questioned Mr. Sugarman who is the head of this department or the Mayor who is charged with this responsibility, to explain the chronology of why this woman—

Dr. SIDEL. It has not been formed as yet.

Congressman KOCH. If you will give me the information I will make the request because I want to find out where it initiated from.

Dr. SIDEL. We will give the case history without the names in front of you and we will get the physician to release her name, and if he does it we will be glad to do it.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much. Anyone who wants to speak will be given an opportunity, today. Just make sure the lady sitting outside at the table gets your name.

Our next witness is Dr. Canute V. Bernard.

Dr. BERNARD. I just have a brief statement. I hadn't intended to talk. However, I have been a member of the society and coming in, and I recognized right away that Congress, the people you represent, what you are trying to reach, is not coming in right off the bat.

It would seem to me that we have a problem here in Queens or southeast Queens in terms of taking it on the basis of what you are talking about. I believe if we are going to in any way effectuate a change, there is going to have to be a change that involves the proper City services and the lawmakers who have to make decisions, in turn.

There is no way that this can be accomplished unless one can establish a separation whereby they can sit down and participate, whereby they can sit down around the same table and find out what the real problems are.

The case that was presented just before here today, I would say, for example, we have much more valuable respect for what you are trying to do if you were to have something like that—to have these people come to you and hear them, like I have to do, like I have to do all day.

I believe you would have more respect, for example, if you effectuated an across-the-board dialogue between a coordinator committee that was made up of all kinds of people, chosen from the subject of the weather up to the atom, then I know it can be done.

I don't want to go into cases, but I will tell you that in one instance that they had the foresight to see this and I have seen it work, where a person is for it and the other person is here, and under the same roof after a two year period.

What's going to happen I don't know, but I have been a part of this experiment enough to see a positive approach to the effectiveness of what we are trying to accomplish and this is what we need right away.

What we do not have, and the ultimate is to provide the overall facilities and help the people here, but there is immediate need on it, and there have been efforts made to get alternate knowledge to meet the problem.

Where there are people who are working right here and actually putting out of their own pockets and then put it into effect. What I am saying is take care of the problem. They're talking about both; they're talking about the need of the college, and they're talking about it from the medical school end, and yet they are not probably working in that area, and are not aware of the seriousness of the situation, not alone in the state.

I say to you that it might well if the delegation to Congress, the delegation from this city of ours, were to make your bill

more effective in terms of getting the information and were to have this matter looked into.

I am not saying this is a lack on the part of the Medical Society. I am a member of the Medical Society, but you cannot get the guidance you need to really find out where the problems are, unless you bring it down to the level where you know—

Chairman ROSENTHAL. What do you see as the problems, Doctor?

Dr. BERNARD. The problems in it, there is no coordinating facilities. Practically speaking, they're far removed from where you can reach them. That is, the working people, Welfare, Medicaid, Medicare—the complex—that doesn't provide with sufficient resources to take care of themselves.

There are family problems. There are the education problems, and all the others on top of this, sociological and emotional, and everything else, and when they get off from work and then they have to go to a public facility and sit down for four or five or six hours and try to get attention, and welfare gets an emergency problem and has to take applications from these people, and then requires—I don't know what they get there—well, it becomes then a question of what they will do.

I can say that in Harlem this happens, and I believe where I work, where if your patients do not come to the hospital, most times there is a good reason for it because they do not feel that when they get there they're going to get any care, anyway; that it is going to be held against them.

So, you have to drive them there. It is the same thing as happened over here. This is the problem. When they get there, they can't answer the problem there.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. When they get there, what kind of care do they get?

Dr. BERNARD. When they get there, the kind of care they get—it depends on how long they have to wait, what kind of facilities the hospital has and what they receive. In many instances, this happens to be a bad impression and that bad impression spreads and they don't want to be bothered with going there.

This, from my viewpoint, needs to be changed and we have to get and put good people in the area where they need them, in the form of a facility of some kind where a person is in one room and at the same time a person comes in as a screening arm.

For example, I say this that many many times, and I have said it in public and I say it again. A limited majority of people in a hospital don't belong in a hospital. They belong in a combined facility that is augmented, that is balanced. This is where the problem is.

If you can bring services to the people and make the professionals get to the process and held in the process, talking it over with the people, then they both have, as citizens of the same community, a common goal.

If the business is up here and the consumer is down here, and they never meet, then you can't establish the problem, and if you can't bring it to the level down to them, you are never going to cure it, especially in the Queens area, and in my particular area, and there are some people in the area who have to be forced to come here because of their concept of training of community medicine; getting doctors back to taking care of people rather than just seeing them.

But the thing of taking care of people has been lost somewhere, and until you grapple with the problem you cannot do what is right. You in Washington and the others in the street cannot do it, as you have been trying for long periods of time.

I have seen this work and it can work. It will have to work. But what has been done is not enough. I am aghast at the ignorance of the delegation as to what the problems are. It is obvious that they have absolutely no idea of what goes on in a community as far as problems of a hospital.

If you are going to determine that a hospital needs refurnishing and that hospital services need to be presented to the people in a big area, and they start in talking in terms of figuring out as to why not, they have absolutely no relationship to human backgrounds.

It is for me to understand it and for you to understand it, and what we are going to talk about; and I am going to tell you what my point is and you are going to tell me what your point is, and maybe in that way we will be able to determine and get a solution of the problem.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think the solution of the problem is that the president should be listening to you, if that is true.

Dr. BERNARD. I am concerned to the point of doing something, and I am telling you that part of the service in Queens, and I am talking about Queens, particularly; it is the old people that I am talking about. And I don't think you really realize what the problems are because you haven't heard them, and I don't mean I want any part of it.

I just happen to be one that is concerned and happen to know on a day to day basis, living with these people. I just hope I can intelligently continue to do it to the extent that where this morning, what all this we are talking about, is this community-based organization.

We are concerned with all kinds of problems across the board, before us in that area. I am talking about redevelopment. I am talking about health services. I am talking about everything else: health care, and all the same people that are ignorant and don't have any knowledge of it, and from my own attitude—O.K.

I have had more from these people, and I have been listening to them and I am going to help them better in my own profession than sitting in an office somewhere, and they're coming to me.

Look at your audience. This place should be full, for example. There is an important topic on this morning in Queens. It should be full, if the communication gap had been solved and I believe this is a problem that hasn't.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. We sent out 95,000 letters. Do you have a question, Dr. Bellin?

Dr. BELLIN. We know each other very well. We have worked together in the Queens Medical Society. Why don't you make some comment on some of the activities that you have carried out?

Dr. BERNARD. The Queens Medical Society is at present carrying out comprehensive health care in the broadest concept, involves businessmen, that requires to be heard. That is, the medical men discipline themselves—examination, X-rays, social services and what have you, in totality, in that area to speak about.

We got into it again because of the federal government and started off with a pilot program, and started talking about improving plants, I don't remember the number, for comprehensive health care. What it did, it got all of us together, professionals, together with all the community people to put this on, and fortunately, we were here because of our relationship with the city government to help us in dispensing, and the point is there are a group of patients between the ones on Medicaid and the others.

There is a group there that have helped us by funding part of our program. We had to do it out of our own pockets. We had to get all kinds of ways and means, and this is for me to say. I represent my area. What did I do? o.k.

Give us the money, give us the plans, and let us do it, you see. This is what he had reference to—this is working. We put in a center and that center is up on Sutphin Boulevard but that is not enough, because you begin to scratch the surface. That is not enough. But it has taken care of them, even though they don't want to have it.

I am not objecting to that. There is need for mother services, for five or six mother services to do the kind of work that we have been trying to do, and that suggestion leading into the development of parallel facilities—the development of hospitals we need down there, too.

I don't say it isn't needed where it is, but surely as I am standing here, that whole area, Southeast Queens, there is nothing in there. You know there are cities less populated than that, where they have 3 and 4 thousand, and don't have it.

The people down on South Road need an ambulance. They may call for an ambulance. By the time they may get an ambulance, and by the time they get to the hospital—I work in the emergency room—where is this what has taken place?

I have often said what would you do if all of a sudden you get chest pains right on Queens Boulevard? What is the nearest physician to you? You stop to think what it is, not realizing that you don't have a physician within reach of you of where you are. The other thing is, what about the person down there?

All of us have to breathe the same air. All of us have to live in the same vicinity. All of us have to use the same transportation. It seems to me that the poorer person isn't getting the health care, while the richest person is getting health care. They're all living in the same place.

In an epidemic, unless you put a wall up here and put a river in, it don't do any good. Yet you have the same public facilities for all, and sooner or later what affects your poor citizen will affect you if you live in the same area.

I say this is the kind of thing I am talking about, that will come out if you begin to meet the people that are having the problems.

Congressman KOCH. I am very impressed with your statements, Doctor. I speak of one aspect of it and that is the last thing you said; that it is the poor that are not provided for.

My experience has been in a rather perverse way. The important people happen to be the middle income category.

Dr. BERNARD. I stand corrected on that. It's the kind of inbetween group.

Congressman KOCH. And the reason——

Dr. BERNARD. This is the group that gets "X" dollars. This is the group I have reference to, by the way. I used the term "group" Medicaid group, and below the affluent group. That is that group I am concerned with.

Congressman KOCH. The in-between group?

Dr. BERNARD. What I am speaking of is the poor—not poor poor. Maybe I could use a better word.

Congressman KOCH. I think that is the message that we have got to get across.

Dr. BERNARD. Because the poorest and the richest persons are the ones that get the best care here. Medicaid, unfortunately, can't go too far. If the middle man can't afford with the high insurance and what have you—I am aware of all that. I don't want to take any more time.

Congressman KOCH. I want to clarify this. You said the poor. It is the guy in the middle who is the one who needs the care, and everyone gets coverage. It is that guy who is wiped out with a catastrophic illness and costs he can't bear and isn't covered under any health programs like Medicaid, but I want to go into another aspect.

I agree with you that there is no substitute for direct confrontation or consultation, and being there were other people who are

involved, again I want to have a little bit of disagreement and that is this.

When you say we should be in a position, you mean you and the people you are working for and you say this is the program and we will do it now and get the money. It is not as simple as that.

Dr. BERNARD. I am talking to you as though I was somebody who knows. I am not talking to you, generally. You are my Congressman and you get me the money. If you don't start somewhere——

Congressman KOCH. You are absolutely right.

Dr. BERNARD. That is what I understand happened.

Congressman KOCH. That is what we would like to pursue with you.

Dr. BERNARD. And I am not trying to—

Congressman KOCH. I come from Manhattan.

Dr. BERNARD. I say you get him to the point where he goes in and gets it. I am going to get off a little fact. That is a fact, o.k. I don't understand why you guys can't do it in Queens. I am talking about Queens. You are talking about all over.

Congressman KOCH. I think the Mayor's goal for this area has been superb. The next thing is to get him and the people who are interested together to do that.

Dr. BERNARD. I know you speak on the federal level and somebody out there doesn't know from a hole in the wall what is going on in New York City. But the idea is brilliant, where to get the money to go to work. I know that can be translated into local levels and we need them here.

Congressman KOCH. What I hoped we would be able to do subsequent to today is get out the people that you are talking about so we can have the kind of round table discussion where we can find out what the problems are and work them out.

Dr. BERNARD. I know what the problems, sir, are.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Dr. Bernard, Dr. Cicero has a question or comment.

Dr. CICERO. My understanding—you can correct me if I am wrong—my understanding is that the Health Services Administration in the New York Health Department is trying to establish—my understanding is that the Health Services Administration of the City is trying to establish in Queens some 14 to 18 neighborhood family care centers.

What I would like to ask you, if you or the people you are talking about are involved in any way in the planning of these family centers?

Dr. BERNARD. I am aware of it because I have worked with Dr. McLaughlin over a number of years and I know what her concept is. I agree with her concept. We have to start them one at a time.

The one that we are running happens to be for the reason that I gave—brought up from our own funds, o.k., but the plan—I call mother service centers, and we are involved in that. We are the first proceeding. We will be dependent on the budget cuts and all that up in Albany. That is what the problem is. The business of priorities and stuff like that, you know, fooling around with the dollar signs and all that malarkey that I don't understand, and I realize then we can get something done.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much. We are joined on the panel by Dr. Herbert Freilich, Director of Professional Services of the New York City Health Administration.

My next witness is Mr. Walter Hilfreich.

Mr. HILFREICH. Congressman Rosenthal, can you understand me? Is it clear. I spoke from this platform two days ago at the Grand Jurors Association, so I don't know if it's turned on all right. My subject is completely different. I just speak for one thing, what the people in Queens, and the subject which is Queens, and as their representative I was called on to speak to you members of Queens who are here, for those not coherent enough to speak up for themselves at great length, about many of our health insurance problems.

Now, I came to this country voluntarily in 1920 because I wanted to live in dignity all my life and I worked ever since publicly for those in business and I thought something should be done about old people because since I was 65 years of age, because I was completely covered by all terms of medical insurance.

As soon as I reached 65 everything went off. I was thrown into Medicare. Medicare is a wonderful thing, but the senior citizens didn't know about it. They don't know, for example, that the moment they leave the country they're out of it. If they get sick anywhere else, they're thrown out.

The important thing is that I have to file personal claims, you see. If I may go ahead with it, if I would be interested. It all has to do with the carrier of our insurance in this country. We have to specify this country. I don't know why we have it.

I have many claims here. My first experience in 1969 regarding reimbursement for doctor fees was so desperate that I finally had to send a telegram to the carrier, as all my telephone calls and written inquiries remained unanswered. In response to my wire I got an answer directly from the vice president in charge and within a few days the mess started to get cleared up.

The wording of the telegram was: "Your unbelievable dilatory way of handling claims. For months I get nothing but a case control number I just wondered why you are in business and I have called you numerous times and spoken to innumerable people, and all these people about stopping bothering the doctors. My health insurance problem is so and so . . ." The name is Martha Hilton.

Now, that was two years ago. The next morning I got a telephone call from a gentleman in charge, a very curt call, and the red tape was cut and in no time I got my money. The money was necessary. I can afford to wait 45 days or a month or two years for the sum of $60 or $100, but there are thousands of people who need that money. They go out to doctors and the doctors do not accept their assignments. You have to pay in cash, and if the doctor feels like raising the fee meanwhile, welfare says this is not our business, how much they pay and how much they don't.

My first experience was in 1969 regarding the reimbursements for doctor bills, so finally I sent a telegram. The same thing happened in 1970 which is the current year.

I sent all my bills on the 26th of December of last year. The bills were $45, that is all. Since that time, some run around I got from these people.

Not having heard from them, I called on February 19, 1971 and was connected with a Mrs. Orlando. After 20 minutes search, she came to the phone stating that they cannot locate our bills which were sent in December 26, 1970. They will have to check this out and it would take two more weeks before they would be able to reply. Her questions were: Who are the doctors, what are their names, what are their addresses, what were the amounts, and when were the bills paid to them, have you any receipts, etc.

Number one, my secretary fixed that up. I have it here, now. Not having heard from them by March 18th I called again. A Mrs. Graff answered: "We cannot locate your claim. Who are the doctors, what are their names, what are their addresses, what were the amounts, when were the bills paid to them, have you any receipts, what is your Social Security number, etc. Please look into your billfold and see if the number of your Medicare card checks so that we can check it out again."

On April 21st I was again asked to submit doctor's bills and all the other information.

On April 15th I sent them the requested bills and information with a long letter addressed to Miss Nancy Klapper, Manager.

On April 22nd I received another form letter, the same information requested, signed Dave Green, Manager, Subscriber Relations.

On April 24th I phoned again and tried to reach Mr. J. B. Powers. I was told he cannot be contacted. By then my hiatus hernia was not getting better, the unnecessary repetitions increasing the flow of my bile.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. What is the name of the company?

Mr. HILFREICH. The name of the company—I tried to forget it. Group Health Insurance. I have no grievance against anybody. I will tell you why. I tried to reach the president on February 24th. I sent him a telegram. He answered my telegram. I was told I cannot leave.

By then my hernia was not getting better. It flowed on and on. All I was looking for was something which I believe I am entitled to. I don't know. I did not want to send another telegram because the one in 1969 cost me over $12.00 and it goes about 10 cents a word. I was shocked.

Finally, on April 26th I got two telephone messages from Mrs. Klapper and another gentleman to call Mrs. Klapper back. I had trouble getting through the different operators who asked me why I wanted to speak to Mrs. Klapper. She finally told me my claims will be paid. One month later on May 24th I received my big check for $32.80 which was the condensation of the allowed doctor's fees.

That was all it was boiled down to. I have nothing to say about that. None of it matters how they boiled it down, where it boiled down. Why a doctor charges me $50 when he gets $60 for it, that is something the medical society has to figure out.

Having spent most of my working days with another "small" insurance company—Metropolitan Life—mostly in the health business, the different treatment of clients between a regular insurance company and our carrier, the G. H. I., came vividly to my mind.

Medicare as such connected with hospitalization claims works perfectly, but the harassment of those who try to collect moneys paid for doctor's visits, is just short of unbearable.

At my age of 76 I cannot undergo any more of those inquisitions connected with the collection of legitimate claims in Queens County. I am seeking medical help in other counties. For example, I had a complete checkup of my ailment with x-rays, etc., in Genesee Valley Medical Care and within two weeks this matter was settled. Their findings were that I was suffering from a gall bladder affliction, no doubt aided by the aggravations described above.

There must be many people who are not coherent enough to speak up for themselves. After all, senior citizens are getting old and many are helpless, and out of this reason and for this reason alone I do think that Representative Rosenthal's Congressional investigation should be very welcome to probably many thousands of sufferers.

I still do not understand why we fully grown-up people should have as our carrier an outfit that does not seem to care at all.

I may even go a step further. As Medicare does not cover senior citizens outside of the United States, I carry Senior Blue Cross and I am sure will never have any trouble should I become hospitalized abroad. And as to the doctors' fees that I paid in Italy, England, Austria, etc., I can very well afford those without coverage.

Blessed are those who are ill and live in Manhattan. Their claims are taken care of immediately through the organization of the Blue Cross.

There must be a good reason why our Queens doctors do not accept any assign-

ments from their patients, and I am sure that in many cases it is hard to scrape up the money needed in cash. I am told that they, too, have to wait six months for reimbursement and they have to battle for it. And I still believe that there are some among them who are not millionaires.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much.

I think we will pass on the question. It depends on what you have to say and I think you will have a chance to have your carrier offer rebuttal.

Our next witness is Mrs. Lily Goldschein.

Mrs. GOLDSCHEIN. First, may I thank you, Congressman Rosenthal. I wish to speak about doctors who are more concerned about their bills than they are with the condition of their patient.

My mother was admitted to the hospital with a very serious illness, and the doctor called me and said the hospital was too large. Yes, the hospital was too large, for the reason that it could not give the consideration for the patients who are treated there.

There may also be a question of politics there. In cases of terminal cancer where they go into a room in a great big hospital they are often neglected. My mother did not get this but her care was no different than if she would go into practical surgery, but they need the concern of the doctors. We do not get that kind of attention in the hospitals.

The hospitals are so large and they are getting larger—in fact, this hospital is now in the process of constructing another enormously big building and their main aim is filling those beds, not taking care of patients.

Now, that is my complaint about the hospital care. I know my family was in the same hospital in a smaller division and the care was much different than the care in these enormously high-rise hospitals.

Now, coming to another point concerning Medicare. Why is it that the doctors do get 80 percent of their fee, because we do not get it back from Medicare, and we think we have a very good record—that record of the department was excellent.

However, in my mother's case where she had to pay $225, she received only $50. I didn't write to you because I didn't want to disturb Congressman Rosenthal. He has a lot more serious problems to contend with than a case like this, and I think people should, if they are able to write, as I am doing, to get that satisfaction.

I have been getting returns in dribbles. $50, another $50, and I finally got up to a $100 return for the $225. Of course, I am not finished with this because I think—it was explained in the medical care booklet that you are to receive 80 percent of the fair return.

$50 on $225 I don't believe or $100 is not even 50 percent of the bill, and you get the run-around with the Medicare, too. If you have a doctor who is not with them, then you must pay that bill.

What does happen if you cannot pay? The dignity, as that gentleman said, as you get older is as important as the dignity of the middle-aged and young. Everybody is entitled to it by law.

Let's uphold the law and see that the loopholes are closed. Why should the anesthesiologist not be licensed with the Medicare division? Why can't the law or some change in the law do something about this?

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Maybe in the course of dialogue—we are trying to answer questions for the moment because somebody may want to testify. I hope someone will be able to give you the answer.

My next witness is Robert Rosengarten, who is the director of the HIP, Medical Center and after him will be Dr. Murray Elder.

If there is anyone who feels that they can respond to a question that was raised by a previous witness, please feel free to do so.

Dr. ROBERT ROSENGARTEN. Congressman Rosenthal, Congressman Koch, distinguished colleagues, and friends assembled to improve health care in Queens if it is possible.

I am Dr. Robert Rosengarten, Medical Director, Jamaica Medical Group, and also Assistant Clinical Professor of New York City University School of Medicine.

The questions in Queens concerning the health system are unique with the availability of medical facilities and quality control and cost of service. The government should concern itself with the method of fostering (1) the coordination and better utilization of existing health resources and (2) the rapid development of large, multispecialities, comprehensive care and medical groups serving geographical areas.

The groups will be hospital affiliated of quality control and be renumerated by a prepayment capitalization system. Legislation provided for the accessibility of low cost loans to develop the necessary facilities and tax shelters to encourage the participation in such groups is a small step in the right direction.

Improve delivery of health care services, however, cannot be readily legislated. The impetus for improvement must come from within the medical profession, with government cooperation.

Status quo attitudes of sole practitioners and medical societies which serve as barriers to change in the health care delivery system must be changed. The medical profession must no longer pay lip service to the challenge of providing a better health care delivery system with reasonable cost, or to face the prospect of having a system imposed upon us.

I represent the segment of the Queens health professionals who have over twenty years experience as pioneers in expanding the frontiers of medical care delivery system.

The Jamaica Medical Group and its associates, the Queens Boulevard and Queensboro Medical Group, are currently rendering comprehensive medical care to 120,000 persons on a prepaid capitalization basis.

These groups will soon merge into one professional corporation of 100 physicians, have seven medical facilities located throughout the borough.

In cooperation with the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York the group preventive, consultation and treatment services are expanding by our excellent LaGuardia Hospital in Forest Hills, a super-specialty consultation service, a borough-wide emergency service center which functions whenever the group facilities are closed.

The Queens National Mental Hygiene Clinic and multi-basic testing service to provide baseline data on our patients.

Attendant health personnel are part of our complex, including nurses, medical assistants, health education workers, nutritionists, physiotherapists, optometrists and podiatrists are optimately utilized in our practice.

The groups are run by full time medical director and professional administrator; self-discipline provided by an executive board. Medical provision by qualified full-time specialties department chiefs and preview and practical guidelines practiced by medical society committees.

The subscriber input is assured by active subscriber committee which meets, regularly. Despite antagonistic criticism, the consumer is assured of the best available plan provided for quality services without claim form at a reasonable price. Thank you.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much, Dr. Rosengarten. Dr. Cicero.

Dr. CICERO. Doctor, are you familiar with the legislation passed by the State Legislature?

Dr. ROSENGARTEN. Yes, I am.

Dr. CICERO. As to a corporation?

Dr. ROSENGARTEN. Yes, I am. There are still shortcomings and drawbacks that have to be refined. One is a mistake that state legislators make, is that, basically, physicians do not need loans or monies in order to develop facilities.

This money is available to an interested group of physicians and the difference in loan costs helps but is not a major factor. This type of legislation will help hospitals, however, who are interested in expanding the out-patient services if they can differentially diffuse the out-patient services from in-patient and run the out-patient to a coding system separate from the hospitals.

I believe it is a step in the right direction, but you cannot legislate this type of thing. This must come from the medical profession, recognizing their need for comprehensive care prepaid group.

Dr. CICERO. No loans have been made in that bill.

Dr. ROSENGARTEN. That's correct. We are utilizing this in our LaGuardia Hospital system. However, for our patient system we do not need this money.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. You're probably the only person today who tells us you don't need the money.

Dr. ROSENGARTEN. We need money for other things but not particularly for those facilities.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much. Dr. Murray Elkin.

Dr. ELKIN. Congressman Rosenthal, Congressman Koch, distinguished panel, I am vice-president of the Medical Society but president-elect for the coming year this July 1st, but I am speaking as an individual, not as an officer of the Society.

I, too, want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you and I was particularly happy to hear Congressman Rosenthal say that he wanted to hear from the people. I think that is the area that has been most neglected over the last 15 or 20 years.

I have read your opening statement and I certainly agree with everything in it. However, I think I should point out there is certain explanations that are not included in the meaning of the statement.

For example, it says we ran 18th among industrialized nations in infant mortality, that it is correct. However, there are different ways of determining infant mortality. In this country when an infant dies within 24 hours or directly after birth that is called infant mortality.

But in a continental country, infant mortality is right there, what we call infant mortality what happens after that infant is born. So although statistics may seem to be favoring the continental countries, they really are not because we include in our infant mortality cases that they do not.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Those figures came from HEW.

Dr. ELKIN. HEW is always mistaken because HEW like any other organization takes statistics that someone else takes and just diffuses them.

Congressman KOCH. What is correct? Where should we draw the line?

Dr. ELKINS. I am sorry. I can't give you the correct statistics but I would like to point that out. Secondly, it says we are eleventh in the life expectancy for men and women—and 18th for men.

I would like to point out there are certain things in our way of life that contribute to life expectancy. For example, cancer of the lungs is now the most common cancer known. It is unequivocal that the major cause of cancer of the lungs is smoking cigarettes.

Now, you can't blame a high incidence of cancer of the lungs which contributes to the mortality rate in this country on the medical profession or lack of medical care. If you get people to stop smoking, then you could lower the mortality of men and women and, incidentally, the mortality rate in

women is rising very rapidly due to the fact that they are smoking more than they used to.

Congressman KOCH. Let's stop you there. Once when I was in the City Council I was very concerned about the fact that the hospitals were selling the cigarettes in the hospitals themselves. I think that has been changed very recently.

My question is, isn't there an obligation on the part of the medical profession to come forward with constructive proposals? For example, you say that you should not be held responsible for lung cancer because people smoke. Are you not be held responsible if you sell cigarettes in the hospital in which you have the word to say whether or not cigarettes should be sold?

What I am saying, and with due respect to your presentations, I think you are defensive on these questions. I think it is important that if the statistics show that we are 18th or 17th in terms of longevity; that they are 11th in terms of infant mortality, not to say they're using different tables and not be able to make a presentation as to where we should be in terms of your figures.

These are very defensive kinds of presentation. I would say we ought to be number one in no infant mortality.

Dr. ELKINS. I agree with you, Congressman. However, I started by saying I was trying to explain some of these statistics and make them more realistic and I agree that smoking in hospitals should be stopped and that cigarettes should not be sold.

In fact, in my hospital we did institute—I did institute a resolution in our medical board and there are no cigarettes sold in this hospital.

I am very strongly against smoking and I don't think there is any question against them. Also, twice as many blacks die as whites. I would like to say that the entire subject of the poor and it is the increased mortality rate I think and I do not believe, honestly, is due to the fact that the medical profession does not provide the poor with care, but I do believe that undistributed people who live in substandard housing, where they don't have the proper clothing and who don't have the proper food and who don't avail themselves frequently of the proper medical attention—that is some of the reasons why there is a great deal greater mortality of black than white.

I would just like to mention one or two other things. There is no reasonable reason why a person should get better medical care because he lives in a better neighborhood, has a better job—has a better job or the right sort of skin—there is no question about that.

However, I would like to point out that in the County of Brookyln in the last few years, even now in the County of Queens, there are fewer physicians practicing than there were 3, 4 or 5 years ago, and the reason is this, very obviously.

Firstly, it is dangerous to practice in these areas. Doctors have been murdered, have been mugged, have been stabbed; they're constantly threatened.

In this County of Queens, in certain areas—Jamaica, South Ozone Park and others, doctors do not keep their doors open for patients. They're locked. Some doctors have security people opening the doors to allow people in that they know, and none others, so how can you expect a person or a Congressman to live in an area where his physical well-being is going to be so threatened, that he cannot possibly bring up his family there or practice there.

I would like to point out to you that that was the reason that physicians do not go to these areas. They can't possibly stay there because they're either mugged or killed, and if they ever try to make a house call, that will end in physical damage.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. They don't even make house calls around Forest Hills. (Applause)

Dr. ELKINS. I am glad to hear you say that and I am glad it's brought out. I will tell you why because I was going to mention that the reason that doctors are not making house calls is not because doctors are no more dedicated now than they were, but I, who am a general practitioner, and have been a general practitioner since 1933 make house calls.

However, my age group of general practitioners is dying out. It has been shown that more than 80 percent of doctors in family practise are over the age of 50 and I would dare say that practically 65 or 70 percent are over the age of 60.

Of all the medical graduates in this country, 8,500 per year who graduate, about 2 to 3 percent go into general practice. In other words, if you had even 3 percent going into family practise who would treat people on a local, basic community level, you would have 150 to 200 or 250 graduates a year. That divided into 50 states would give you approximately 3 or 4 per state.

Now, certainly, that is hardly enough to replace the doctors who are dying out, who are retiring because of age or because of infirmity, and that is the problem; not the fact that doctors don't want to make house calls, because our age group who have been in practise 30 or 35 or 40 years and who cannot physically work 24 hours a day, have no replacements.

It would be like having a battalion in the Army go into battle and suffer 90 percent mortality rate, and no replacements and that is the problem in this country, and I am glad you brought that up, Congressman, because that is the answer and we who are still trying to uphold the duties of the family practitioner are being blamed for not being available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year, when we can no longer do it.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think the point that Congressman Koch made, I think is that no one really should be defensive. We all know there are changes in the system, changes in needs, changes in the times.

One of the reasons we are holding this hearing, and this committee is going to hold hearings—it may well be that reformation of the major delivery system is needed. I know there have been a reduction in the number of general practitioners. I think you probably overview this thing. We can't really say because house calls aren't going to be made because of one set of facts. Most of us know they're not being made in other areas. Basically, an understandable medical—

Dr. ELKINS. That is true. However, I would like to point out as in every neighborhood, particularly Manhattan, there are practically no general practitioners coming out to practice and there have been none in the last 15 or 20 years.

Congressman KOCH. Doctor, I want to speak on the question of the differential between mortality rate for blacks vis a vis whites, and also on the longevity rate between them, too. You pointed out, quite properly, that some of the aspects have to do with this; that we have problems in housing, and we have in the areas, as you pointed out, people without clothing—the simple maintenance.

But you make one other comment that they don't avail themselves of the services which you say are available.

We had a doctor here who testified earlier who comes from South Jamaica, black—were you here?

Dr. ELKINS. I was here.

Congressman KOCH. And he makes a point; one, that the people don't know where the services are. (2) That services that are provided are provided in such a way that people who come from a constituency feel rejected when they come in. He mentioned the general hospital.

Is there any validity to his presentation which is that the services that are provided are not adequate and also because a rebuff is made? Is there anything to that statement?

Dr. ELKINS. I agree with what he said, wholeheartedly. I do agree with what he said but what I am asking is no different than what he said.

I would like to say that in the past two years as secretary of the Medical Society I have been Editor of the Bulletin and it has been my duty and privilege to write an editorial each month.

Many of them are economic subjects. The first one in July of 1969 was entitled, "Medicaid and Simple Arithmetic." At that time I showed that in the present Medicaid system the quality of care certainly has not been demonstrated; that legislation had been passed by people who had no first hand knowledge of community medicine as practised on the local level in the doctor's office.

If a legislator, or if he is a physician with an M.D. title, but is in public health, is that man not practising with people and does not know the problems of the practising physician and patient.

Now, as I pointed out then and I will point out again, that Medicaid pays a hospital anywhere from $25 to $30 to $50 and even $65 per patient visit every time that patient goes to a clinic in the hospital.

$65 in some cases and frequently $30 to $50, and that same service which could be rendered in the physician's office, if he would accept Medicaid would be $4.80, minus 20 percent now, which the poor indigent would have to pay a doctor about 96 cents instead of $50 to $65 per visit.

Now, a great preponderance of people—I can supplement this.

Congressman KOCH. I don't understand this. If a patient comes to a clinic the charge to Medicaid is $50 to $65 as opposed to where he comes to the office of the private physician where the charge would be $5?

Dr. ELKINS. Exactly, and in many cases——

Dr. BELLIN. I would like to bring something important out. I was formerly Director of the Medicaid program in New York City and former First Deputy Commissioner, and one of the more patent concerns that have taken place in the field of economics, as Dr. Schlossman has stated, $50 to $65 rather—is rather esoteric. The average is $35 a day in New York City.

Anybody going in an out-patient department in a New York City voluntary hospital, on an average, we have to pay $35 for that office visit to the out-patient department of a hospital in New York City.

If that same patient were to go for that service into the doctor's office, we would have to pay somewhere, $4 or $3, depending upon the treatment.

Now, what has happened, as a result of some peculiar social problems is that the physicians in New York City have been driven out of the Medicaid program to a very great extent. The reason they have been driven out is because of the rather absurd fees that they are permitted to charge, the Medicaid fees as distinguished from Medicare.

Medicare they're being paid more or less what is the prevailing rate. What I am suggesting is this; most important is the prevailing fee concept. I think that modifications are necessary and what we call prevailing fees, because some prevailing fees weren't so prevailing until Medicare started. That is another reason.

What I am saying, you have two programs right now, two federally supported programs. There is the Medicare and Medicaid program.

Because the Medicare fee schedule is so much better than the Medicaid fee schedule,

a physician will take more. Why should he settle for $3.20, why should he see a Medicaid patient instead? Why should he see either one if he could see a patient who is not supported by a federally supported socialized program?

What has this demonstrated; why the physicians have left this program. So we are now in New York City with about 8 percent of what is regarded as hard core physicians who send their bills.

If they didn't get these fees, they could not give appropriate care under that kind of fee cases. What happens? The patient cannot go to the private office any longer, the same medicaid office, during the last four or five years and is obliged to go to the hospital, to the out-patient department, whereupon the City, State and Federal Government kick in their 25 percent and their percentage of the medicaid dollar and are paying $35 for that visit.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. We don't want to get too many interruptions, but somebody asked a specific question.

Dr. FREILICH. I would like to clarify it. I would like to clarify the rate discrepancy between the out-patient costs and the private doctor costs. In a city hospital the average costs I believe are $32 per day.

Let me explain that. You are getting different things with the hospital costs and a visit to the doctor's office. The hospital costs in many cases is a built-in cost, which would be added on an a la carte basis, if you went to the doctor's office.

The hospital's out-patient visit is an average based on the complex care given to very complicated visits as well as the simple care given to a scratch, but it is the aggregate.

It includes all laboratory tests which can be very expensive if added by a private doctor. It includes a cardiogram. It may include physiotherapy. It includes x-rays, barium enema, and so forth, which you know what those cost if you go to a private radiologist and pay for that. It includes medications which are prescribed. Also, there is a big training program. The hospital trains aides, physicians, house staff and so forth.

Dr. ELKINS. I would like to say in response to that, that although that may be so; on the other hand, our hospitals which are not always judiciously interested in the welfare of each individual patient but interested in the financial returns they get for their institution, takes every type of personnel they wish and asks upon a cost basis, which they are going to charge Medicaid, and, therefore, the various types of government pay for the services they render, and I who see the clinics and am in the clinics know that most of the people who go there do not go for complete workups, but a great amount of the people are a number of people who sit on the benches, who come in with their bottles of medicine and all they want is a refill, and they call for that each month and at $35 to $65 at the hospital center, if you please, per visit for a bottle, in my opinion, is one of the most violent reasons for the financial repletion of this country.

I would like to go just a little bit further.

Dr. BELLIN. I would have to make a comment at this point on behalf of the City. Dr. Schlossman is correct. I am comparing apples and oranges, but not apples or oranges. I am not comparing the vegetables with fruit.

We are talking about the same species of the thing, and I think anybody who has had experience in our department knows full well, and I have to agree—I find myself curiously agreeing with the representative or organized medicine this morning, which is not unusual at all.

We generally have the greatest relationship in a number of areas, but they're absolutely correct this morning. The situation is this, and the average patient who comes in the hospital is not getting an EKG, does not get 55 laboratory tests, does not get a proctoscopy.

There are a number of things that are charged to that visit. Now, I find this very difficult to understand and justify—a training program. There is a health care program. I think training should be subsidized, but I don't think it should be smuggled into the actual cost per visit and I resent that the City has to pay 25 percent on a medicaid visit for an experimental nursing program.

I just feel this is pure camouflage. I think, secondly, that there is a lot of insufficiency in these institutions, and when you work in the Health Department, and I have in the last eight months looked into voluntary hospitals and I know what is happening in voluntary hospitals, and upon some of the reasons—I think, having some educational background—however, I think we cannot justify some of these costs, and I think if we truly want to save money in this program what we ought to do is put some of the moneyed people out of the New York City Medicaid program, and put them back into these programs and save that money.

However, it should be done in the offices rather than private visits. Figure it out, mathematically. If it is $5 instead of $35, you get 7 visits instead of one.

Dr. ELKINS. I would like to point out that the visit does not include the fee that is paid to the physician for attending the clinic which ranges from $15 to perhaps $30 per physician, so the astronomical figures I metioned are figures that not a legislator in Washington sees, but only the doctor working in the clinic.

That is why I applaud this type of investigation because you can't know this by sitting in an office in Washington.

I would like to point out, in addition, that it is shown, for example, that children in schools who have to be sent for routine examination and have Medicaid, when that examination is done in the school by the school physician it costs $3.50.

However, thousands of these children have been bussed to hospital clinics and the cost of that clinic visit for the routine physical examination of a school child was $35.57.

In November of 1970, I wrote a second editorial entitled, "Doesn't Anyone ever Listen Out There?" and I repeated exactly the things that I mentioned, today. I sent both editorials to four City Councilmen. I didn't even get the courtesy of an acknowledgment or a reply. These were published in the Queens Medical Society Bulletins. They're common property. They have been seen by newspapers in New York. No one has commented upon the tremendous waste.

In October of 1970 I wrote an editorial entitled, "The National Health Crisis," and I am going to repeat what I said before. Dr. Richards has been slandered and blamed because of the unavailability to cover 24 hours.

I told you the reasons why and I implore the legislators to try to encourage as many physicians to go into private practice as they can, because not only on the county level or in the neighborhood level, but those who are deploring the lack of physicians in the small towns. There are no replacements for doctors who are dying.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. We can't do anything to encourage physicians to go into family practice other than make the change in medical school training of these federal government subsidies for the tuition of people who are willing to commit themselves to a five year term as a family practitioner in various types of neighborhoods.

We are going to have to go to all types of people we take into medical schools, and subsidize those people who are willing to render services in community medicine.

VOICE. It has been done with teachers.

Dr. ELKINS. I would like to point out, Congressman, that right now I think less than 50 percent of medical school graduates actually treat patients in communities or neighborhoods, but they go into either a closed type of research—research type of practice or hospital practice, so no matter how many you graduate, if you encourage twice as many medical schools and twice as many graduates, you still will not have enough physicians, primary physicians who are willing to see people.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. The only point I want to make—we will have to obtain some kind of commitment from them in return for something even before they are admitted to the medical school.

It seems part of the problem is to put all this money into research and failure to understand the situation in the country. It's very glamorous that you develop a live virus in Palo Alto, in California, where you can't get a doctor in Forest Hills that will do you any good.

The point is you need research; at the same time you need people to treat people.

Dr. ELKINS. A doctor in New Jersey stated there are not enough general practitioners. 75 percent of the graduates go into specialties with little or no relevancy to the immediate needs of the cities, and I feel that there is hardly a medical care problem that cannot be solved by physicians in neighborhoods where they are going to treat people.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Is there anything in medical practise where they can continue as a single practitioner, a sole practitioner, where they have to join a larger enclave of physicians?

Dr. ELKINS. I believe that there is a great impetus in this country, state, city and national level, to force doctors into groups. Now, I have nothing against a person who likes to be treated by a group, whether it be Kaiser or HIP; that is their privilege, although I may comment on that type of practise in just a bit. But they have that right and privilege.

However, I do not know why a certain single physician should be penalized now from being able to help them. There is legislation on a state level, and Senator Kennedy on a national level, to almost force physicians into group practise.

Assemblyman Blumenthal has a bill in the State Legislature which would provide that if a patient belonged to a group all his expenses will have been prepaid, hospital and medical care.

However, if he chooses a solo practitioner, a physician of his choice, there will be a $150 deductible for the family, $50 deductible per person, and a 20 percent deductible in addition, for anything above that.

If this isn't discrimination against the people who desire to have a solo physician, I don't know what it is.

In addition, I would like to say this, and I will ask a question of the people in this room, how many when they become ill, not on the street, but ordinarily become ill seek a group or a hospital or any permanent type of installation, and how many call their own doctor and ask him to treat them?

I don't think there is any question that the majority of people would like to go to the physician of their choice in whom they have implicit confidence and they want that type of assistance.

For those who want a group, let them have it. I say for those who want HIP, let them have it. I get many of the HIP patients in my office who are dissatisfied and probably already many people who are dissatisfied to go to their own physicians, too.

However, that is one of the reasons for low cost patient care for being as it seems to be, but I could and do believe in the right of the person, not of the doctor, but the person to have his freedom to choose his own phy-

sician and to continue to have that right to have that freedom.

Many of you have read the articles in the New York Times which Mr. Watson, Chairman of the Board of the International Business Machines, had written an article in which he lauded the type of permanent system and others.

I would like to point out that in the past two, Kaiser-Premanente, which is considered by many a motto of cross-sectionists by government has increased its rates more than 7.5 percent in 1969, again 18 percent, and finally a total of 34 percent within a period of two years.

Now, as far as HIP is concerned, the loss cost ratio is supposed to be low because many patients use facilities like that for ordinary visits, for visits they consider perfunctory, but as I know and as most practising physicians know, we see many HIP patients who come to us because they have confidence in us and they go to HIP only when they have some perfunctory illness. That doesn't mean all but it certainly explains a lower rate in the cost ratio.

The Finnish system and Scandinavian system has been lauded by many. I think you should know, for example, in Great Britain there is a resurgence of private practice. There are long lines waiting in hospitals, hospital conditions are poor; waiting list for surgery sometimes a year or more, and there is a period of about two minutes which practitioners allow to their patients in their own offices, as you know, called a surgery.

Again I say I think people should and must retain the rights of freedom to choose a system that they care or prefer, and I, as I said, those groups—fine, have them. But they should have the right to be free and choose their own doctor.

The ultimate casualty of people shall not be the pursuing of the free practise of medicine which will happen, but I think that it will be the deprivation of the free people of these United States of the alternative to government compulsion without alternative or without choice.

In my last editorial which has just been published, entitled "Tinkers to Evers to Chance," or "From John to Nelson to Richard," or "The Great Giveaway Programs and How they will rack up the City and State and Nation," I would like to read something to you, if you don't mind.

Chairman ROSENTHAL. You could put the entire article in the record. We are under a terrible time problem. I will put the entire article in the record, if you would like.

Dr. ELKINS. I would be very happy.

Congressman KOCH. May I ask you this question. Were you for or against Medicare?

Dr. ELKINS. I am completely in favor of comprehensive prepaid insurance for everyone in this country.

Congressman KOCH. When Medicare came into being not very long ago, were you one of the doctors who opposed it?

Dr. ELKINS. Absolutely not.

Congressman KOCH. You were for it?

Dr. ELKINS. I am for it.

Congressman KOCH. I am pleased to hear you say that.

Dr. ELKINS. I would like to state, unequivocally, that I am in favor of complete, comprehensive prepaid insurance for every citizen in the United States, with the right of that person to choose his own physician and facility, and I also believe that those who wish to do it on a fee for service basis should.

Congressman KOCH. I am really pleased to hear that because I think that it is a great contribution where a physician comes forward and takes that position, but it always distresses me about many doctors that they have opposed programs like Medicare.

I remember the opposition that the medical profession brought to bear and I am pleased that you are not one of them. One of the situations is that men like yourself are able to bring out the inequities.

I mean I did not know. I want to tell you I did not know that the City, State and Federal Governments are paying $35 for a visit that if it were held in the doctor's office would be $5 and I consider that insane and fraudulent on the public purse and not to be resisted. I really do.

I don't know what I can do about it but you can be sure of one thing. I am going to try to do something about it. What would be helpful instead of just attacking the Medicare system and the Kennedy bill and things for providing decent medicare care, which is not available at a price that people can pay in this country; instead of attacking it, to come forward with proposals to make it better.

Dr. ELKINS. I agree with you 100 percent, Congressman, and such proposals are being made. At the present time serious consideration is being given to many many counties in this country. In this county and in Nassau there is a movement for a foundation—for the formation of a foundation where physicians will belong, where physicians will be regulated by physicians for the best interest of all, and there will be no excesses as far as humanly possible.

I would like to point out, too, Congressman, as far as Medicare was concerned, there were certain congressmen and senators that voted against it.

Congressman KOCH. Well, they were wrong.

VOICE. I have a question.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Do you want to ask it of the doctor?

VOICE. Anyone who cares to answer this question. I think one of the reasons why certain doctors might enjoy Medicare is that they simply get patients to sign blank Medicare forms. They never see what has been paid to the doctor until Medicare sends them a paid notice of their allowable fee. This gives them carte blanche. They can write their own ticket. I am not through—because they make a bundle.

Dr. ELKINS. Congressman, I don't speak for everyone in the medical profession and I don't say every doctor in the medical profession is doing exactly what is right. I certainly don't. There are a lot of things I see, and you are absolutely right.

However, I do say that by peer review, by formation of a foundation as we are trying to form it here and we hope will be formed in other counties, there will be a peer review so doctors will not start exercises and will force physicians to accept what is a reasonable, customary and ordinary fee in that neighborhood.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. What happens when you refuse to sign a blank form?

VOICE. I have an elderly aunt who is in a nursing home with a hip pinning and she is not 100 percent well. You know, she doesn't have enough knowledge or sense to know what she is signing, but she knows she shouldn't sign a blank form because I have told her this. She is being harassed by a doctor who is unauthorized to make certain visits to LaGuardia Hospital, it happens, so I——

Dr. ELKINS. Is this a HIP hospital?

Chairman ROSENTHAL. We knew that before you did.

VOICE. Yes, I had rotten experiences.

Chairman ROSENTHAL. Have other people had experiences with physicians after you signed Medicare forms? Have you?

VOICE. I have asked that question as to whether a physician is allowed to bill you, privately, when he accepts an assignment for Medicare and he is disallowed his probably exorbitant fee. He then sends a bill to me, personally, to pay for the difference. Is that a legal procedure?

Dr. ELKINS. The answer to that is this. I won't comment on the word "exorbitant" because I am not qualified. I don't know the case. However, a physician is not permitted to bill a person after he has accepted the assignment.

VOICE. I have one more question relative to the same. I called at this particular building with regard to the same case to find out what the opinion was, realizing different methods and different doctors would get different fees.

I wanted an idea. They refused to tell me. No one will tell you what you can expect to pay for different procedures and different surgery. This is a secret that is kept wellguarded by Blue Cross, by Medicare, by the Medical Society—nobody will give you an idea.

Dr. ELKINS. I could answer that, very simply. If anyone has complaints about a fee and it is sent in writing to the Medical Society and that letter is signed, it is referred to the Review and Arbitration Committee, formerly called the Grievance Committee, where both parties are called in.

If there is any question of exorbitance of the rate, the doctor is so notified. If it is found to be a reasonable and fair fee, they're both so notified.

But in the new concept of forming a foundation, in which set fees will be determined by the entire profession, not by single individuals, where we will make that reasonable, customary and the fees will be the fees, generally.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think the lady's question is why she called this building representing the Queens County Medical Society, and you said you were not satisfied by the response—did they tell you to send a letter in writing?

VOICE. There was a young girl who was very vague and said we cannot give you this information.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Did she say to write?

VOICE. She didn't say anything.

Dr. ELKINS. It could be the secretary or someone who answered the phone who perhaps did not know.

VOICE. I had the same experience with the hospital and said the doctor is supposed to on Medicare and not paid by you in this case. I sent it to Medicare and one thing they told me that it was not covered and sent me back things that they didn't allow anything.

"We will only pay 80 percent at this point," and besides I called on them that I would like to have the bill of the hospital, that the hospital sent for Medicare. I don't have it. I think I am entitled to have the bill. They came to see both of us and they charged something extra, and why?

Congressman ROSENTHAL. This transcript will be submitted to the proper authorities and before you leave if you will give the stenographer your name and address, we may be able to help.

VOICE. I have found since Medicare that the doctors have upped their fees almost double, and when you take exception to it, they say, "What do you care? You don't pay for all of it. Medicare pays part of it," and that is the reason I have joined up with a HIP doctor because I get the same identical examination. I pay my quarterly fee, but I will say this; I would prefer to go to a private physician. I have more rapport with a private physician, but they make it impossible to do so and I'd like something to be done about that.

Dr. ELKINS. As I said before, I would not dare to speak for the ethics or the fees of any physician in the practice of medicine in Queens. However, I agree that there are many cases where fees have been paid which are above the usual customary fees.

With the concept of a foundation this will be eliminated and I think your comments are justified.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. At some point and before the next witness, Dr. Schlossman

who is presently the head and President of the Queens County Medical Society, perhaps would want to respond and offer some remarks on this question. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is the Medical Director of the Queens Hospital Center.

Mr. ROBERT VITELLO. To our distinguished Congressman who is concerned about selling cigarettes in the hospital, I would like to put his mind at ease. We don't sell cigarettes in the hospital.

My name is Robert Vitello. I am Executive Director of the Queens Hospital Center and have been for the past 17 months. I have been in the hospital administrative field for 13 years.

At a time when comprehensive health care is considered the right of every American, a public hospital finds it increasingly difficult to fulfill its part in providing such care. Salient problems include:

1. Emergency Room Load:

The City-wide network of ambulance services and the fact that family physicians are almost non-existent and are usually not available for house calls, continue to make the emergency room load in the municipal system a constantly growing and increasingly complicated one.

There is a mixture of patients who might ordinarily be seen in a physician's office but come to the emergency room because of the absence of medical care in the community and because of its unavailability during evening hours and weekends.

The voluntary hospitals have a relatively small emergency room service and, since it is usually not served by the City's ambulance trauma service, does not see the same kind of traumatic or extreme injury. The public hospital system is forced to place excessive amounts of its resources in comparison to voluntary hospitals in the provision of emergency services. This input of patients into a public system does not lend itself to control and, as a result, the emergency room service must be staffed out of proportion to the rest of its demands.

2. Specialty Services:

In a public system, the large majority (up to 75%) of patients admitted for care come through the hospital emergency room. This is in direct contradiction to the voluntary hospitals where anywhere from 75% to 90% of the patients admitted are elective admissions and have been, therefore, scheduled for hospital treatment. The hospital which is able to schedule its admissions is able to staff more economically and efficiently and is less likely to have to provide all of the special services which are expensive both in material and medical manpower which the public hospital must provide because of the nature of emergency admissions.

In addition to being acutely ill, the emergency room patient who becomes a hospital in-patient is often from an indigent population, is less healthy and well-nourished to begin with and presents additional problems for care which the average middle-class patient in a voluntary hospital does not present.

3. General Patients:

In addition to the emergency room patients who appear in greater numbers in a public hospital, the other end of the spectrum exists as well. The pul lic hospital is forced to admit larger numbers of chronically ill patients and geriatric patients whom the voluntary hospital can and does reject. The rejection there may be occasioned by lack of adequate financial resources of the individual patients or may reflect the hospital admitting policy. Voluntary hospitals can be selective to patients they admit and can transfer patients for admission to public hospitals when they do not wish to admit to their own facilities.

A public hospital, as the health resource of last resort for those in the acute emergency room and for the chronic patients, finds itself burdened with the most difficult type of patient load. It is required to provide all of the emergency and specialty services which the voluntary hospital can avoid providing because of its extensive nature; and, at the same time, it must carry the load of the chronic patients for whom other health resources may not be available.

The public hospital has to provide such specialty services as renal dialysis, neurosurgical services and, at the other extreme, must provide extended care facilities within its own hospital. The voluntary hospital can insist that a family accept a patient who is discharged after the financial resources have been exhausted while the public hospital goes on caring for those patients long after the need for acute hospitalization has passed.

4. Physical Resources:

The public hospital, despite its major importance to large segments of the urban population, has received no significant help in providing and maintaining an adequate physical plant. So-burdened funds do not flow to the public hospital and, while voluntary hospitals were receiving massive upgrading programs through the influx of fresh money, public hospitals were forced to attempt to maintain and upgrade facilities within very limited city budget resources.

As a result, physical plants have continued to run down and utilization of health manpower is extremely inefficient in archaic and obsolete plants. Such necessities as nurse call systems are taken for granted in voluntary hospitals; they are often absent in public hospitals and represent a typical example of poor use of limited manpower.

The unattractive and difficult working environment in most public hospitals makes it extremely difficult to recruit and maintain key staff, who prefer to work in surroundings which allow them to provide the kind of care they are trained to give.

5. Accreditation:

Public hospitals are now no longer able to meet the standards of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals; for example, Bost City Hospital has lost its accreditation, and Kings County Hospital has only been provisionally accredited.

It should be noted that the Joint Commission Standards are minimal and, in no way, guarantee adequate care for patients even when these standards are met. The fact that public hospitals are unable to meet these standards does demonstrate that their resources are not matched to the patients whom they serve.

6. Patient Load:

In addition to the conditions described above, which include the necessity of caring for large portions of the City's emergency and chronic load, and the minimum of elective cases, the public hospital is required to accept all patients who come to it for care and who require care. They cannot match their resources to the needs which are presented to them, and this unlimited load demands that the public hospital sometimes is forced to concentrate all of its resources on the provision of emergency care, in-patient care and follow-up care in clinics in the hospital.

It becomes impossible to bring the public hospital system into the sphere of preventive medicine and the neighborhood family care centers because its resources are committed elsewhere. The spiral as perpetuating suggests a public hospital which has become the primary health care resource for large segments of the population, is unable to enter the scepter of preventive care and health maintenance, and the problems detailed above will continue to exist.

A point of digression. It may not come as a surprise; it may come as a shock to some of you, we get patients who are admitted to a public hospital over the weekend or during the week because mother and dad are tired taking care of grandmother, they would like to go on a vacation, so the grandmother is brought into the hospital. She has absolutely no medical condition. She becomes a social problem, which is medical.

When we begin to talk about cost, it is ludicrous in this day and age when you talk about a system which is required to fill so many problems, not medical.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Are they accepted because they are grandmothers?

Mr. VITELLO. The patient is brought to the hospital. The mother, the father, the daughter, the stepson, whoever it is, says, "Look at grandmother. I am going down to the car to get something," and they're gone.

Dr. BELLIN. I have seen a social worker bring her to the hospital, put her in the emergency room and walk out.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Where do you see the future of the public hospital, and Queens General Hospital and the Queens Medical Center going?

Mr. VITELLO. If I had the answer to a question like that I wouldn't be standing here, I would be telling you right in Washington.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. What happens in our society? We all stand by in a crisis so eruptive that it is uncontrolled.

Mr. VITELLO. Let me respond in this way; that prior to July 3rd of this year—last year, rather, when the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation went into motion, we had an unusual situation in terms of the public sector of having an agent in the Department of Hospitals providing, and we had another City agent in the Department of Social Services determining their eligibility for that care, and the cost to the City of New York General Fund was staggering. Absolutely no responsibility, three different activities in the segmentation for Medicare.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. It seems to me that the Health and Hospitals Corporation is an endeavor to bring some order out of the madness and chaos of the system, to begin to coordinate this care.

Many people raised questions about the high salaries of the administrative costs.

Mr. VITELLO. What can I tell you? When I came to Queens and accepted a position as the Executive Director, one of the things that I never thought I would do in my professional life is take five weeks out of my activities to present the plight of the City Hospital in a budgetary crisis to a large segment of Queens population. I didn't even think of that kind of thing in graduate school.

I think the best we can do is to go out into the mainstream of things. We don't have any time to do this in the fighting of the budgetary battle. I don't know what a high salary is. I know what type of salary would mean to me as an individual, willing to accept a job in the City of New York.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Does Queens General Hospital render appropriate services in the community, adequate services?

Mr. VITELLO. No. That is because we have a dual system. We have the double standard. Queens Hospital Center will begin to deliver adequate care to the people who come there when anybody who wants to go there has the ability to do so.

We have a limitation. First of all, I don't think that there are many people in this room who if they were acutely ill right now or became ill would say, "Take me to Queens Hospital." It has been known it is a double standard.

It has been known as a poor hospital with medical facilities together. People come with two or three bus changes, transportation changes, from the Rockaways. However, of the total, they tend to avoid this area for medical services. They come to others which are not so good.

We saw many people who mentioned this morning not being able to identify the sys-

tem. How people get into the system? We don't have any difficulty getting into the system. We pick up a phone and we call a doctor who knows the amount of the bill for the services he provided and we pay that bill. Very simple.

Unless we have accidents. This is one of the things I would like to address myself to. I think there are problems or these problems that we mentioned, but I think there is a thing that we don't recognize.

The people of Queens will always have inadequate care, in comparison with the alternative. When they have the Queens Hospital Center they receive the good medicare care, but the method and manner in which they receive it is bad.

When I first came to Queens Hospital we used to go by number in the out-patient clinic. When they were ready to be served, and number one would be served, it's like going to Shelley's and getting a number out of a machine and when you are ready to get your bread, they call your number and you transact your business. That is part of the program.

You are a second class citizen. You go to the public hospital because you can't go any place else. You have a locked-in, employed situation in terms of civil service. I may be having reference to public, civil service mentality, where people—and this gentleman mentioned the problem with his insurance company—these are the kinds of problems which are legend in bureaucracy.

I have two titles and, unfortunately, I shouldn't say that. When I first came I was an Assistant Commissioner of the Department of Hospitals. When the Hospital Corporation came into being and I was calling City agencies to find out what was—how I was going to get answers to simple problems, and I was called on to identify myself, an Assistant Commissioner of Queens didn't do anything.

As soon as I said I was the Commissioner, I would sense that people at the other end would respond. It is that kind of bureaucracy that, hopefully, the Health Corporation will overcome, and it has the flexibility to deal with it, but if it becomes a political football for a few people, to talk about it and to talk about the high salaries, I wouldn't take the job as president of this corporation at ten times the amount of money they pay.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Wouldn't you?

Mr. VITELLO. No, I wouldn't.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Does the panel have any comment?

Dr. FREILICH. I agree with what Mr. Vitello is saying. I think the quality of care is of the best as far as the medical care and also certain procedures, but then much of the care we give to these families—rehabilitation care and so forth—when it comes down to the amenities, and in some families it's very difficult to attract people to work under the conditions that we have to handle.

It's a question of conditions and a question of working with many of the elderly. Actually, someone who is interested in working in a hospital will find a much easier job in a voluntary or proprietary hospital, where in a semi-private room where a patient is more ambulatory, not that ill, rather than the serious problems that are here.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think the young man back there wants to say something.

VOICE. Congressman Rosenthal, I am going to speak on this later, but I have changed my mind when something like Queens General was brought up.

I work for the corporation and the point I would raise—I hope it will get more money for the hospital, this hospital in particular. The rates of reimbursement that they're getting now at the City Hospital, Queens General, included for Medicare and Blue Cross are so small as compared to what the voluntary hospitals are getting, and I think I find in my particular position where I have to bring off so much of the amount of money for the cost of the stay is ridiculous.

Now, I have asked people about it, and the rates in certain city hospitals on the reimbursement of medical insurance are so small. On Part A it is almost half the cost of a per diem position.

I think in your position you may be able to see that the necessary legislation or appropriate amount of money is sent back to the City hospital, where they are paid for part of each day and certain private hospitals and voluntary hospitals are paid much more.

It seems there is quite an inequity in it. I have been on the task force for the Hospital Corporation and the backload of cases in trying to get out those cases where Blue Cross at one point was paying $50 on reimbursement and the contract—well, I hope the gentleman from the corporation will see that each contract will be vitalized and more money will be got and the City hospital might get a fair share of this money and perhaps wouldn't have to pay so much.

I have to write off so much in costs of the person's stay that the taxpayer comes back to me. It's trying. We can't win, and some legislator in Washington where more money can come back from the particular group, can accomplish this.

So, the gentleman from Queens General doesn't have to say you got to spend five weeks getting the budget because there isn't enough money. Where the money goes out and so many people have to rely on the city hospital in time of need, it seems fair they get a certain return on their money.

They get paid less than fair. I think there is a lot of politics—

Congressman ROSENTHAL. What kind of politics?

VOICE. I am taking a course where we found that certain reimbursement rates for private hospitals are a little larger and certainly more controlled by the state administration. There is a book out, "American Care," put out by Healthpak, not that I agree with everything they say—that costs and certain organizations are controlled by reimbursement, and it would be consonant for managers to see that Medicare gives a proper reimbursement.

I understand the cost basis for the hospital is one of the determinations of how much the reimbursement is, and I don't think that a hospital, especially in Queens where we have two city hospitals—

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think you have made your point. What is your response or comment on what he says; anything at all?

Mr. VITELLO. I think the appropriate agency in the department, within the organization, is in the process and has constantly been negotiating at the state level for a better shake on the Medicaid reimbursement.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think the point he is trying to make is that private, voluntary hospitals will get a better return from Medicare than Queens General Hospital.

Mr. VITELLO. That has been the case for the Corporation hospitals, Queens General—

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Why?

Mr. VITELLO. I don't know.

Dr. FREILICH. This is not my area. I can say this is a matter of negotiation—negotiation with Blue Cross and what not, and when you negotiate, you put certain details on the table and it is a matter of interpretation and so forth.

I do know one of the problems was the matter of counselling and identifying costs in that the city hospital—they were part of the municipal accounting system and it might be placed on a strictly cost accounting basis.

However, the matter has been extended in an accounting type system and has been taken care of.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. You mean for a long period of time the City has been shortchanged?

Dr. FREILICH. I think it is a matter of negotiating what is allowable for—

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Let me put it this way. (A) The City's accounting position and (b) The City negotiations are not adequate?

Dr. FREILICH. Reimbursements are on those formulas. Formulas are made by men and not made in heaven. Formulas go into certain aspects and it's a matter of interpretation and negotiation between the two parties as to just what is included and what the rate is, and they have been trying very hard and the Corporation has been able to up the rates, but not up to the rate that they feel we are entitled to.

This is rather a question of mathematics and we are working night and day on this matter.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Dr. Bellin, you might have something to say on this.

Dr. BELLIN. I believe I have some comment. As I recall, the City hospital now charges about $53 a day. $53 is what Blue Cross will pay and it is under Medicare. It isn't the rate accepted by the State Health Department.

That meant that for a day in a hospital the City hospital would receive $53, whereas if a patient stayed in a hospital, a voluntary hospital, he might receive double that amount. The average per diem, the voluntary amount in New York City is $130 a day in a semi-private room. That is what it is, currently.

The argument Blue Cross wholly advanced and the reason they couldn't give you more than $53 a day because they couldn't justify giving more due to the fact of the lack of adequate accounting information that the City of New York was furnished.

I am not going into the City of New York accounting system, but it would seem to me as it would to many of us in government, that Blue Cross has undertaken a very arbitrary position, that even if you cannot account for every buck there is seemingly quite a difference between $53 and $135, and you shouldn't take a shellacking.

The point is that the City has taken a shellacking from the fiscal intermediaries and from the other agencies that are determining it. One of the major accomplishments I think that the corporation has to its credit is that it just brought up the per diem to a little bit over $100, up at the recent present, but it has to go a little bit more before anybody shall be satisfied.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think that gentleman wants to say something.

VOICE. I have been in the hospital system for a long time. I would like to point out two aspects of this. One is the problem in regard to fiscal accounting. For several years the department made some comparable cost analogies of what is going on in the municipal hospitals, what is going on in the voluntary hospitals, only to find—no matter how we inquired and from whom we inquired—we find our system accounts made comparisons of the figures just unavailable.

There is no way of exactly knowing with whom you are dealing. There is another thing involved here, if you examine the figures. It is not always the hospitals you consider a real high consideration, with New York City at the higher price, that within the hospital costs themselves that whole area amounts to about 75 percent. It's a very hard thing to understand.

This must mean that hospitals are not going to be doing the right things and the high cost they are putting on hospital bedcare is not the way.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Don't you think those costs that are not bed care should be

subjugated and paid from other costs, so we are not really deceived what a day's care costs in the hospital?

VOICE. I would think that is so. It would seem every other share and other activity where you have an insufficient producer, yet the health care can be so reconstituted that it can be made into a producer.

Where you have a producer where your economic differential is a variable of 75 percent and yet you keep paying and are not sure you are getting the same thing at the time, or as you do know the current situation where special programs are undertaken which are taxed on to general costs.

One example was brought out here. The cost, for example, of out-patient system to a city hospital, emergency room, and where the care there is not really relevant, where you know you got to put the administrative salary on to the cost of the housing department, the educational budget, the research budget—all tailored down to each individual service, this is really not what is needed.

If a hospital cannot produce that service, economically, that hospital should not be doing that particular service. This is the thing we are getting more and more and getting less and less of, now.

Possibly, the Hospital Corporation will be able to do this, possibly they won't. I will say this; they haven't been moving with great speed. I don't know why but I think the kind of material they have has not been given out to the public yet as far as I know.

I would say one other thing. We should have reasonable hospital costs, not only the hospital corporation, where you can get one hospital with good reputation providing hospital care for $50 and another for $140, something is wrong. Maybe it's the other way around.

Mr. VITELLO. I would like to point out that in Queens Hospital Center we don't have private accommodations. That is a very difficult basis. It's not a simple basis to make comparisons on.

We have a 42–50 bed open order. That is part of the problem of Blue Cross.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think this gentleman here wants to say something.

VOICE. I have the best intentions. I think you ought to heed some fundamental principles here. Those who are really interested in improving health care ought to be having a fundamental discussion as to what constitutes, in other words, adequate health care, which we know to be poverty health care.

As time has gone by, many people have either indicated a desire, and you haven't got to the fundamental root of the problem. All the money in the world is not going to buy adequate health care unless something is done to make that adequate health care available, and that is the fundamental question that ought to be asked.

You represent Queens. Queens is one of the worst boroughs of the five boroughs of New York with regard to health care. It certainly has the lowest quality.

The COURT. Do you want to identify yourself for the record?

VOICE. I am Dr. Andrew Martin.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. We were going to call on you, Doctor.

Dr. MARTIN. What I started to say, if everybody has an emotional retort attitude, the real course of relationship—the real beginning are the fundamentals, and after all, if you are going to talk about costs, you are talking about the economy.

Let's talk about the inadequacy of health care. I don't know if you are aware of this, Congressman Rosenthal, but one-third of all the patients take their care outside of this borough. They want to come into this borough where their homes and communities are, to seek health care as such.

This is something fundamental that ought to be gone into.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Why in your view do they do that?

Dr. MARTIN. It's all very simple, to find out what the view is. For example, Mr. Vitello up there represents a thousand bed——

Mr. VITELLO. 1,200 beds.

Dr. MARTIN. But there are 4,500 beds represented by the 10 voluntary and 10 proprietary hospitals which you haven't in your platform any expertise to explain it. I hoped to find representation from every quarter but you have three physicians from the Health and Hospital Corporation.

I would appreciate, for example, seeing a representative, besides you, Dr. Bellin, from the medical and health association up there.

I would appreciate to see some proprietary representative up there, and I would appreciate it— I am trying to explain it—and I think if the public is here and obviously concerned about it, that they were given an opportunity to understand what they're missing—and then they can understand it.

They don't have to be either PhD's or M.D.'s to understand what they are missing. I think they would understand and I think something fundamental might begin to build, and I am just appealing that we begin at what should be fundamental to health care, what it is all about in terms of why there are no beds in Queens, because what you are talking about is a national problem.

You represent the Borough of Queens. It is where it is being the bad health care. Let's begin with that and maybe we will get there with that and maybe we can go on to what is more city and state health.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think I ought to reply to criticism of why the president of the Queens County Medical Society is sitting here and not saying anything. Dr. Schlossman is going to be the next speaker. What I did I thought was somewhat judicial, but I thought it was useful to have representatives of some of the city and state agencies sit with me so they could act and take back reports of the hearing back to their organizations, which may be useful.

I myself, together with Congressman Koch, will prepare a report and analysis of this hearing and deliver it to another action agency, the Ways and Means Committee. What I thought is that maybe the witnesses who made public recommendations would broadly present the outline. A person such as yourself, who is on the witness list, and Dr. Schlossman and other people are here, but I think a representative of Queens General Hospital is important to discuss that important thing.

In other words, there is no disagreement between us. You might have managed this program a little differently than I did, but I did the best within the limitations of my skill and ability.

VOICE. But we have no rebuttal when the doctor says that we have a shortage of physicians. Why do we have a shortage of physicians? There are thousands of physicians trying to practice.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Maybe, Dr. Martin, we have to study that question. I want to ask you, Doctor—

Dr. MARTIN. Congressman Rosenthal, we came here to discuss this problem and you were unavailable and so might I add was every other Congressman in the County of Queens unavailable and not a single one has responded to this brochure that was sent to you to study in depth the Queens problem, other than giving lip service, in fact as you did, but there is no opportunity, as the lady pointed out.

I am not trying to argue or quibble. I am trying to appeal that we get down to some fundamental dialogue and try to understand.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think that is what we are trying to do today, isn't it?

Dr. MARTIN. Not one minute has been devoted to this, not one minute.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Then, perhaps, I don't understand what you are appealing to.

Dr. MARTIN. Let's talk about why there are no physicians in Queens.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Let's talk about it.

Dr. MARTIN. You haven't raised that question.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I am willing to listen.

Dr. MARTIN. You raise it and I will answer it.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Yes.

Dr. MARTIN. The reason there are not enough physicians in Queens that you can understand is what modern facilities are necessary for a physician to do an optimum high rate quality care are seriously lacking in Queens in great many areas.

Now, you have to understand what these are. People you remember go where they feel they can be accommodated. You have a little over 100 medical schools in the United States. They're turning out your children to be doctors.

These doctors are highly trained. They want to go where they can practise their skills. They find in Queens a scarcity of opportunity for them to practise their skills and they will go elsewhere and there is something the public should be interested in because they're the taxpayers.

If funds that are going for a great deal of things have to pay for many of these things that can be made available there, then they're not to practise in Queens.

Queens has two million people. You have medical schools in Manhattan with 1.8 million people. In Brooklyn, you have almost the same 2 million people but you have got something like 42 hospitals, and only 20 hospitals in all of Queens for 2 million people.

In other boroughs you have a great many hospitals that are modernized. That is, modernized hospitals that give you modern care, and I say we need a minimum of 500 beds. The hospitals in Queens that cater to the bulk of the population have no more than 300 beds and you have to go on from there to understand what it means in terms of delivery of health services and delivery in your report of the quality on this basis.

These are the fundamental things that I think should be discussed, and I repeat it doesn't have to be at a hospital or medical care for a level to be concerned.

If you, as the chairman, don't bring this meeting around to the question of fundamentals and permit that sort of discussion, we will never get to it. I don't want to monopolize the meeting.

VOICE. Why didn't we have the state senators?

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think Dr. Bellin wanted to respond and ask you a question.

Dr. BELLIN. Doctor, I'd like to have some clarification. Queens County Medical Society and Bronx County Medical Society came out two months ago with a statement in The Times—I presume you saw the article—complaining rather bitterly that the number of physicians in Brooklyn and the Bronx have been going down, precipitously, particularly in Brooklyn, but the Bronx has been suffering this, also.

As a matter of fact, at a Bronx County Medical Society meeting not too long ago I heard the names of new physicians going into the Bronx County Medical Society. Most of them were non-Americans—were American citizens, naturalized citizens—very few native born Americans coming in.

Were it not for the foreign-born coming

in there is practically nobody coming into the Bronx right now. Brooklyn is even worse.

Now, that leaves three boroughs. That leaves Manhattan, Staten Island and Queens. Now, given the actual value as to New York City, and the city as a whole, the best ratio of doctor to population—I said the best—far, far better comparison than any other part of the country; it was not in the other three boroughs.

I was startled when you speak about the Queens problem. I happen to be registered in Queens, also. When I think of some of the tremendous problems in Southeast Bronx, Biafra looks pretty good.

I know some portions of Brooklyn which look like something worse than Biafra right now. What are you talking about when you speak about the Borough of Queens in regard to the other boroughs?

Dr. MARTIN. Rather than respond, I would just like the question, itself. What is the exact question?

Dr. BELLIN. Well, the exact question is this. You have made statements about the inadequate number of physicians in Queens?

Dr. MARTIN. No. I didn't make that statement. If that is a fundamental belief, then it has got to be explored first as to——

Dr. BELLIN. Well, you know, you spoke about exploration. This can be either a yes or no answer and we can have the check in our department. Is it, in your opinion, that the ratio of physicians to population in the Borough of Queens is least in the entire world; is that your opinion?

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Let me break that down.

Dr. MARTIN. Let's not.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Dr. Cicero has, I think, these figures and let us have him answer.

Dr. CICERO. Although I am from the state we gathered a few figures before we came down here. In actual fact, you take the population ratio—the Bronx indeed does have a lower physical population ratio. Of all the five counties, not excluding New York County, Queens has the highest at 160 ratio.

This is what I wanted to say before.

Dr. MARTIN. I am aware——

Dr. CICERO. Excuse me. The nation ratio is 158 per 100,000 population. Perhaps I should have injected myself in the argument on the platform. What you are really talking about in 1968 you had 15 million out-patient visits. In 1970, you had 20 million out-patient visits. You had that on one hand.

You have a continual problem, the lack of a primary physician. You have forced them to go to the out-patient departments as opposed to going to the doctor's office, and I guess what I am saying now is what is your answer to the problem.

Is there a physician shortage? I don't know. I am here to learn.

Dr. MARTIN. The answer to your question is that in certain areas of Queens there is absolutely a physician shortage, in many many areas of Queens. In most of Queens there is a relative shortage. That relativity depends upon the extensivity and availability of the type of physician that is required for the particular problem.

For example, to understand quality care you have to understand what changes there are in quality care. That is my experience, that there are some standards that are in this country and they need to be recognized by the general public.

In Chicago there are certain standards of what is recognized as quality care. There are something like 20 general standard specialties in the United States, including general practitioner.

In Queens, you can muster a total of 13 accredited residencies, whereas many of the hospitals have as many as 20 accredited residencies in their hospitals. That hospital which has 13 is the only one. The other hospitals in Queens have only 4 and 5.

There is a real scarcity of qualified physicians and a lot of people in Queens, Congressman Rosenthal, you know, and that is why one-third go elsewhere.

It is a crime where there are a few people that they can't organize themselves, their representatives and their resources, and use these to organize them. It can never be done unless a position in leadership takes the leadership to organize, to seriously explore what is lacking and to get it.

I am sure you will be surprised that many of the people in here have complained about doctors raising their fees. I am sure that is true, and I will tell you one fundamental answer to it—that old spirit of competition.

If you can get a lot of doctors in here competing with each other and all of them highly qualified, then you will get a drop in price which is natural. Anybody who has ever been in business understands that.

But as long as a population of 2 million people have the resources now available and no chances of action by our highest representatives, then you will have the opportunity of having the people handled as they are.

There is nothing mysterious about it. It can be overturned, if you just get them to be logical and reasonable about it, instead of having them reach down in our pocketbooks.

I believe, Congressman Rosenthal, that you can try to set the stage for this type of an orderly approach.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. We are going to move on and we do want to thank you very much, Mr. Vitello. You told us some of the problems of Queens General Hospital.

It was at this juncture that we were going to paint a broader picture and we have asked the gentleman who is really our host, and who does, in my judgment have a broad view of physician-patient relationship in Queens. Our next speaker is Dr. Ralph Schlossman, President of the Queens Medical Society.

Dr. RALPH SCHLOSSMAN. In addition to being President of the Medical Society, I think you all should know that I am a physician. I do render a service during the week. I think one of the problems we are talking about, if we are talking about medical care, we realize it is not just one kind of medical care, and even within so-called first class medical care, it is not just one kind of medical care.

What Dr. Martin was talking about was institutionalized, highly expert care, but I hope to talk about the difference between health care delivered and the general public, because I am sure that is what most of the people here today are interested in.

These things are really not exclusive. They're all part of the broad framework in which you are all interested. The question is not whether we have a shortage or relative shortage. We take care of the people. I'd like to share my thoughts about it with you.

I am going to eliminate the broad national picture. I am going to tell you what we think about our local problems. We were given some inkling about the physician population. While it's true in Brooklyn there is some shortage, I think it would shock you to know that in Brooklyn in the last ten years they have lost 1,000 of 4,000 physicians. That is a 25 percent loss in ten years.

Here in Queens we have been categorized as being relatively lucky, yet you must realize that Queens is the fastest growing area in the entire country so far as population is concerned.

Now, population has increased 30 percent within the last ten years. We have been barely holding on to the number of physicians. We have about 600 physicians in the Society and we are really concerned and we have really suffered.

The chief thing that we have lost is through attrition as the primary cause. Now, whether he is a general practitioner or internist or pediatrician, that is the man who sees the sick person. The truth is that these men do not come to Queens.

The main problem in Queens is that we do not have a medical school. A medical school tends to attract good physicians to the area. If Queens were a standard city, it would be the sixth largest city in the United States.

There are perhaps three dozen population areas in the country that have their own school base, their own medical community. I would like to allude a little bit to what Dr. Bellin said about the cutback in medical centers.

While you understand that Queens and Elmhurst Medical Center represents the backup, you can understand the statement of Mr. Vitello on the necessity of lack of care. I do want to tell you that this medical society has gone on record as volunteering to man these wards if that crisis should come to pass. This was announced in all the papers, and, of course, at the insistence of the principals, but I think the public should realize that the physicians are interested in medical care in the community.

I think perhaps the solutions have been bandied about for some of these problems. I must tell you that there are times when I worry about the delusions and the problems. I think it might help everybody's understanding if we reviewed what the main suggestions for heatlh care would be.

Everybody is talking about the prepaid group on the panel. What does it mean? It means in an organization a participating person is paid an annual amount per person to services.

Prepaid. Prepaid is what it means and a group means that the care is rendered by the group which should accomplish all of the expected minimal activity.

A great deal has been said about this, as though we are living in a vacuum, as though we had no health care at all. As a matter of fact, we had this self delivery health care something more than 30 years.

As a matter of fact, the three largest groups are existing here on the east coast. HIP is in this group and some small group just recently in Cleveland, and I believe also in Washington, D.C.

Despite the availability of this sort of care to the public, and the poor people of the United States get that kind of care, let me talk about one that is known to all of us—that is HIP in New York.

It was started between LaGuardia's administration and the closing days of the Wagner Administration. Its population consisted largely of the city employees, all of whose health care was paid for by the City. If they got care elsewhere, it was not paid for.

When the Wagner Administration came about a free choice was given to the people whose health was being paid for and they left by the thousands. There has recently been—and I am familiar with all these statistics; there recently had been two studies which appear to be of interest.

One of the studies of the subscribers who came from Europe. It came up with a figure I heard, from one lady in the audience, because though they went to HIP because of financial ability, 40 percent of the people did not consider their HIP physician, but they considered another physician. This was despite the fact that they were not paid when they went to a physician.

Then there is the attitude of a physician participating in HIP at the time. Not less than 30 percent of these physicians felt because they were working for HIP that they had suffered in the eyes of their present colleagues under the standard.

I am not here to knock other systems. What I am trying to do is to point out that the kind of solutions that are being pro-

posed today are not panaceas. They are not the plans of God.

Let's talk about the benefits of care. Let us see what it is, exactly. Now, we have a background in the figures to estimate this and again a recent study has shown that 16.6 percent are enrolled in these plans, they get their care out of them. So there is no way of computing the care outside and this must be taken into consideration.

It is unfortunate that in one of the major costs in the control of medical care is the non-delivery method of care. I think to the public this is recommended as a disservice and people who are dependent on the total of total care and expense, it is obviously a solution pushed by many of these groups.

One of the third advantages is proposed under the blanket of HMO, Health Maintenance Organization, which is something that Congressman Rosenthal referred to as crisis care. We know that health care in the country is oriented to where people live, and more expensive hospital care is dependent on the different communities and their general well-being.

As yet, there have been no adequate studies of this because the people who are supposed to do it are unable to do it. In a recent article in my organization it was said when people called them up for annual checkups and diagnostic checkups under the plan that the waiting period averaged 55 days or more, because they had to deliver care to other people first; they had to divide their responsibilities in such a way that a sick person could get care first.

We all recognize this has to be so and yet even in a prepaid system where all of this is supposed to be available to subscribers, it was in fact not so.

I will agree for many people this is an adequate solution. My position is that we are a dualistic society. There is more than one way of doing things and there should be more than one way of health care available to the people in this country.

I'd like to spend a few minutes talking to you about some of the things that the federal government has done already on health care. I should talk about three things, in particular, in the last few years, Medicare, Medicaid and Regional Medical Help.

I think that some of the feelings of the older people in the community about the benefits of medicare where these people have talked about it today, I think there will be a lot more talk about it later—I am sorry there wasn't an able person here to answer some of your questions earlier.

Let me point out one or two things about Medicare. Medicare when it was sold to the public, the public was sold a bill of goods that Medicare was really good and it was not explained to them that all their costs would be covered.

Furthermore, the subscriber who complains today about today's fees and reimbursements that are allowed almost is under the provisions of the plan and the rules of the Social Security Administration. It happens that today we have a high official who is here, and although he knows much about the subject and I must give him credit, he cannot take the credit to instigate this type of cost control.

There are many people in the audience who have felt that they have reneged and they have not received the proper return they should. This is quite correct, but the reason for this is that almost until last year all Medicare payments were not based on current fees; as originally, on 1965 fees, but you can't buy today's groceries for 1965 prices, either.

Just recently because the Social Security Administration has allowed the fee schedules to be revalued up to the 1969 level, so there is still a gap between the amount that a Medicare recipient can get, between the doctor's charge and the work allowance by Medicare, and the reason for this difference is that neither is the doctor's fee too high nor is that local intermediary.

Just a brief word about Medicaid. There was a long discussion about clinic fees. Let me tell you my personal experience. Until the advent of Medicaid I used to come and spend half a day in the clinic. I used to enjoy it. I did it for no fees, no salary.

Medicaid came along. There were rules in the clinic. This clinic was now being reimbursed for 5,000 visits, so not only would a patient get two cents worth of medication, no barium enemas, no proctoscopy. They would just get a refill of medication every two weeks.

I told the clinic I would have no part of it. I think the gentlemen who take time to analyze this, analytically, should realize the inflationary aspect, that pouring a large amount of money without cost control now, but I have to agree that the bias is against the individual practitioner and for the clinic, and this has actually far increased the cost of this program by driving practitioners out of the program.

Let's just take one minute about the proposed program in Medicaid. These figures from the undersecretary of the HEW as to the projected cost of the health proposal. He says in this bill that costs will be involved and, for example, only utilizing the existing funds.

The Javits Bill—$66.4 million dollars.

The Griffith Bill—$35 billion dollars.

The Kennedy Bill—$77 billion dollars.

Incidentally, in the Bureau of Insurance, Social Security Administration, there were present some high officials from our local group, men who were asked by the Bureau of Health, Welfare and Security to increase the amount of money they would receive from their Medicare.

The statisticians couldn't have it because their costs to the government were 110 percent of the service they were supposed to give under Medicare. This was presented to the House Committee and this has not been published. Naturally, this has to be made public. I am sure a phone call will verify the accuracy of the fact.

I'd like to close by telling you people I had a great experience last year and the year before working with people like Canute Bernard, a real representative of the community. I am afraid that I am not at all hopeful that Congress is really involved in planning for health care delivery, and I think the people know what they want. I think the people should know what they are going to get because they're paying for it.

I think it was mentioned earlier that no matter who the individual, that he has his option, that he would prefer a one on one relationship with a private physician, in whom he had confidence, than in any form of legislation that might be passed.

Something must be reached to allow people to have this kind of choice. If they want to budget their entire medical care budget in advance, I think they have a right to do so. I think that it is unfair to the public to place a premium on one type of care of program as against the other, because the government is not going to deliver.

It did not deliver under the Medicare and the Medicaid programs. I do not think they are going to be able to serve the public and the people who don't get the care, who are going to be created and again they are going to complain and not realize it is due wholly to the legislators.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you for your talk.

Dr. SCHLOSSMAN. I will be glad to respond to anything you want me to.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think there are a couple of people that have a comment. Do you want to identify yourself, please?

Dr. AMEDO D'ADAMO. I agree that the ethics of the delivery of health care is important to discuss. But there is one thing I should like to comment on and that is your response and the response of the President-Elect of this Medical Society to defend himself from Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin has said the following. That one of the main problems here in Queens is the question of quality and be pointed out of the 20 medical specialties, Queens Hospital Center is training only in 11, and other hospitals in Queens only have 3 or 5 or 6 of these various specialities available in terms of training.

Now, what I would like to know is, as a person who recognizes that in medical school principles you only go so far; training in internship brings you only so far. What I would like to know what you propose to do, what the president-elect of this society proposes to do, what Congressman Rosenthal proposes to do, what Dr. Cicero proposes to do—in terms of getting the proper kind of educational facilities for this city of 2 million people.

Dr. FREILICH. Before you answer, I would like to make one correction. You mentioned Queens. The other city hospital in Queens, Elmhurst, has a full staff of specialties, and in addition to Queens General, Elmhurst has also a—

Dr. D'ADAMO. I think there are things that I would like to comment on relative to that in a few moments.

Dr. SCHLOSSMAN. I just wanted to repeat what Dr. Martin has said, but I have worked with Dr. Martin in trying to bring a medical school here in Queens because there is great need for a medical school in this community.

There is no question but that the health care in the community would be vastly improved by a medical complex centered around a medical school. I have certain definite opinions as a former attache, as to the kind of training it should offer.

I feel that this community needs a medical school that would produce physicians—physicians who are oriented in primary care. I think the Buffalo School and Sherry Medical School would be appropriate for a town like this which have eight medical schools turning out those people we need—

Dr. D'AMATO. May I point out statistics in terms of medical acceptance, the actual training of physicians. I think for the public here in Queens this thing will be very helpful in understanding what need there is for a medical school here in Queens.

There are a total of about 120,000 applications for medical schools of which New York City institutions get about 16,000, which means we get in this city about one out of every six applicants for medical school, which implies, of course, that we can pick and choose, get the best students available for medical training.

Countrywise, one out of every ten applicants—countrywise, is accepted. Here in New York City one out of 20 applicants. So, here in New York City we are picking and choosing what we hope are the best of the crop of young people.

However, it is important to point out that in terms of the people actually chosen, 53 percent of the people actually chosen to go to medical school here in New York City are not residents of the State of New York.

Countrywise, this figure is one out of every three. So, in terms of the facilities which we have available in New York City more people are being trained here in New York City who do not live in New York State than any other place in the country, with the exception of Washington, D.C.

Now, this, Congressman Rosenthal, is important from your point of view to take a look at these statistics, because what it means is that New York City facilities are being used to train many physicians who are going to other areas in this country.

The last point I want to make is, as follows: It is indicated in terms of training here in Queens above the M. D., that Mount Sinai now has some involvement in the residency programs of Elmhurst. Stony Brook also, I think, with its new medical school will have some involvement in the training of residents in the Queens Hosptial Medical Center.

However, doesn't it appear to you ludicrous for the people of this city or this borough of Queens to have to depend on institutions outside of the borough for this kind of training represented for the physicians who we hope will practice in Queens.

The last point I want to make is the following. That here in Queens we have the facilities to start a medical school practically overnight. We have two large municipal hosptials—Queens Hospital Center and Elmhurst Hospital Center.

You are paying your tax dollars to support those two institutions. With very little money, and it has been done in other places with very little money, a medical school with all the attendant personnel or advanced things and so on could be set up in Queens.

The decision is yours. The decision is also your representatives in the various city council and legislature and congress. I think that you should be aware of the fact that you do not have sufficient medical training here in Queens, that you have the facilities for which you are paying, that other people are realizing.

So that I think that if the public really wants first class medical service in Queens they must support the establishment of a medical school in Queens and in the very near future.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. In the discussion I want to apologize for us eating while you are not. This is something we never do in Congress where we usually take two-hour lunch hours, but we are going to work through right now and not stop.

Dr. BELLIN. About your comment, about the comments about the Queens medical school, I think we would all support the notion that the Borough of Queens deserves its own medical school, if only on the basis of its population.

Dr. MARTIN. It's in the power of the Hospital Corporation to do it.

Dr. BELLIN. One thing I think we ought to avoid using is an argument and we should avoid using certain types of parochial approaches to it. I do feel there is a little argument there, with all respect to your general argument.

I happen to be a graduate of the New York County State Medical School in Brooklyn. I was a resident at New Haven, Connecticut, when I was accepted at that school. I work here in New York City, and I have for the last five years. My brother was accepted to Utah Medical School when he was a resident of New Haven, Connecticut. He now works in the Bronx and makes house calls in areas where we need cops and he goes out there. He goes out with police very often.

I have a third brother who is now attending UCLA Medical School, whose residence is in Springfield, Masachusetts, and he will be practicing in New York.

I think before you make general comments that we are educating people outside the city, it is worthwhile to review the statistics of physicians in New York City who were educated elsewhere and were educated in medical schools outside of here.

Dr. D'ADAMO. May I comment on that. I think that you will have to revise your comment by quoting statistics. I have these statistics and they are available to you, if you wish—the facts in New York State.

We take the same proportion of out of state students than all the other institutions out of New York State, so that, obviously, in a very mobile country like the United States we have people who are educated elsewhere who come here and people who are educated here go elsewhere.

I think your three specific examples are something similar to the micra and macro physics, that the macro system doesn't necessarily correspond when you take two or three molecules and look at that.

And I maintain that you are taking two or three molecules and looking at the gross statistics. Now, the gross statistics show, and I teach in the City University, and I have the responsibility of getting new students into medical school—the gross statistics show there isn't sufficient places available to students in this area as students.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Dr. Martin, do you want to say something?

Dr. MARTIN. I have not for ten years attended one of the City's medical school and for a short time held a professional rank there. What you have said is not tenable if you know all the facts.

The facts are that there are over 10,000 medical schools in the United States. Naturally, in a country that has 200 million people, there are going to be people who have to go everywhere but there has been a relationship where students grow up, their financial ability—whether they can afford to go to that particular local medical school, get all their training in that area and they can practise where they live.

That is where it's quite true that a medical school in Queens would really produce more physicians, wholly, but that only is a point in one of the problems. Physicians will go like anybody will go where there is a quality atmosphere on which they can relate to.

You don't have that in Queens. The existence of a medical school here will not help more physicians who are wholly born and reared and get their education to stay here, but it will bring in a vast influx of physicians from elsewhere, who today have a free choice to practise where they will be happiest in their profession. They will not be happy in Queens which had inadequate quality.

Now, this need to be understood. There is no reason whatsoever why it shouldn't be understood by the Hospital Corporation, that along with its administration, that you may do it together, to bring in a medical school.

Dr. D'Adamo here, he is a teacher at York College. There are back to back to City institutions that the City has, that the taxpayers pay for, that exist in Queens, that have about 90 percent of the operational budget of the principal sources available today, and it has been done elsewhere in the United States.

In one year's time we could have had a medical school here and do the things I talked about. In the City, life will continue. Corporations will continue. A medical school, and you can look at the budgets at Columbia Presbyterian or Physicians and Surgeons, or Harvard, which bring wholly into their area some 75 million dollars a year from all sorts—federal, state and private foundations.

All that money with all their extra jobs and all those things Dr. Schlossman is referring to. All this is in the hands of our representatives and the money will be coming from—the money that is realized will be coming from 2 million people in Queens that are being shortchanged by an inadequate comprehensiveness of this problem.

This is the thing that ought to be discussed, and when it is discussed enough and everybody wants to throw it out, so be it. So, until it is discussed, you will never understand and I assure you when you do it, you will do the right service by the people. I wish you would go to it right now.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I don't want to disagree. I think we ought to mobilize all our forces, political and all our community forces, to build up and develop a medical school for Queens.

For years I highly urged the same. I do not think we should let a discussion about medical school admissions go without discussing a little bit of the need for getting a broader range of students into medical school.

I take a very narrow parochial view of this. I don't think that those that were admitted have to be someone whose father was a doctor or who has two brothers who were doctors. I think we should have a little more financial spread.

In other words, have the young people from less affluent families. One of the ways to do it is to subsidize their tuition by the various governments. I want to help correct the record a little bit about some comment Dr. Schlossman made about the Kennedy Bill and I speak on behalf of Senator Kennedy, only in behalf of his absence.

The Kennedy bill was drafted, significantly, by the AFL–CIO Health Care bill. They estimated that the cost of that proposition would be about $44 billion. Kennedy estimated $44 billion.

HEW and President Nixon estimated the cost of the Kennedy Bill would be $77 billion, so you can take your choice, whichever bill it is.

Dr. MARTIN. What is the cost of the Nixon bill?

Congressman ROSENTHAL. The Nixon bill is latched to a private insurance system, an opportunity to across the board health care, but it is usually the private interests' concept.

The Kennedy bill is to use the Social Security public concept of financing. I think the point that Kennedy made urged the health cost would be the same or less than what the American people are paying now for health care, which is about $77 billion.

In other words, Dr. Schlossman is actually correct when he says the government expenditure would be more under the Kennedy bill. Kennedy said that the American people are paying into another cash register $70 billion now and they will take that money and put it into another cash register, and they will get more back for the buck. That I think is the dispute.

Dr. SCHLOSSMAN. On the basis of the letter the government says there—they say this isn't cheaper than—

Dr. MARTIN. All federal employees are under an insurance plan.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Is Mr. Sinder here still? Did the government do anything to cheapen the private plans? Mr. Sinder is the director of the Social Security Office in Flushing and I think he has had some experiences in the health plan where the government has produced it cheaper than private industry has.

Mr. SINDER. I know as a private individual, from over 38 years, that the government can and frequently does do it cheaper than private industry.

I hate to say this but even our own experience with the physician intermediary with the Medicare program shows that they do not produce programs as well as government. It is not a question of cost but a question of how ably they perform it.

My own feeling—will you redirect that question.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Well, my question was, are there any areas that you know of where government has performed more efficiently than private enterprise?

Mr. SINDER. Well, the Social Security interests we have right now is certainly a mas-

sive undertaking, where 25 million people are the beneficiaries. 25 million beneficiaries get benefits each month.

Certainly, it is an effective matter. I think is the testimony of the government, officially—

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I would also concede and agree with Dr. Schlossman that there is a large area where government is not sufficient. It also brings to mind Lockheed and the Penn Central and a few others.

Dr. SCHLOSSMAN. It would occur to me where there are good economists on both sides, where they have a disparity in $40 billion between what it should cost. If you pardon me, Congressman Rosenthal, it should be very thoroughly investigated to find out.

Dr. MARTIN. Gentlemen, we are talking dollars. Let's talk people.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much, Dr. Schlossman. We are going to take one more witness and then give Henry, our reporter, about a three minute break.

Mrs. BLANCHE BRODY. At 4:30 last night the Committee of the Aging and Disabled for Welfare and Medicaid, a coalition of 47 organizations concerned with problems of older people in New York City, asked me to speak, so that I can only speak as a caseworker in a social agency in Forest Hills.

I would hope that my remarks on the feature of I think it is HR–1, that affects the people that I see and some of the experiences I am having as a result thereof.

I am not going to give you any horror story but these will be typical situations that we are encountering. I'd like to in passing comment that the health program proposed will offer some measure of experience to the older person concerned.

This is based on our own experience with HIP in the community where they were able to respond to crises and get there for the people. I think Dr. Bellin here is very familiar with the nursing home situation and we applaud the amendment to the Social Security Act when they tried to upgrade the quality of care in nursing homes.

However, the new amendment to the Social Security Act and the extended care facilities, which is the nursing home, the features of this are going to downgrade the services when there has hardly been any effect on the services as they exist, today.

As an example of this, there are over one hundred nursing homes, commercially run in New York City. The licensing of these nursing homes is done by the institutional review committee of the Department of Hospitals.

Of these nursing homes there are no more than a handful that are getting licenses for a year; they're being licensed two or three months at a time, which will give you some idea of the kind of care that people are getting there.

The proposals for the nursing home that administrators who currently are supposed to be licensed, will no longer need a license. Three years of experience and I don't know how that experience is defined will be the substitute.

The effects of this on nursing home care can be illustrated by the lady who came to see me yesterday, a school teacher. Her mother had a hip injury. She went into a nursing home. The reason why she went into the nursing home is because she wanted to reestablish mobility and be able to get about her business, and we are talking about a woman in her 80's. She gets social security of $76 a month. She has savings of $8,000. She is a paying patient in this nursing home, and the nursing home guaranteed to her that she was going to get physio-therapy. This was two weeks ago.

There have been no physiotherapy, and when I spoke with this woman about the quality of care her mother is getting, I think that what she stated was classic. The quality of care ranged from indifferent to sadistic, and this is in the nursing home that is very good business today for the five or six people who are operating it.

You might have asked me why she did not get private physiotherapy at home. I'd like to call your attention to the home health circulars that are available under Medicare. In New York, this means visiting nurses.

They are the authorized agencies for services in the home. They are unable to provide physiotherapy. They don't have therapists on their staff and, conseqently, this woman could not get therapy in the home, because if she tried to get it in the home it would cost her $15 every time a therapist came in the house.

VOICE. Excuse me. Do we have physiotherapists?

Mrs. BRODY. We have nothing.

VOICE. Not all the patients require the services of physiotherapists in the home but the nurses can provide physiotherapy and the patients are restored to mobility fast in their home situation. I will speak later.

Mrs. BRODY. I agree with you, but I know the problems the visiting nurses are having with providing care in the home and I am not going to take this opportunity to comment on that at any length.

I want to make a few comments about Medicare. There is going to be, if this holds true, reduction in the number of hospital days and I believe I will leave some of the comment on this to some of the hospital professionals, to the effect it will have to the individual.

I do, however, know that the committee in the hospitals are breathing down on the backs of the social workers, to empty out those beds and there is no place for those people to go.

It is impossible to get today into a nursing home. There are no beds. The Department of Social Service has a waiting list of 800 and there is—I am only talking about people who are eligible for Mediciad, who are going into homes under Medicaid, so for the individuals to get into a nursing home it is almost impossible.

I'd like to cite the example of a gentleman whose family visited me yesterday and I am giving you one of my typical days. He is 92 years old. He has no funds. He is in a private hospital where there is no social service or maybe a social service department that operates one or two days a week.

He has no Medicaid. He is well. He is able to leave the hospital and this has been true for two weeks; there is no place for him to go. The daughter he lives with works. She cannot take care of him during the day. This man cannot prepare his own meals and take care of himself.

He is, by the way, the darling of the hospital. I spoke to one of the nurses there and he is a delightful man. He doesn't need nursing care and he can't go into a nursing home because Medicare is looking very closely to the kind of people going into nursing homes.

What are you going to do with this gentleman? He can't go home, he can't stay in the hospital, he needs somebody for a few hours a day. The homes for the aged which might be an appropriate place for this gentleman are busting at the seams.

I regret the facts. The Home for the Aged, their beds are only made when someone dies. We have to be constantly working with the foolish thought that somebody has got to die before you get a bed. You can't get into the Home for the Aged.

First of all, there is a whole process of application and then one of getting on the waiting lists—waiting lists for the Home for the Aged is one year, and somewhere down the line I frankly don't know what to do with this gentleman.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Could you sum up what you see the urgent problems are and what might be the possible resolutions of the problems?

Mrs. BRODY. The major resolution for the people would be continual care for people as they need it. By this we mean, the purpose—our purpose—all our purpose is that older people be in their homes. If they were able to be cared for in their homes.

For example, last year, Representative Gilbert, of Connecticut, introduced a resolution in Congress to suggest that Medicare could cover home maintenance. You know what this means; a simple little thing like somebody coming in to wash the floor. If somebody were coming in to wash the floor in the home that means that that person is capable of maintaining a good clean house and could live there.

I bring it down to the lowest common denominator, from there we could move up the scale. There are many people who could stay home, just as if some services were provided. With some, it may be a day at the hospital. For some, it may be someone who comes in to perform services that are necessary, but these services don't just exist.

VOICE. I understand from the School District Department of FAIR that there is a housekeeping service.

Mrs. BRODY. I am not dealing with those people who are on old age assistance for the most part and, consequently, certain services are available to them, and I think the comment was made earlier that there is this big gap—there is the person in the middle and he is the guy who is really caught in the bind.

Under Medicare he is paying about $125 a year for part C, provided medical services. He has got to pay $125 because it's being taken out of his social security and you have got to pay $50 first, and he is paying money, $125, before he gets a nickel back, and then the amount he gets back is very little.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Time is fleeing. From where you sit, in your experience and in your professional background, what do you think is the most urgent problem needing attention in your area?

Mrs. BRODY. Every kind of service in the home ranging from medical services, and this ought to be cheaper—medical services; ordinary home services—someone to prepare a meal for older people, somebody to be able to come in and straighten out the house, somebody to be able to escort them to the doctor. They can't get there and the doctor isn't coming to the house.

These simple things that in the long run tend to keep up all of us and help people to live a decent, dignified life. When they are no longer able to.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Our next speaker is Dr. Daniel Martin. I apologize for bringing you on so late.

Dr. DANIEL MARTIN. I spoke before with regard to floor comment. I would like to make my statement a little more formal, not that I prepared any formal remarks but I have a formal remark.

It is the opinion of an organization, the Queens Medical and Health Program, that a group of people that were organized in Queens some three years ago—they are not doctors, they are doctors plus contributors, plus hospital administrators, plus people in the nursing profession—they're the people who put forth this particular booklet that some of you must have, which is available on the desk here, which is a survey of the inadequacy of facilities in Queens and which comes with a fundamental recommendation with regard to the fact that what Queens needs is a medical school.

Now, that sounds like a chauvinistic viewpoint because I am a physician. I am a physician with training, professorial background, etc. Let's dispense with that and let's get into proper focus.

The reason why a medical school or medical complex, grouped around a medical school, and you have to understand what a medical complex is. It is in the fullest sense of the

term a place where you can get the most up to date modern care no matter what your ailment because it's all there in quality and quantity, and with the lights on.

What I mean it's all there with all the possible standards that have been devised always being reviewed to make sure you are getting the best thing. This thing all relates to the whole community—the way they're waking up to their obligations; the way the local community hospital will have people on the staff of your hospital that also will be part of this teaching complex.

We are back to the medical school. This to and fro, back and forth, insures every school. There is a relationship of a bed and tie-up quality of care. To begin with this other thing, you will note, you will recognize the problem.

Unless you have somebody that gives you quality care, you are buying a pig in a poke; you are in a financial problem here. Nor are you sure here. Dr. Schlossman's charging Medicare inadequacies and their care of problems, and so on, that have been alluded to this morning.

The big thing that you got to recognize what you really want is an ability of care and you want it available in high quality. They said about a person who had lived 35 years in Queens and had never gone to a physician in Queens, and no member of her family had gone to a Queens doctor, but she realized the inadequacy.

I am sorry Dr. Freilich left. He made a statement, but I am tired of having statements made by people in responsible positions which are so entire inadequate. He said that the City Hospital at Elmhurst has a full range of programs.

It does not. For example, there are a number of hospitals in Queens that a patient can go to to get x-ray treatment. There is no radio x-ray therapy possible in the Elmhurst Hospital at Queens, although the people have paid for it.

There seems to be something said as to what is available and the quality. There is only one way to do that; if you all put your efforts together and do this one thing. There is only one thing you can do and that is insist upon a medical school of quality.

I have no ax to grind. I am not interested in this, personally, I am just here one doctor in Queens, but I know from extensive background what is lacking and what you need and what it will do for you.

This is a Queens forum and what we are not discussing is what is inadequate in Queens and what could be done to correct it, and we know a lot of people here who know what is in that list, both consumers and producers, and we have got people up on this background; namely, people like yourself, Congressman Rosenthal, who with the help of representatives in the Hospital Corporation could take a tool like that Municipal Hospital Corporation and make it work for the people of Queens.

Right now you are paying a fortune for the Queens Medical Center to keep going, and yet this fall 16 students from the State University at Stony Brook Medical School are going to come in there to be trained.

That will do nothing whatsoever for the Queens people, although under the state system now, and it's helping, nationally, so I am not opposed to this thing. I am talking about optimum utilization and quality level. That it will produce, itself.

I hope that somebody here who doesn't understand what I keep stressing—a medical complex, a medical center grouped around a medical school, as to how this will help everybody; if you can't understand that, I wish you would ask me the questions so I can try to prove the point.

Voice. Dr. Martin, I was born and raised in New York and I know the borough quite well, and I come from a family with medical background and I see, in Manhattan, you have three large medical centers who can do anything in the world. Every type of specialization is handled there. In the Bronx, you have development. You have Einstein and you have Montefiore and in the other boroughs they're all expanding.

The only way we expand is with taxes and population. We need services.

Voice. I have been taken care of, not in this borough. I am forced to use a private physician in Queens but for hospitalization, if I want to live, I go to Manhattan, and at a very very costly sum, and I don't think it's fair for people who are getting older to have to constantly worry about what is going to happen to you when all your life you pay taxes to this city.

Queens is a part of New York City. Why can't we have services?

Dr. Martin. You understand what I was saying now; the existence or creation of the medical school and the medical center would go along way to providing the services.

Voice. I have been to the NYU-Bellevue Complex and I know how they function. I know that Whitman is modern and up to date and it's a coordinated service, but in these other places——

Dr. Martin. Congressman Rosenthal and the Hospital Corporation representatives, why can't we do this? Why must the public be actually lied to to get this thing at a cost of $400 million, which is absolutely wrong.

Actually, elsewhere in the United States municipal hospitals have been put together, either on a private or municipal level, and it has cost practically nothing except the proper reorganization and certain there was available what we would call needs here.

Why don't we do this sort of thing, since it has been so well done elsewhere, and it's not done in New York City. In Miami, Florida, for example, you are 20 years behind what they did in Miami, Florida in terms of creating a medical school by putting it together.

They put their municipal hospital, Jackson Memorial Hospital, together with the University of Miami and presto, a medical school.

Why can't you do that in Queens? There are a number of examples of medical schools of both local hospitals and universities. I submit to you this problem is one of conscience.

I submit it to both of your representatives. Queens Hospital Center from the budget has every year $15 million budget for paying all sorts of teacher salaries, professor salaries, assistant professor salaries, part-time professor salaries, the secretaries and so on, and you are deferring that right now, the fact that this money could be used for the possible use of a medical school is proven by the fact that a hospital corporation has just agreed to a contract with Stony Brook to send its state medical students into our borough for the medical school training at the Queens Hospital Center.

Your school is right there. It should be alongside Queens Medical Center. It's going to train nurses. It's going to train medical technicians, radiotherapy technicians, etc. The fact that it is qualified at a biological level, so to speak; you have got physical and human resources and financial resources.

Now, each year it is there, so why don't we take appropriate leadership to organize it to do what has been done elsewhere. Why don't you get together and do it?

Congressman Rosenthal. Let me ask the fellow from the State to comment on that. Dr. Cicero.

Dr. Cicero. The first thing I just want to clarify I am not part of the Health Corporation. I am not trying to evade the issue, but our feeling was, like you, we did look to the Health and Hospital Corporation to see what we were going to do in this area.

The medical school is one thing. The primary access is another and I don't think that the medical school of itself, and I want to tell you, Dr. Martin, that I did read your brochure and I am very impressed with it, except for the final conclusion.

After a complete, very exhaustive, and thorough outline of all the problems you ended with your one recommendation, and that is the medical school complex.

Here today, it's the same thing. I would have liked to have seen a development of the explanation of what that medical school complex, the feeding of the neighborhood care centers, bringing things out in the community, which to the people are important.

Now, you are excited and I recognize you are trying to make your point. I think that these people might not grasp it. I assume that is the point you are trying to make.

Dr. Martin. I am glad you brought it up because I think it is important, that this exists. You can talk to some doctors and they will, with a great deal of gesticulation, say, "Bosh, a medical school does not do anything for you in the community," and the reason why they will say it, because they will be able to point to some of yesterday's medical schools.

If they're still in existence, the way they functioned yesterday: what we in the academic world call "Ivory Towers." They hold to themselves and holier than thou.

Well, the hue and cry of that, within the last five years, of the die-hard Ivory Towers, well they have begun to turn, and they're beginning to turn, and you know they are ultraprivate institutions and they will take a long time before they will break tradition.

In Queens there are none. There is nothing such as that here. There is much available at the level where the people can benefit. If we took the Queens Hospital Complex—after all, we didn't want to write a thousand page essay on hospitals—if we took the Queens Hospital Center and your hospital, and if we took one of the City institutions such as York College as your academic institution, and established, made it clear in the original formal understanding that would be appointment from each community—that is qualified appointments on a teaching staff, which they would have to arrange back and forth to their hospitals, this would keep things moving.

Many of you people—Congressman Rosenthal is a lawyer. He had to go to law school. I dare say he couldn't—that he doesn't feel that he could go back as a law student. He knows from what he has learned in law school, from his private practice, that he could keep abreast of what changes has happened in the institutes.

This is not true with the profession of medicine that may be very unique. There is no way, whatsoever, so today's most brilliant medical school graduate to be any good five years after he graduates if he isn't put into a learning atmosphere. He just knows the nitty-gritty practice of taking care of the patients. The patients are too ignorant to ask him questions of what he is doing, because there is a natural development between the lay person and the doctor, so he finds it very easy to take care of people and—

You take this same doctor and put him in a hospital where there is an intern and resident and medical student, people who are somewhat knowledgeable about the field but still learning, and either they have gotten out of medical school or into medical school, or are a resident, and who has certain knowledge and he is now asking questions.

Now, the doctor in that situation has to answer a question by a layman, in which he is told by a pat on the back, "You go home and I will take care of you." He knows he has an answer.

The answer has to be up to date with medical literature and other things. That means you have a built-in situation. Every-

thing built in a self-perpetuating doctor of quality, and you have got to have in medicine this quality, and I know of no other profession where this is needed more, where it is gotten by simply doing what I am talking about.

Now, you can't say give him a medical degree and forget about him. It's all a resident situation. It can be done in every area of the Borough of Queens. It can be, and if you do set it up that way, and that is exactly what I have talked about, you will find it in here.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think we ought to ask Dr. Bellin to comment about it.

Dr. BELLIN. I can't think of anything official that we are opposed to establishing a medical school in Queens. I think you might know there is a group in the Borough of Richmond starting to get a medical school started in Staten Island as well, and you know Richmond is the forgotten, one of the last boroughs.

Dr. MARTIN. I said Richmond County has a total of 1,581 beds in all of Richmond County, and you're citing in Queens where there are a total of 12,769 beds, and you are trying to relate one borough to the other in the sense of need.

Dr. BELLIN. I think you are making a mistake in the message you didn't want to hear, where you are the messenger, where you didn't try to address yourself to the message. I think it is necessary to look at the issue of the medical school on its merit.

First of all, there is no argument in this room that there ought to be a medical school in Queens. I think, however, that in supporting this point of view, I think we ought to avoid using as an argument for this that this thing can be done at very very little cost. There is no such thing as a medical school that has ever been put up in the United States, at least in the last 25 or 30 years, that has been done at very little cost.

I am familiar with medical school economics. When I was in Massachusetts, when I was Health Commissioner of the City of Springfield, Mass., six years ago I had occasion to work on the establishment of the University of Massachusetts Medical School in the state.

Dr. MARTIN. You were engaged in the physical development?

Dr. BELLIN. I was engaged in the beginning of it and so engaged until the time I left Massachusetts. Let me just comment. You cannot do it for nothing, you cannot do it for a small amount of money. It's going to cost money. Let's not delude ourselves. Let's not delude the people. It's going to cost money and let's spend the money.

Dr. MARTIN. These are the exact figures that were given by the dean.

VOICE. You can always get money when you are interested in it.

Dr. BELLIN. Dr. Martin, you made a point that this could be done with very little money. This is generalization. I take exception to that. I think this wrong. It's going to cause—

Dr. MARTIN. You don't want to give me the specifics, do you?

Dr. BELLIN. I think I want to speak on the issue we are meeting here today on. I think the medical school issue is only one and is only one of the issues involved in the general issues, that I think we are all here this morning on.

The issue is how to get more medical care to the people, who need it so desperately. I think the medical school is one way of doing it. It is only one way. I think there are many other ways that need consideration, that perhaps would cost just as much, at a time when the City is undergoing a desperation situation of finances.

The issue is to maintain many services, tuberculosis, public health, and whether they can maintain these services that are currently used by many of the people. I look around the room and I don't see many people with black faces who are in the room. I think these are some of the people that have to be taken care of.

I think we ought to address ourselves to some of these issues, and many of these other issues that we are concerned about.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. At this point we will continue the hearing, but we will give our reporter a chance to rest.

Dr. BELLIN. I didn't imply that you didn't know what you are talking about. I just said it did cost money.

Dr. MARTIN. We are talking about trying to establish something that is good, and we can't forget about money, can we? Then the issue as to how to get a proper leadership to do what is to be done, because nobody knows the problem more.

I am trying to have representatives of the State to try to get up to the point of trying to reach the people and pick up one bill after another, trying to establish a new medical bill which is going to cost $200 million or $300 million or $400 million when you know that kind of money can't be possible.

But I am saying that is immediately practical and in the hands of our representatives to do something with, if they will.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I think there are two young people who wish to say something. A young lady over there.

VOICE. I beg your pardon, Dr. Martin. I have just come in here since I have been at work. It seems to me right now I heard a contradiction. First of all, I heard you crying about money for a medical school. Will you please let me finish and then you can answer.

In the next breath I heard the problem isn't money. It seems to me that an American public isn't that stupid. We have known for years that the American Medical Association has deliberately impeded the creating, the building and the everything else that go with a medical school in order to keep a scarcity of doctors.

Don't try to tell me that this is a lot of nonsense because, on the one hand you said that money isn't a problem, and in the next breath you say money is a problem.

Are you crying to us when our medical bills are already so high, when I personally have found in case of an emergency in New York City, that the New York City police are much more responsible, that my next door neighbor who was a nurse after 12 hours is much more responsible, that the average human being is much more responsible—are you crying to us that you want us to support you.

What problem of Medicare is concerned?

Dr. MARTIN. What you say, you came in late so I don't think you possibly understood, fully.

VOICE. I understand what is going on because I have been following the news and I also read the journals.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. You won't want to answer her now, do you?

Dr. MARTIN. There was some talk about the fact that medical schools do cost a lot of money and they do, depending on the circumstances. That is why I mentioned my Arizona example. But here in Queens, it will cost virtually no money to create a medical school.

There was actually a difference in what we are talking about in terms of money. What you say is quite true that the American Medical Association was adamantly opposed. You must know, and I am not an AMA devotee, even that their attitude has changed. There is, for example, organizations in the United States including the AMA that feel there should be more medical schools.

My point is there are ways to get medical schools without getting a lot of money and we have that way right here if we will grasp the opportunity.

VOICE. You are kind of kicking yourself again. You said the problem in Queens isn't money. Now, you said they're waiting for money. It seems to me—

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Let's not belabor that issue. Dr. Martin, did you want to say anything? Did you want to ask a question that Dr. Martin might respond to?

VOICE. I do want to say one thing. I think a medical school can be established as an adjunct to Elmhurst very quickly. You don't need so much money, just like a few classrooms.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. That is what Dr. Martin says.

VOICE. The last two year student in a hospital, put them in obstetrics or gynecology and have them learn, and if the government is going to subsidize any medical student, let them do what Mexico did. Require a student that is going to be a G.P. for two years wherever the government wants to send him.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Something I mentioned earlier. We have to move this along. Do you want to say something?

VOICE. I think we would all appreciate that we sorely need a medical school in Queens, that we would want you to present this and to take further consideration about it, but there are many other concerns today that we should be concerned with and we are spending more than this half morning or the day right now discussing the need for a medical school.

There are traffic problems in the area that have not been spoken of.

VOICE. One question I would like to bring out. The cost of a medical school which might be very well for the Borough of Queens and perhaps for the city, what assurances would we have? We see the Columbia empire, the Einstein empire, that are in very bad urgency if the directors of those hospitals do not reside in the city. Many of their patients do not come from the city.

I say if you utilize the city hospital in Queens, if we utilize the universites that are available as part of our tax money, what assurance are we going to have that the people who live in Astoria and Long Island City where there is a scarcity of hospitals, people in South Ozone Park, people in the Eighth Congressional District who will be the recipients of this kind of care?

Doors are closed. They use Medicare patients, large numbers of them. Harlem Hospital is overburdened.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. You know we are going into a real problem. People are going to be offended. See if you can narrow the question, now.

VOICE. What assurance are we going to have if this medical center, if it comes to Queens, will be for Queens and will help us and not like an empire to help other people?

Dr. MARTIN. We had the meeting on May 13th in order to answer all possible questions, to show what exists, particularly your Columbia example is absolutely true but the difference between Columbia and Queens, Columbia is an entirely private corporation and every private corporation in America is, by and large, they have their own private considerations to consider and to do what it will.

In Queens, you would have the taxpayers to make the decision. Elsewhere, legal documents have been written, very formal, very well drawn up by lawyers, to show that the medical school should be functioning in such a fashion.

Now, this is a taxpayer's judgment and one that is subject to a law suit by any citizen. The fundamental requirement of that is a document. So it can only be done, and it has been done elsewhere. Finally, I just want to answer—I am sorry I didn't explain enough to you. You couldn't begin to talk about health at all if you didn't have a doctor.

VOICE. A doctor, and a doctor's assistant, and a nurse and a social worker, and a home health aide—I think there is entirely too much emphasis upon the doctor in this whole picture and in this whole medical school.

Dr. MARTIN. I am trying to explain what you need is the raw material to achieve what you are trying to achieve. All your raw material comes out of a modern medical complex. When you say medical school, it has to have a teaching hospital; where somebody says health complex, we know we mean the same thing.

I am afraid you might have misunderstood me. What you mean is something that not only produces the raw material as the nurse, physician's assistant—you know, all the levels that you are concerned with, including the doctor, but it is of such a quality that it pulls people into it from outside who want to practice here, who want to be near their home, and these are the people who are practising it that will be your community physician and your community specialist.

Unless you set up your raw material as you begin, this gentleman is correct, whether it be Elmhurst General or the Queens Hospital Center, we have got to do it right here. When you do that, everything else can proceed from there, including a lowering of many doctor's fees.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much, Dr. Martin. Our next speaker is Mr. Paul Lerth.

Mr. PAUL LERTH. Maybe I don't have to go up there. I think you will hear me.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Why don't you stand up here.

Mr. LERTH. When I heard about this meeting today I was surprised to hear that a Congressman was calling a conference on health because I don't recall any before. Maybe I didn't follow it enough, but I thought it quite a thing and I decided to come down here and listen in.

At the outset, the Congressman said that he wants to listen to the man in the street. I am afraid this Congressman hasn't heard very much from the man in the street. (Applause) It is not enough for the doctors and others in the medical establishment to iron out their difficulties and disputes between voluntary and the private hospitals, and so on.

The main thing here is to find out whether the people are getting the correct health care. That is what I think they want to know in Washington.

In connection with the White House conference on aging we were supposed to in 1970 have the voice of the older American heard to determine the needs of the older people. I myself found out then that the needs of the people must be considered first, and I think it would be a good idea for the Congressman to call another meeting next week or a little later and bring down people from the centers and slums of senior citizens and bring down people who belong to the neighborhood organizations, whatever they are, and different kinds of organizations that exist.

A few weeks ago I attended a conference on Neighborhoods in Action, at Julia Richman High School. There were 1500 people there from all over the city and they lined up in 40 different classrooms, in workshops, to consider a special topic and devote several hours to it. Not only to tell the conditions but to tell what they thought should be done, and I think that example should be used and I think also on the basis here of Queens, that there should be not just one Congressman calling a meeting; there could be in all Queens sections, of all people working together, not only the Congressmen, but the State Assemblymen and the State Senators, and the members of the City Council from Queens.

Because it's not only a national question; it's a state question as well as a city question. I want to spend a moment on the doctors here and the health plan. I think that if you people in Queens or anywhere else know the difference, sufficiently, between President Nixon's plan and the AMA plan or medical associations, which are more or less alike, and the Health Care Security Act, because President Nixon's and the AMA plans are insurance plans, as well have been pointed out to you by the Congressman.

They want to have the insurance companies give policies for workers and so that they get their commissions, but it would not affect the health care that we get.

The Griffiths-Kennedy Bill, S–3, HR–22, these bills do provide for trying to improve the delivery of health care to the people. That is the main point, its main virtue. I think it should be supported on the platform by the representatives of the medical profession who attacked that plan, and I want to go back to Medicare in 1965.

What did the doctors say? I don't mean the average doctor; I mean the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association. They attacked the Medicare plan as a plan to destroy the doctor-patient relationship.

Was that true? It was false. It was intended to scare people away from the Medicare plan and to get Congress not to adopt it, and the same thing is being done now. Now, they say if the Kennedy plan goes through you are going to destroy the doctor and patient relationship, and, on the other hand, when they talk about group insurance, they say that many people despite belonging to group insurance still go to their doctor.

So where is the destruction of the doctor-patient relationship? It's a fiction. It just does not exist. They say the same thing for group health insurance. They opposed it when it first came out and now they're for it.

How did they spend their time? Did they tell you what's good about it? No. They told you what's wrong about it, which means that they are against it, that they are for the fee for payment plan. They want to maintain the profession as it is, the practices as they are, the fees not as they are but they go higher, and remember that they are earning a terrific amount every year on the average.

I don't want to go into an attack on it. There are doctors who are dedicated but they don't belong to organizations. They don't run the organizations. The House of Delegates runs it from the top and they spend millions and more dollars every year on propaganda.

If you look at your newspapers, you will be seeing ads about the doctors, and they will soon come out with arguments against the Griffiths-Kennedy bill.

Now, these are the main points I wanted to bring out. I did not like the fact that one older person got up and said a businessman such as he had to talk for them, that the older people cannot talk for themselves. That is not true.

The fact that older people are not given the chance to talk for themselves, whether it is in hearings or anywhere else, and that too often the representatives organizations are those that talk for the older person, and I think that is wrong.

Just one other point. Two years ago I believe Congress passed a bill for neighborhood health centers. I don't know too much about them, but that is something that should be encouraged. It should be extended.

There are a lot of things that have been done by government for the people. The trouble is they pile on the plans. They try it out here and they try it out there. When it's over, they just drop. They don't give them any more money. It practically dies out because in too many cases local officials don't have the funds to continue the program.

In conclusion, I want to thank the Congressman for calling a meeting like this and I hope he continues to get down further to the people who are getting the services or not getting the health services and continue this until you solve your problems and get good health service in Queens. (Applause)

Congressman ROSENTHAL. The next speaker is Murray Rimmer, Assistant Administrator at Long Island Jewish Medical Center.

Mr. MURRAY RIMMER. I am Murray Rimmer. I am Assistant Administrator of Long Island Jewish Center. Thank you for this opportunity to share our views with you. I am in charge of Ambulatory Services, speaking today for Dr. Robert K. Match, Director of Long Island Jewish Medical Center, a 450-bed community hospital responsible for staffing, teaching and medical services at a 1200-bed municipal hospital, Queens Hospital Center.

Dr. Match has had a long involvement with health insurance plans. He is known throughout the country as an authority on pre-paid group practice and is presently the prime mover in the organization of an Institute for Community Health at Long Island Jewish Medical Center. He was unable to attend this hearing today and asked me to present the following statement for him;

Community hospitals, traditionally a political, have rarely taken a public stand in matters of health care. In view of the inadequacies of todays health delivery system, I feel that the time is long since past for their involvement. As the Congressman is well aware, problems in the borough of Queens mirror those throughout our country.

The cost of medical care is rising far more rapidly than other costs during the inflationary period.

High quality health care and a comprehensive array of medical services are largely unavailable to low income people.

The poor receive virtually no dental care.

Few of us can afford catastrophic illnesses.

Physician shortages in the city are growing more severe while enrollment capacity in medical schools remains almost static.

Nursing, paramedical and ancillary health personnel are in short supply. Neighborhood health centers, mass mobile disease detection services and community health programs are urgently needed.

These are some of the problems we share with the rest of the country. What is unique to Queens is that its growth in population has been disproportionate to the growth of its health care facilities. Queens lacks a medical school. The number of its voluntary hospitals is small. Large segments of the population are not served by health facilities or programs. In many areas of the borough there is an acute shortage of physicians. These deficiencies call for correction.

What we need in Queens and what the country as a whole needs is a new system of health care. A change in the health care delivery system can only come about through a national health program which would provide the financial base required to restructure the system.

We must concern ourselves with the establishment of outpatient services designed to maintain good health, to prevent or predict the onset of disease, to treat illness in its earliest possible states. We must provide comprehensive ambulatory care with standards built in so that the quality of care can be measured.

Incentives must be built into the system so that efficiency of operation can be recognized. Outpatient services demand the highest priority in the redevelopment of the health care system. This approach makes sense not only in human terms, but also in economic terms. There have been countless statistical demonstrations proving that comprehensive outpatient care results in fewer hospital admissions. This has a profound effect on cutting the rising cost of health care.

It is my opinion that group practise or-

ganizations can best provide the continuity, availability and broad spectrum of services to which the consumer is entitled. Within the group setting, each family unit is assigned a single family physician who manages the family's health needs. There are specialists in all fields to whom the family can be referred.

Care is provided on an on-going basis—not just in a crisis situation. Group practise is inherently more economical than solo practise—costly equipment is shared, manpower is utilized more effectively, and most significant—expensive hospitalizations are often avoided. The pre-payment factor in group practise provides for a sharing of the costs by the consumer, thereby creating a sound fiscal foundation.

The absence of physicians in certain areas of Queens, as well as the rest of the city, may very well be solved through the establishment of group practises which offer physicians the opportunity to practise in an exciting professional environment where peer review results in the creation of standards of quality designed to provide the highest calibre of care.

Not only must we address ourselves to the delivery of care on a one-to-one basis, we must also look toward the development of diagnostic testing systems outside of hospitals where mass screening can take place for early detection of disease and where norms may be established for healthy people so that comparisons may be made when illness occurs.

We must also attack community health problems on a broader scale than we have done in the past. I refer to prevention, detection and treatment of drug abuse and addiction, alcoholism, venereal disease, sickle cell anemia and lead poisoning. I refer to methadone clinics, therapeutic residential communities and half-way houses for the rehabilitated drug addict or alcoholic.

We must meet the needs of the community by training paramedical personnel and other health professionals. I speak of physician's assistants, community health workers, home health aides, and mental health aides. We must hasten to develop curricula in our educational institutions to encourage participation in health delivery—not only to fill the void in this area, but to provide job opportunities to the disadvantaged.

We in hospitals are now trying to learn from the community its health needs so that we can be more responsive. We ask that we may be involved in the legislative process to the extent that we make known the needs of the population we serve as well as contribute our own thinking.

We at Long Island Jewish Medical Center have already started planning an Institute for Community Health which will house many of the services already discussed. It is my sincere hope that this will be the first of many such community facilities to come.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you, today.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much.

Mr. BRUNO B. LASK. My name is Bruno Lask. I am not a resident of Queens; however, I do make my living in the Borough of Queens. I am in the paramedical profession. I own a telephone answering service in Queens.

At first, I thought I was in the wrong business. I didn't know we were here to speak on Medicaid. My problem I feel is your problem. We have had too many complaints during the night, "I can't reach my doctor." If I am out of order, Congressman—

Congressman ROSENTHAL. It sounds like you are out of order.

Mr. LASK. We have had too many complaints through the medical societies that I can't reach my doctor. Now, there is no such animal that you can't reach your doctor.

Every doctor has or should have a telephone answering service. I am not here to sell a telephone answering service; I don't need the extra business.

The thing is that your doctor may not be available at the particular moment you called him. If he doesn't answer the telephone answering service, why his wife will answer it. After all, he is a human being. He has the responsibility and he likes his time off, too, but he can always be reached.

There was a time when there were not enough people available to cover a doctor on his day off, which is frequently a Wednesday or a Sunday, naturally, or a Friday. Every telephone answering service in Queens has available an accredited panel. By accredited I mean they have been sanctioned by the Medical Society of Queens, resident physicians who are licensed and covered by insurance, who will answer through the telephone answering service.

They will reach you and they will answer any question you may have, or make a house call in any place in Queens, 24 hours a day.

I heard Dr. Schlossman, the incoming president, say there are doctors who won't go to certain areas of Queens. That isn't so. There are people that will go to any part of Queens, day or night. If they do not want to go or if the patient does not want a house call, they will make an advice call over the telephone. The only time you can't get a doctor if you tell the telephone answering service—my files are full of calls like that where the patient refuse the advice or house call of a covering physician.

Now, I am here just to tell you that we are available, that doctors are available. The problem is that the public does not make use of it. We have also had cases of narcotics.

There is a voluntary association of rabbis, ministers and priests in Queens called "Faith and Narcotics." All it requires, in the event of an addict or a person who knows of or who has need of help—it all requires one phone call and the answering service will reach the priest or rabbi of his choice, of the person who wants to be counselled. This is strictly an anonymous situation, and this is a very necessary service that we furnish, and I want you to know that the terrible narcotics problem we have had in the borough of Queens—it's getting worse every day.

The month of May we took two calls. Something is wrong somewhere, and we have gotten some degree of publicity through the Long Island Press and New York Sunday News, and we get two calls a month on narcotics of people who desire counselling on narcotics. This to me is ridiculous.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Is Alex Sheina here?

Mr. ALEX SHEINA. I am affiliated with the Machinists Union, Local 797, International Union. For the past two years I have been appointed as Health Education and Welfare Chairman of this local and one of the functions of the local, and under this position I have been looking through the aspects of our medical problems.

As I sat here, I heard them mocking Medicare and Medicaid and now the health program. Medicare is not as good as it should be for one reason. For every time you turn around the doctors up their prices, and the cost of Medicare went up.

Medicaid the same thing. No matter what labor does for the workers. It improves medicine; along comes the doctor and jacks his prices up and we are always second best. Many people have Blue Cross and Blue Shield and they're supposed to be fully covered but, you know, when you go to your doctor, if you had an operation, Blue Cross charges so much and then the doctor adds another fee on it.

If that doctor belongs to Blue Shield he won't accept that fee as full payment. In Brookdale, if you are over 35 you can get a completely free examination—oral cancer, x-ray, blood pressure and lung function for cancer. This is free for the residents of Brooklyn.

This we haven't got here. For the past two years I was going along and taking clips out of the paper concerning mental problems. As far as Queens goes, very little.

You talk about diagnostic care, which was mentioned here. The City workers they have GHI. Well, under GHI you are allowed to have a free medical checkup once a year. Why I bring this out, I think a medical checkup is important to each of us and, normally, we can afford to have a checkup. We don't go to the doctor unless we are sick.

If we are sick, then we go into the hospital. As I said, in Brooklyn they have this free checkup. Once a year they should have it. Those that have GHI, they get a free checkup. I would like those people who represent us in Queens do something about getting this for us so we can get this free examination.

Through my union, one of the shops in our local, CIC sent us notice through the telephones to examine your heart. Two years ago, I took this computer. I set it up in the American Legion Hall on 43rd Avenue and for a $5 fee we had an electrocardiogram, we had a lung cancer, blood pressure check, and a couple of others. This is for $5.

This can be done if the people in the community and the doctors want to participate. We can get this thing done cheap. As I say, every time you turn around there is always the kickback. I'd like to see the doctors do something for a change to help. They talk about medical schools, to make things better for us, but what happens? They up their prices every time you turn around.

Once in a while you get emergencies, Saturday night and Sunday. Go down to the so-called city hosptial. You are not going to get the emergency treatment. All doctors are away for the weekend. They will leave the interne and to take care of the whole hospital.

About a week ago in Flushing Medical Hospital a woman, 80 years old, was brought in with a broken hip. It was 12 hours before she could get help. This is a weekend. You shouldn't do these things. You shouldn't get hurt on the weekend.

Another thing about doctors is the five day week, never Saturday and Sunday. They will not come on Saturday or Sunday. No tests or anything to be performed on the weekend. All the technicians are off over the weekend.

In one hospital that I took an active interest in, this is a hospital in Queens, they're actually doing something for the people. Not only are they doing something—

Congressman ROSENTHAL. What hospital?

Mr. SHEINA. Peninsula General Hospital in Far Rockaway. In fact, they ask whether you can come down to belong, they ask you to come down and give recommendations. About the only one I ever heard of.

I have this paraphernalia that I will leave with you. You can look at all of it. Plus there is one more thing. We have a something like a Lions Club. The Lions Club in this county was responsible for a Kidney test. It's not like a urine test.

I happened to get 4,000 which I passed out to my local. It is not that foolproof but actually gives a person an idea if there is anything wrong. This is a test for kidneys and also for diabetes.

But there are ways and means of having these checkups. The important thing is prevention.

If we could stay the hell out of the hospital, we are better off. If we go for checkups once a year, which we can't afford, but these health plans should cover it.

VOICE. There is a suggestion I want to make on the Medicare program.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Why don't you say what it is?

VOICE. When you sign an assignment form, you sign it in blank. The doctor never lets

the patient know what he is going to bill you for. That is wrong, because it happened to me, and you put a terrific bill in, but I wouldn't pay him.

I am a lawyer. I said, "You better go ahead and sue me." I want it understood when a patient signs an assignment form the patient should be given a copy with a correct diagnosis of what he has done for the patient, because a lot of doctors, while they may have a proper file based upon 1965 fees, they charge you exorbitant fees.

I can tell you from my own experience that should be a requirement of law, and also a check I think on Blue Shield which audits all all these bills. They allow a doctor to charge $25 merely when you cross the threshold of his door, a fee of $25, plus what he does for you, and that is wrong.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Our next speaker is Marilyn Liota.

Mrs. MARILYN LIOTA. I know that many of you are tired. I am tired, too. Here are the things I have to say. I represent the Visiting Nurses Service which covers the boroughs of Queens, the Bronx and Manhattan.

I am situated in Queens. In 1970, the Visiting Nurse Service made 91,748 visits, just our non-professional staff. Our nurses made 77,801 visits. My office is in Astoria. This is northwest Queens. My office made over 40,000 visits last year with a staff of 16 registered nurses, 30 home health assistants.

I know what the problems are. The main problem is that there are no health services in our area.

I want to concern myself with three items. One, the Medicaid cutback. The legislature informed us that, inadvertently, it cut all home health benefits. If this error was in fact inadvertent, then restore it.

When I say that home health benefits have been cut out and there are several law suits pending at this time, it means that no transportation services will be available, no nursing visits will be paid for, no home health visits will be paid for.

There have been very serious cutbacks in Medicaid, and May 15th past we were supposed to terminate services to many people who were receiving them and who needed them. I don't want to play upon your sympathies, but I think one good example of this situation would make you realize how serious this is.

Let's say there is a man 50. He has a very very severe, hopeless neurological condition. He lives with his wife and his son. He is terminal. He wouldn't die at home. We have had a home and health aide with him for the past year. She bathes him, she feeds him, she transfers him. This victim—this man was a victim of Nazi Germany.

His wife, his son, they escaped. They came to this country, but the wife tells me, "But America will take my aid away. You mean I will have to stop working and become a welfare recipient, so I can stay at home and take care of my husband?"

This legislature cut back on Medicaid to take away home health benefits. It's going to result in a return of all the people we have take care of in the home to the institutions, who are already overburdened, and cannot cope with the influx of these in-patients.

Let's talk about transportation. We have housing. It covers 300 aged and handicapped people in Astoria, Queens. It's a wonderful concept. There is no one in the community who made a home visit to this place.

If you are handicapped, you cannot negotiate a hill to get over to a bus, and you need three buses to get to the city hospital in Elmhurst. The HIP Medical Center likes to see its patients at the center. If a patient needs transportation, he cannot get it.

We had a man the other day who felt he was going to commit suicide. His wife had died. They had just moved into Good Will. I had tried to make transportation to take him to an after care clinic which is also closed down and because of money was cut back, the Queens Aftercare Clinic.

I was told by the city representative that we could not get any transportation for this man because it would cost too much—call an ambulance. He was rational. He was well. If I called the ambulance and sent him to Elmhurst he would not be admitted because he said he would like to commit suicide; he would have to be in a coma first, and then they would take him to Elmhurst.

I could go on and on, thinking twice about many of the situations we have. Let me give one more. We have a woman who is 93. We have been taking care of her four years. When we started four years ago, an aide was with her two hours a day. Now, she is 93 and she is still alive and she is very alert, and a little more debilitated and she needs four hours of care a day, but she is being one of the Medicaid cutbacks and we have brought her to a point where she can barely keep alive. She probably will die when her services are withdrawn.

Our home health aides are all people in the low income area. If we are forced to cut back and not give out home health aid services, we will of course have to release our home health aides. Our home health aides will become home welfare recipients and the city will be paying more money.

The other situation is long term illness. If you have a long term illness you do not qualify for assistance under Medicare. The booklet that comes to you dated April 1970 does not tell you clearly what the benefits are. It tells you that you may have skilled nursing care from accredited agency. We are an accredited agency. We are the ones giving you care at home.

The contract with the skilled nursing care we use is two and a half pages long, and I am not a lawyer, and we don't understand it. If you think your doctor has ordered a nurse to come and see you, you are wrong, and because you had cataracts and the doctor wants you to have eye drops and you haven't been arthritic, and you have to be blind in that other eye and can't negotiate that eye dropper, that is too bad, because Medicare pays for three visits.

It's in our booklet. You have to accept it from the nurses and its not in writing. If you had a fractured hip, Medicare will cover three nursing visits to teach you how to check your cast.

If you are 90 years old and most of your patients are above 80, you cannot manage at home taking care of your cast, you can't cook, you can't eat, you can't shop—our home health aides are the ones providing you with food, with sustenance and with custodial care included in the law.

One other thing, the Queensborough Bridge Health Maintenance Clinic in the Queensbridge project—well, 1400 people over the age of 60 are housed in that project. There is an ambulatory clinic for maintenance in Queensbridge for 600 people. There are no transportation services now available to that clinic. The City has not seen fit to restore transportation services for it, but the hospital for that clinic is Elmhurst Hospital. It cannot transport the patients to clinics.

It means that if an aged person can walk to this clinic, and has to be transported to Elmhurst for a cast, for an x-ray for further diagnostic test, this can't be done.

I will just conclude with a few facts which were in existence before the Medicaid cutbacks so you can see we were concerned with what is happening to our total population.

There was a questionnaire and it was distributed to all nurses in the Visiting Nurse Service. It's based on the examples of 734 cases who were receiving home health aide services. Of those cases, 390 were in Queens.

The number of patients in the whole setup receiving public assistance was 364. The number of patients not receiving public assistance was 370, so there is both sides of the coin.

We asked the questions, what would the probable alternative be if home health services were discontinued? 394 cases would return to institutions. Institutional care would cost much more than home care. An employed member would have to stay home.

82 of these cases; an employed member would go on health assistance, 99 of those cases, a patient would probably manage on survival basis, 19.

We studied many other things. I deplore the conclusion of home health benefits with this current legislation.

Dr. CICERO. I just want to reinforce your statement about the Social Security Administration definition of skilled nursing care, both as applied to the home health aide services and as it applies to the nursing home, benefit and Medicare.

Our viewpoint and I just communicated this to the Social Security Administration is that it is a truly outrageous definition of those eligible for benefits.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much. Mrs. Ruth Levitt.

Mrs. RUTH LEVITT. There were several statements made earlier today as to patients not utilizing the health services that are available in their area and I think I have heard peculiar examples that may be true and the suggestion that this be corrected.

For example, there is the problem of a mother who has to care for herself with three little children. She has to travel to the clinic, with the two or three children. She has to keep two or three children there two, three or four hours to take care of them.

What we do need is a child care center in the hospital which we could have in any major health facility. Actually, we did have that at Elmhurst Hospital. However, because it was necessary to make the treatment center, it was removed.

I think if funds were available, there should be the establishment of that there and other facilities, and also we have some parents who have problems of their own, actually at the clinics, of older children who have their little problems and they have to all see the doctors, and the parents are so overwhelmed by all the problems they have.

Therefore, I think it would be of help if you would establish comprehensive clinics where arrangements could be made to have all the doctoring this particular family needs on that one time or possibly two times. In that way you could take care of them.

I also wanted to mention one other thing. I think that alcoholism is a problem here now very much in Queens. When you have one alcoholic patient, you really have a whole family because the children are really maltreated, money is spent on drink and the children are not eating properly, and it should be very much considered as far as the problem is concerned.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. J. M. Magoolaghan.

Mr. J. M. MAGOOLAGHAN. I am from Creedmoor State Hospital. I am here representing our director who could not make it. I have been hearing a very excellent seminar on the health care administration and health care clinics. It's a good refresher course. As an administrator, I appreciate the very interesting comments.

I will point out that many problems have been referred to in a very oblique and quick manner, in much of the discussion. I believe the medical services thing is an extremely complicated problem and before that today these things have barely scratched the surface.

You raised the question before about government efficiency in doing something. I would like to take a moment to refer to something historic.

Government efficiency is not naturally a matter of law or course. It is perhaps the

efficiency of getting it done. Back in the early 1800's they were looking to building the railroads. As a consequence, people who went on one railroad did not travel on another. It required loading and unloading from one terminal to another. It took government standards to make one standard, to make this done in a proper manner.

I am going to very briefly cover the areas that Dr. Greenberg asked me to cover. I am not referring too much to the prepared text. I want to point out there is a major problem in Queens that we have at Creedmoor of the abidities.

We have the medical and surgical ability. We have 800 patients there because they need medical-surgical care, not only because gaged in rendering that care.

We are a psychiatric care facility yet we are carrying a medical surgical burden. We have 700 employees of our institution engaged in rendernig that care.

Now, these employees could be actively engaged in psychiatric care in the community if they were not tied down with having to render a medical care there, because medical care is not available anywhere else.

It is a major deficiency in Queens. I think perhaps I should use my glasses. We are constantly working and expanding with our psychiatric patients, with an effort to reach them into the community, to keep them in the community, to keep them in the homes, to keep them in their family groups, to become as productive taxpayers in society, rather than people cooped up at Creedmoor, and we are working rather well in that respect.

We have come a long way. We have 11 clinics out in the community, but we see opportunities where we can do more without being tied down to the medical services which we must provide because nobody does it.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. I don't understand. People who need medical services are also psychiatric problems.

Mr. MAGOOLAGHAN. In that building we have 800 cases, not all—

Congressman ROSENTHAL. Are they from Queens County?

Mr. MAGOOLAGHAN. No. In some cases they come from the inside or other institutions, but they are not, basically, psychiatric problems. They have medical problems and should not be in a psychiatric institution.

The point is we seek a complete comprehensive plan for medical services of all kinds in Queens, getting right down to the basic fundamentals of what we are trying to do and setting goals for this before we start planning.

I have heard a lot of plans go out. A couple of people referred to in questions of trying to refer to the aid plan. We do feel there is a need for medical training, for medical training center in this area.

We talk about a medical school and allied training. There is a distinct need for all these things. "In the past we have placed our elderly in a position where they must go to some monolithic warehouselike structure to die without any hope of return to active life or any involvement in the community in which they lived. This situation arises out of a failure to press hard enough for budget priorities for community health centers."

We feel in the community of Queens there should be an appropriate community center for the elderly. This might include apartment space for elderly husbands and wives with appropriate built-in means of handling their infirmities; with nursing home services attached as well as infirmaries, with group dining rooms as well as cooking facilities in the apartments. This type of structure could easily be built into some of our low rent housing which is being erected.

I believe that covers the basic needs. I have heard a lot today showing that medical care is extending. General medicine is moving more and more toward the centralized large institution. I am very personally proud to be associated with Creedmoor.

We have reacted right out into the community, and in the community, but we are out there and we are getting out there, all together. Thank you.

Congressman ROSENTHAL. We will conclude the hearing. I want to thank all of you. I think you have shown amazing patience and concern. My own judgment is there is a deep crisis and, obviously, a great split between the medical profession and the average citizen.

I suppose a great deal has to be done about reorganizing our medical delivery system. Many changes have to be made. I am going to write a report when I receive the transcript of this hearing. I will be happy to deliver it to you. The transcript of this hearing will be delivered to the Ways and Means Committee for their concern and consideration, when they are analyzing the various bills before the committee. I think it very important that this committee have the benefit and the views of the average citizen. What they usually have are professional organizations and associated organizations and it is important for me as a Congressman from this district to know the value and opinions of my constituents.

Thank you for coming. The meeting is concluded.

STATEMENT OF DR. LOUIS DELLI-PIZZI

In today's affluent and sophisticated society, the identification and delivery of man's basic needs—or better, rights—can be as complex as it is demanding.

However, it has long been acknowledged that paramount among them—is his right to health—via the immediate availability of the best possible medical care. It may be said, "What other rights are really important if one is in poor health?" Any planning truly responsive to the dignity of man must be ever conscious of this tenet.

Broadly speaking, the health care system in this country can be approached from the standpoints of:

Program—

Facilities—

Manpower—

1. For the sake of "planned economy" any restructuring must not destroy what is good in our present system. The personal doctor-patient relationship—the one-to-one equation—must not be diffused to the point where continuity in care is destroyed.

Our areas of great need—programs for the disabled, poor, unemployed and those afflicted with catastrophic illnesses must demand our immediate attention. Experience from a broad range of old and new delivery systems must be carefully evaluated if we are to achieve our goal of excellence in health care and avoid the disasters of Medicaid and shortcomings of Medicare.

I am sure with objectivity and knowledge there will evolve a pluralistic delivery system which will protect the right of both patient and physician to choose the system which is received and delivered.

Only in recent years and only in certain locales have our facilities come under careful scrutiny. Further duplication and maldistribution of public and voluntary facilities must be prohibited. Where the facilities have accessibility, they must meaningfully relate to the community they served. Wherever possible, the cooperative efforts of interested and capable institutions must be encouraged and subsidized.

Manpower. I wish to address myself to two specific problems:

1. The "doctor shortage" and what we in Queens are trying to do about it—and the

2. Plight of the voluntary hospitals in medical education.

We are told by numerous authorities that there is a 50,000 "doctor shortage." In October 1970, the President of the A.M.A. stated that "by doubling the entering class of medical students, starting this fall, we will only get an additional 30,000 doctors in the next ten years."

There is no indication that all of these 30,000 would go into practice. Many authorities feel that mal-distribution compounds the shortage—and that any significant restructuring of health care delivery system will increase and not decrease our demand for doctors.

If a crisis is not with us, it soon will be. As our costs for health care increase, so does our cost per student.

Federal and State aid to medical schools vary greatly, e.g., in New York State an average of $2,000 per year per M.D. candidate is available in both State and Federal ($543) funds (24th in the country). While in Illinois $6,500 is available to each medical school, per year, per M.D. candidate. The A.A.M.C. is seeking a flat $5,000 grant per student while the Nixon Administration is presently pressing for $6,000 for each graduate. I urge support of the A.A.M.C. request.

Furthermore, I urge that cost of graduate education (Intern and Residency training) be federally subsidized. As you know, the time spent in obtaining approved specialty training (Education) can vary from three to seven years. Presently, the costs are borne by reimbursement via third-party intermediaries of insurance and not educational funds.

I do not wish to pursue the propriety and merit of this practice—which is costing us—in Queens, more to train Interns/Residents/per year than the State of Indiana spends per year/per M.D. student.

If tomorrow Queens awoke with an ideal health-care delivery system encompassing the best in facilities and manpower, a noticeable vacuum would still exist. To fill that vacuum—to attain a goal of excellence in health care—to properly coordinate and meaningfully relate to those massive problems earlier alluded to, it is my considered opinion that a medical school must exist in Queens.

Locally, this problem has not gone unchallenged. Recognizing the realities of the moment—concerned individuals, representatives of health institutions, public and voluntary agencies, educational leaders, etc., have organized into the Queens Medical and Health Program.

Conclusion. In the light of this brief presentation, I wish to recommend that you promote immediate steps to obtain authorization for the establishment of a Medical School in Queens and that you look favorably upon the other recommendations made herein.

Respectfully submitted, Louis J. Delli-Pizzi, M.D., Director of Medical Education, Flushing Hospital and Medical Center.

Letter dated June 1, 1971, from Eugene Henry Duffy, Esq., 68–28 Dartmouth Street, Forest Hills, New York, as follows:

"My Dear Congressman Rosenthal: Thank you for inviting me to testify on Queens health problems. I regret I shall be out of town on the designated day.

Please record me personally as stating that Queens outstanding health need now is a medical school to which should be attached a new City Hospital and a Veterans Facility.

For a quarter century the city, state and nation have played fast and loose with Queens in these matters. This long neglect could be remedied by affiliating the medical school with York College and adding the new City Hospital and Veterans Facility as part of the Jamaica Redevelopment.

Providing these buildings would go a long way in solving other problems, lack of hospital beds in Queens, more clinical facilities for the area, including South Jamaica, and a corps of medical doctors trained in Queens, available for service in Queens as interns, residents and as physicians in the future.

With every good wish for a successful meeting, Very truly yours, Eugene H. Duffy."

Following from Mrs. A. M.: letter dated May 28, 1971:

"Dear Mr. Rosenthal:

After reading your May Report and Questionnaire only a calamity will stay me from the June 5th Congressional Hearings on Medical Care. I intend to lend my ear and mind (but not my voice) from 10:00 to 3:00. A youthful incident of stage fright impels the pen. Here is my constrained vendetta (details would cover 25 pages) re: experienced current medical practices offered for public discussion in anonymity.

Anyone who was destined to seek the ministrations of the medical fraternity 25 years ago has acquired a growing awareness that patient care today is not what Hippocrates has in mind. Dr. Kildare is sheer Victorian fantasy. His counterpart may be a retiree on the Maine coast or a hamlet in the Swiss Alps and is undoubtedly unavailable for an emergency. Or, according to a recent TV interview with a British neurologist-writer-actor the GP of England makes house calls as a basic responsibility of his profession.

In New York City probably the closest thing to a personal physician of monarchs and presidents is the diagnostician of a private clinic who pilots departmental examinations without disruptions to his studies. But even this "royal" treatment (At an astronomical cost) is not without an important flaw. If the patient suffers a reaction to medication during the test period the clinic diagnostician is not permitted to make a house call. And on Saturdays, Sundays or other holidays he is not available for telephone advice, nor after 5:00 p.m. Also, if the enrollment was self-initiated (without the determination of the patient's physician) his ego is deflated and the patient begins to consult the Yellow Pages. When one physician was informed of the circumstances he said he did not want to interfere.

Suggested reforms. Extension of services to the clinic patient by enlargement of their staff by only two physicians who can have access to the patient's file and be on duty when the diagnostician is off duty. In this way the strange physician who was reluctant to "interfere" could receive information before making his house call. But the house call problem will continue ad infinitum. On TV recently I saw something regarding a communal physician's group dedicated to house calls, and further information would be welcome.

Present Atmosphere of A Doctor-Patient Relationship: The amenities of a visit died in 1960. The patient now goes directly to the examination room for blood pressure and respiratory observation. After this brief encounter is interrupted by incoming phone calls the patient goes to the desk where a brief comment and more phone calls ensue. When prescriptions are rendered the patient's file is not opened as it had been 15 years ago.

Woe to the "normal" patient unconcerned with pharmaceutical knowledge culled from FDA articles. When the patient discovers that his home pharmacy needs an additional bread box he equips himself with a magazine drug chart and learns that he has been consuming duplication of tranquilizers under different trade names—remembering that when he described a symptom the doctor proceeded to write a prescription with a comment, "Drug X is good for that." Had the file been opened it would have revealed a similarly prescribed tranquilizer to enable the physician to state, "When you take Drug X omit Drug Y."

Prescription chaos. Another aspect of the prescription involves medication duplication of Identical brand names resulting from (a) the physician's disinterest in the patient's dwindling finances and (b) the inscrutability of his penmanship. Leaving the prescription with a busy-bee pharmacist before going to work doesn't help bring illumination.

The alert patient will further "do his own thing" by asking the doctor to write a large quantity for a constantly-used medication that is stable, for purposes of economy. This involves self-education in stable pharmaceuticals. Years ago one could ask the function and stability of a remedy but today when the doctor's pen is dropped his hand is on the doorknob.

While the doctor writes the patient observes a standard, 27-line yellow pad on his desk inscribed with a patient's name on each line. He will probably not leave his office before 7:30. Succesively overworked secretaries complicate treatment efficiency. One specialist I consulted gave advance hint of time limit by a system of 15-minute appointments and while dressing a secretary brings in a prescription and places it on the examination table.

Further follies of the file. Kindly refer to the private clinic treatise on Page 1, paragraph 2. The patient requested that a report be sent to his internist. In a subsequent visit to the latter the patient made inquiry re: the report and the doctor scanned it in the file with the comment: "nothing serious—it's your nerves." "Nerves?" wailed the impatient patient, "I was told I need an operation for blankety-blank growths." He returned to the file and read again. "I didn't expect it to be at the bottom."

Difficult situations to reconcile. The senior citizen who gains organic problems along with his weight comes to the internist as a burden, so he is dissected like a chicken in parts and advised to see specialists for the ailing areas. This refutes those compassionate medical articles with title such as, "Do Not be Afraid to Ask Your Doctor Questions" or "Describe to your Doctor the Kinds of Pains You Have" or "Tell Your Medical Doctor About Your Emotional Discomforts." "The new school of physicians is treating the whole person," we read in a medical article—beautiful theory like Marxism.

The elderly patient who must visit his physician more frequently clutches his AHS Medical Policy at spiralling costs and watches the figures in his bankbook drop alarmingly while the physician sits on Olympus.

I don't think the ethical physician revels in the mounting statistical need of his services. I believe he'd rather like to be home at 6:00 for an uninterrupted dinner. And hospital service today with the best of medical policies offers false hope.

Beds are at a premium because so many of them are being occupied by mounting emergencies arising from crime incidents. (Unless drug traffic is halted at the point of origin medical schools will have to specialize in surgery and every 20-block community will have a hospital and police station."

But FDA regulation might be easier. The doctor's calculated time-saving devices include, "As directed" on prescription instead of specific instructions. A patient who might have a repertoire of 14 is apt to forget its use. So the twin sins of commission and omission coexist. (a) If a doctor issues a prescription for 200 pills a pharmacist I know will reserve the balance for refill but another will not. (b) Also, typing of the original date on refills can be misleading to the user of many, many medications. Unless she has time to keep pharmaceutical records it is possible to consider an exemplary refill older than it is—and with the pharmacist's blanket rule discard it when it is only 6 months old. The pharmacist, too, won't like the extra work but I propose regulation of original and refill dates on prescriptions.

Mr. Rosenthal, I have about one more page to type for the completion of my vendetta which I may be able to hand you on June 5th. In the meantime I want to thank you for the opportunity to explode on paper. I do hope my confidential disclosures will result in some significant reforms and I trust a recess period will enable me to exchange a few words. I know you must be very busy but could you drop me a post card just to let me know this letter was received.

(Letter dated June 13, 1971 from Mrs. A. M.)

"Dear Congressman Rosenthal:

Thank you for your prompt acknowledgment of my May 28th letter. I regret that my 1:15 departure from last week's hearings did not permit me to make your acquaintance. I hope the following supplement will be of value in your studies:

The mysterious methods of AHS (Blue Shield and Blue Cross). The lady's complaint about the inadequacies of reimbursement by AHS is known to me. I had wanted to ask her if she knew that medicare imposes a $50.00 deduction but she had left soon after her testimony.

The diagnostic clinic case I reported to you in the previous letter was about $575.00. Blue Shield refunded $45.00. A letter from the patient, citing enrollment in AHS since 1936 and incurring only two short hospital stays in 33 years moved AHS to appropriate another $45.00. But the check received was only $40.00 and so several mutual time-value letters eventually brought the balance of $5.00.

The self-initiated clinic enrollment was not a hypochondriac whim. The patient knew that only blood studies and X-rays would indicate proper treatment for long-experienced symptoms. Thus, two organic disturbances were brought to light. Someone suggested to me that BS makes its determinations in accordance with the negative and positive findings, and whether the patient's physician advised the tests.

I don't know how true this is but I can say that not ALL service reimbursements are published in a subscribers' handbook and "up to" a certain allowance is nebulous. For instance, on a low-premium policy X-rays must be taken within a two-week period to benefit by a single deductible, but a subscriber doesn't know he has more leeway when he holds the most expensive policy unless he sees it in print. Here again, is another example of the sins of omission. Blue Shield must be enjoined to publish more information. They will say that schedules are available at their offices but how many working or ill persons have the time for such visits?

In another instance my physician performed a service in his office for a fee of $20.00. Blue Shield reimbursed the full amount of $20.00. The following year the same service at the same fee yielded only $10.00. After the 8th futile letter I closed my typewriter but not my mind. In an eye mishap my oculist had to use a tweezer-type instrument. I wrote to the doctor and subsequently received $5.00 from BS or one-third of his fee. The point is that the service was not published by BS nor did the doctor offer to fill out the form. As I implied in PART I, once you're a medical victim you've got to "do your own thing."

Pharmaceutical manufacture. Since the physician doesn't know or doesn't care and the pharmacist will advise the discard of everything older than two years the manufacturer should be enjoined to do what Bess Myerson has accomplished in the food industry—Print, print, print—conveniently.

The pharmacist knows the expiration date from a medication carton but when he transfers the pills to his own bottle he does not include this information. Not only should the user know the expiration date but whether to store the medications in a cool or cold atmposphere. Squibbs gives some good information on the use of their mineral oil but this is printed on the reverse side of the label so that one has to struggle with a reading through the mineral oil. Also, all capped containers ought to have well-glued paper seals. Also, the expiration

date ought to be a qualifying one, i.e., does it mean the medication will lose its potency or become deteriorated?

Pharmaceuticals (Identification of): Most pills are white. Vitamin C is white and so is aspirin of obsure manufacture. Bufferin is engraved with the letter "B" and a pill named Donnatal has "R" which may signify the manufacturer but there are so many which have no identifiable characteristics at all—either by color or manufacturer.

I suggest that arbitrary identification be made mandatory by the information set forth. Idealistically, the "B" of Bufferin ought to be in contrasting color but this process might be too costly. Most capsules bear imprints and my attention has just been called to a new release of Dexamyl engraved with the manufacturer's initials and a classifying number—all very clear. Previously, the green, heart-shaped tablet was blank.

The impersonal surgeon and caseworker. I was round-the-clock home nurse to my widowed, indigent mother. Members of my family had to play a game of 'medical chess' to find a doctor. She was a pawn in situations involving boroughs and week-end unavailability. To compound her maladies she sustained a hip fracture and a ghost-surgeon operated. While still hospital bedridden he handed her a Blue Shield statement to sign. It is the usual practise of surgeons to include in their fee post-operative examination but he never asked to see the patient.

If an iron-clad rule frees a surgeon from making a house call to a wheelchair patient it should be abolished. The point is that he couldn't care less in the fulfilment of his Hippocratic oath to an 86-year-old gentlewoman by (1) dispensing cheer and (2) seeing the result of his creativity. A certain woman I know agrees that he is a monstrous person but a genius of a surgeon. In countries of the Buddhist faith such conduct would be non-existent, particularly to the aged who are held in great reverence.

Medicaid muddle. To add further insult to injury my mother became a "ward" of the Kerr-Mills Medicaid bill. Thanks to an inept caseworker the "largess" of $11.50 a week was brought to a halt when my mother suffered a stroke and an emergency nursing home was needed—for the third time. (Applications made several months previously to welfare-approved homes were fruitless for lack of space in 5-bed wards). I will omit here details revolving around a succession of doctors who became unavailable.

I was ultimately successful in acquiring the dependability of my own Manhattan-based internist with residence in an outlying area of Queens. His efforts, combined with family assistance brought my mother to a nursing home in Forest Hills where I was able to visit her several times a week. (What I witnessed here and in another highly-rated nursing home in the area I will not relate because the sordid business was given wide notoriety in the press a few years ago.)

Nursing homes. (I wonder if the subject was brought to your hearings on June 5th.) The caseworker was infuriated and said we should have sent my mother to Riker's Island. Before the paralytic stroke my mother was subject to "small strokes." So it was necessary for me to engage the help of a nurse's aide for the risky business of a tub bath.

Is it necessary to convince anyone that such a patient needs the special service of excessive laundry, preparation and feeding of meals and the vigilant eye? After the tub bath I was free to leave the aide to her chores while I went to the Supermarket.

Since I couldn't pull a weighted wagon over stairs the marketing was done in two sessions. Well, it was hard to convince the caseworker that I wasn't playing queen with an aide and so my family had to bear the additional hardship of $30.00 a week.

My mother's illness over a 2-year period cost $15,000.00 in medical and related expenses which was reduced to $5,000.00 by Medicare and Blue Shield reimbursements. Medicaid's entire assistance to us was the $11.50 stipend per week for two months. It did not honor the nursing home fees of about $150.00 a week nor the mortician's bill of almost $800.00. Also, figure my round-the-clock service at a modest $100.00 a week.

Medicaid will pay a welfare-approved nursing home $80.00 a week but nothing as little as $30.00 a week for a nurse's aide while the daughter is deprived of earning power. I did everything possible to recover over $1600.00 for the nursing home and mortician expenses. A letter to Albany disclosed that Medicaid can only pay the vendor and informs me that I should have known this fact from the Medicaid booklet given me. I had no knowledge of such a brochure for I surely would have put it to use. When queried about reimbursements the caseworker said, "What are you worried about—your mother is not on the street."

For three years following my mother's death, December 16, 1966, I received renewal Medicaid cards, and the letter from Albany read in part, "If there is an unpaid burial bill submit it." Do they think a mortician will wait two years for payment? And from a clerical standpoint my mother was documented as living. So you can believe all the bungling bureaucracy you read or hear.

Legal aspects. Three questions have not yet been answered by authorities I consulted including the Legal Aid Society who withdrew because the claim exceeded $500.00 and private lawyers avoid Welfare like a plague.

Question. (1) What is the statute of limitations in medicaid cases? (2) I was the beneficiary of my mother's life insurance policy because I paid the premiums over a period of thirty years. Was I obliged to forfeit the proceeds to pay the mortician? (3) Where can I apply for a hearing?

What I have outlined in a personal case history pertains to an indigent patient who was fortunate to have a family who cared. So my sympathies lie with the deprived welfare patient which makes me cynical about the popular theory that the poorest and the richest receive the best attention.

I was not surprised to learn from the hearings that Queens' quarry of hospitals is not keeping pace with its population growth. Similarly, neither is Westchester or Staten Island self-sustaining in medical complexes. A patient in need of highly specialized services must depend upon the big three of Manhattan. So how shall we overcome the blights?

On TV recently a scientist revealed that the only block in realizing a remarkable medical discovery is money. So shall we build by burdening the taxpayer further or by advising the captains of industry that they ought to build monuments to health for the common good.

A notice in yesterday's Times states that Ralph Nader was organizing a group of medical doctors who will monitor the medical profession. This relates to my essay that before we even deal with masonry let's bring to the healing art only men who are not hangovers from the stone age—a formidable type of "preventive medicine" that ought to begin on a psychoanalytic testing ground of medical aspirants.

The problem is provoking on many other levels. Why, despite the advantages of the wonder drugs are more people ill today than ever before? Perhaps pollution, the toll of cigarette addiction, chemical additives in foods? I could continue ad infinitum.

Of course, you may submit my letters into the testimony from the hearings so long as you keep them anonymous. But if you wish to see a dress box filled with documentary evidence of my mother's case you are welcome to examine the papers. Of if you need more explicit information on anything I have cited please feel free to inquire. I wish you great success in your esteemed efforts. Sincerely yours, "A.M."

REMARKS BY HUGH BARBER, M.D., PRESIDENT QUEENS MEDICAL AND HEALTH PROGRAM

QUEENS MEDICAL SCHOOL NOW FOR IMPROVED HEALTH SERVICES IN QUEENS

Representative citizens of Queens have advocated a medical school with supporting hospital affiliations for a quarter century. The years bear witness to a need which so long unmet has resulted in a climate of health crises for two million people.

Today, health professionals, providers and community representatives are associated in the Queen Medical and Health Program. The priority is a Queens medical school—now. The proposed school must respond to people's needs for care by placing emphasis on education for developing careers in delivery of health services and program of research for preventing illness. Certainly, burdensome costs related to laboratory investigations must not be tied to teaching. Also, this Queens school must be university affiliated and assure quality education and appropriate standards of services through its teaching hospital affiliates.

Let it be kept in mind that Queens young people are disadvantaged for health career opportunity. In an unbelievable educational void foreign exchange students and foreign medical graduates have some to occupy intern-resident staff positions in Queens hospitals for these many years. Indeed, where is the community conscience for its own people? The will to teach is the thing. The product is service to people.

Health education for career opportunity in Queens demands creative rethinking for a medical school. It is proposed that existing resources be affiliated for programs of health education, and public funds already allocated for operation be supplemented. Marble halls and diamond-studded laboratories are not required, and if made available would not guarantee the quality program sought. With committed leadership, a few million dollars of new operating funds a year can guarantee the beginning of this school. The time has arrived for planning funds. The community is ready for a health school complex.

Basic teaching. A medical school results from the union of basic science with bedside teaching—school with hospital. Teachers in basic medical science can teach not only medical but college students as well and always the object must be quality and value for the dollar. People's health needs demand that faculty be oriented toward guiding the student's mind and heart for service. This teaching involves attitude, people to people. Under current stringent circumstances teaching can take place in renovated buildings as well as in one hundred million dollar science halls. Would anyone deny people's health requirements now because marble halls for teaching medicine could not be built for 10 years? Who hears the neighbors moan?

Two units of the city university and St. John's are degree schools in Queens. These schools are listening; but whichever one emerges the chosen school it will require operating funds to get started now in existing facilities.

Bedside teaching is the other half of medical education. Two major city and one state hospital exist in Queens, any one of which is appropriate for the principal teaching hospital of the basic science school. The two city hospitals have been assigned by contract to out-of-the-county institutions. In both instances the future needs of the Queens people for health career education have been shunted away. Five voluntary hospitals—each about 300 beds—require teaching affiliations. Are these to be denied another twenty-five years?

These hospitals will need full-time teachers whose privilege to serve patients should be maintained. Teaching is service. An enormous reservoir of voluntary talent lies ready to serve people and to teach. Are voluntary reserves to be denied two million people in need?

Summary. Health needs for two million people in Queens demand health educational opportunity for students and continuing education for persons in practice.

A medical school may get started now by utilizing existing school space and affiliating with neighboring teaching hospitals. Limited funds are required each year for school administration and teaching staff.

The effect could be dynamic on the morale of two million citizens, and on the aspiration of students for career opportunity in the health sciences. Are you prepared to assist this cause? Planning funds to complete the proposed structure of the medical school are required now.

WESTERN TECHNOLOGY AND SOVIET ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 1917–30

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in light of the various legislative proposals currently being advanced to increase the flow of U.S. goods and technological know-how to the Soviet bloc it might be well to look at some of the results of the inflow of Western technology and economic assistance to the Soviet bloc in the past.

What have been the results of our previous dealings with the Soviets? What effect has Western productivity and creativity had on the material and technological base which supports the world Communist movement. Anthony C. Sutton of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace has completed two of a three-volume series investigating just this question. His detailed, meticulous, and exhaustive research into this subject is unique and of tremendous historical value.

The first volume of his three-volume study, entitled "Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development 1917 to 1930," deals with what Mr. Sutton terms the concession period of economic intercourse between the Soviet Union and the West. Due to the brilliant application of Marxist economic principles by the Communists, Soviet industry was at a complete standstill by 1922. Mr. Sutton comments that—

> The economic decline which directly followed the Revolution is unparalleled in the history of industrial society . . .

In order to solve this problem Lenin issued an authoritative policy pronouncement dealing with concessions and their purpose. Lenin stated:

> Concessions are nothing but a new form of war. Europe fought us, and now the war is moving into a new plane. Formerly, the war was conducted in the field in which the imperialists were infinitely stronger, the military field. If you count the number of guns and machine guns they have and the number we have, the number of soldiers their governments can mobilize and the number our government can mobilize, we undoubtedly ought to have been crushed in a fortnight. Nevertheless, we held our own in this field, and we undertake to continue the fight and are passing to an economic war. It is definitely stated that side by side with the concession land, the concession square of territory, there will be our square, and then again their square; we shall learn from them how to organize model enterprises by placing our own side by side with theirs. If we are incapable of doing that, it is not worth talking about anything. To procure the last word in technology in the matter of equipment at the present time is not an easy task, and we have to learn, learn it in practice; for this is not a thing to be got from schools, universities or courses. And that is why we are granting concessions on the checkerboard system: Come and learn on the spot.

Economically, we have a vast deal to gain from concessions. Of course, when settlements are created, they will bring capitalist customs with them, they will demoralize the peasantry. But watch must be kept, we must put up our communist influence in opposition at every step. This also is a kind of war, the military rivalry of two methods, two formations, two kinds of economy—communist and capitalist. We shall prove that we are the stronger.

As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace: In the end, one or the other will triumph—a funeral dirge will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism. This is a respite in war. The capitalists will seek pretexts for fighting. If they accept the proposal and agree to concessions, it will be harder for them. On the one hand, we shall have the best conditions in the event of war; on the other hand, those who want to go to war will not agree to concessions. The existence of concessions is an economic and political argument against war. The states that might war on us will not war on us if they take concessions. From the point of view of the danger of a collison between capitalism and bolshevism, it must be said that concessions are a continuation of the war, but in a different sphere. (*Speech* . . . November 26, 1920, *Selected Works*, VIII, 294, 295 f., 297.)

Mr. Sutton describes a concession as an economic enterprise in which a foreign company enters into a contract with the host country to organize, equip, and exploit a specific opportunity, under the legal doctrine of usufruct. The short table which follows lists all known concessions:

TABLE 1-1.—CONCESSION APPLICATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, 1921–30

Year	Applications [1]	Number of agreements Types I and II [1]	Type III [2]
1921–2	224	18	0
1922–3	579	44	0
1923–4	396	55	0
1924–5	256	103	4
1925–6	482	110	7
1926–7	263	NA	13
1927–8	200	NA	17
1928–9	270	NA	33
1929–30	NA	NA	59
Total	2,670 (to 1928–9)	330 (to 1925–6)	134 (to 1929–30)

[1] A. A. Santalov and L. Segal, Soviet Union Yearbook, 1930 (London: Allen and Unwin, 1930), p. 206.
[2] U.S.S.R. Chamber of Commerce, Economic Conditions in the U.S.S.R. (Moscow: Vneshtorgizdat, 1931), p. 162.
NA=Not available.

Mr. Sutton disagrees with the generally accepted notion that concessions had no appreciable impact on the development of the Soviet economy. After an extensive chapter by chapter analysis of the effects of concessions on all the important sectors of the Soviet economy, Mr. Sutton summarizes the degree of influence which Western concessions had on the various sectors in the following table:

THE DEGREE OF TECHNOLOGICAL IMPACT WITHIN SPECIFIC SECTORS

[It now remains to estimate the degree of impact within each sector. Table 20-6 estimates the direct and the indirect impact of Western technology upon each of the sectors discussed in part I.]

TABLE 20-6.—DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACT OF WESTERN TECHNOLOGY BY SECTOR AND SUBSECTOR

Industry	Estimated direct impact	Estimated indirect impact
Oil industry (chap. 2):		
Exploration technology	Complete	Not applicable.
Drilling technology	do	Do.
Pumping technology	do	Do.
Oilfield electrification	do	Do.
Pipeline construction	do	Do.
Refinery construction	do	Do.
Market acquisition	do	Do.
Coal and anthracite mining (chap. 3): Coal fields:		
Donetz	Heavy	Significant.
Kuzbas	Complete	Not applicable.
Moscow	Heavy to complete.	Do.
Far East	do	Do.
Sakhalin	do	Do.
Shaft development	do	Do.
Mine mechanization	do	Do.
Ferrous metallurgy (chap. 4):		
Iron-ore mining	Heavy	Limited.
Blast-furnace repairs	Limited to significant.	None.
Blast-furnace new design	Complete	Not applicable.
Steel-plant construction	do	Do.
Rolling-mill construction	do	Do.
Nonferrous Metallurgy (chap. 5):		
Zinc mining	Significant	Limited.
Zinc smelting	Complete	Not applicable.
Lead mining	Significant	Limited.
Lead smelting	Complete	Not applicable.
Copper mining	Significant	Limited.
Cooper smelting	Complete	Not applicable.
Silver mining	do	Do.
Silver smelting	do	Do.
Manganese production	do	Do.
Manganese markets	do	Do.
Miscellaneous mining and smelting (chap. 6):		
Gold mining	do	Do.
Platinum mining	None	Heavy.
Platinum markets	Heavy to complete.	None.
Bauxite exploration	Heavy	Do.
Pilot aluminum smelting	Complete	Not applicable.
Mica mining	do	Do.
Asbestos mining	Heavy to complete.	Do.
Asbestos mill technology	Complete	Do.
Asbestos shingles manufacture.	do	Do.
Agricultural technology (chap. 7):		
Wheat farming	None	Significant.
Seed growing	Limited	Limited.
Cotton growing	do	Do.
Merino flocks	Complete	Not applicable.
Dairy industry	Significant	Limited.
Egg and butter markets	Complete	Not applicable.
Tractors	do	Do.
Other agricultural equipment.	Limited	Limited.
Other food industries (chap. 8):		
Fishing	do	None.
Fur collection	do	Do.
Fur sales	Heavy	Do.
Fish canneries	do	Limited.
Lumber industry (chap. 9):		
Forestry production	do	None to limited.
Lumber markets	Complete	Not applicable.
Pulp and paper mills	Not applicable	Complete.
Machine construction (chap. 10):		
Locomotive construction	Heavy	Not applicable.
Machine building	Heavy to complete.	Do.
Ball bearings	Complete	Do.
Steam boilers	Heavy	Do.
Precision engineering	Complete	Do.
Electrical equipment industry (chap. 11):		
High-tension equipment	do	Do.

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 20–6.—DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACT OF WESTERN TECHNOLOGY BY SECTOR AND SUBSECTOR

Industry	Estimated direct impact	Estimated indirect impact
Electrical equipment industry (chap. 11):		
Electrical motive equipment	Complete	Not applicable.
Low-tension equipment	do	Do.
Accumulators	do	Do.
Turbines and generators	do	Do.
Hydroelectric technology	Heavy	Limited.
Chemicals, compressed gases and dyes (chapter 12):		
Synthetic ammonia	Complete	Not applicable
Nitric acid	do	Do.
Superphosphates	do	Do.
Sulphuric acid	do	Do.
Coke oven by-products	do	Do.
Oxygen and hydrogen	do	Do.
Basic and intermediate dyes.	do	Do.
Glass technology	do	Do.
Rubber technology	Heavy	Limited.
Clothing, housing, and food (chapter 13):		
Texiles	do	Do.
Clothing manufacture	Limited	Do.
Artificial silk	Complete	Not applicable
Buttons	Limited	None.
Food processing	Significant	Limited.
Construction industry	None to limited	Do.
Miscellaneous small items	do	Do.
Transportation and transportation equipment industries (chap. 14):		
Rail operations	do	Heavy.
Railroad electrification	Complete	Not applicable.
Telegraphic communications.	Heavy	None.
Radio communications	Complete	Not applicable.
Automobile construction	do	Do.
Truck construction	do	Do.
Shipping	Heavy	Limited.
Shipbuilding	do	None.
Port construction	Significant	Do.
Freight transportation	Limited	Do.
Military technology (chap. 15):		
Airplane construction	Complete	Not applicable.
Pilot training	do	Do.
Poison gas production	Heavy	None.
Artillery and shells	Complete	Not applicable.
Armored cars and tanks	do	Do.
Trading companies (chap. 16):		
U.S. markets	All trading companies had heavy assistance in the early years of the decade.	
United Kingdom markets		
German markets		
Austrian markets		
Italian markets		

Note: This table summarizes the evidence presented in part I concerning the degree of impact of Western technology on the Soviet economy. The "direct impact" treated in column 2 refers to identifiable technical associations between Western firms and Soviet institutions. This involves not only Soviet adoption of Western processes in toto but also the employment of foreign engineers in the U.S.S.R. for production or training of Soviet engineers.

The "indirect impact" treated in the last column refers to the acquisition of Western equipment not, however, operated by a foreign company. Such instances are comparatively rare in this period, but they become more common in the periods to be covered by later volumes. The characteristic distinguishing the 2 types of influence is the supply of supplementary services; training, installation, break-in operations and servicing. The degrees of impact are defined as follows: Complete—80 percent of all new capacity; heavy—60 to 80 percent of all new capacity; significant—40 to 60 percent of all new capacity; limited—20 to 40 percent of all new capacity; none—0 to 20 percent of all new capacity.

Thus, in a sector such as oil-field rotary drilling, there was a complete and direct impact. The adopted technology was almost completely Western, and the equipment was installed and initially operated by a Western company.

It is obvious from this listing that Western concessions had quite a bit to do with the economic survival, on which depends political survival, of the Bolshevik regime of the Soviet Union.

The general Leninist approach to economic intercourse with "imperialist" nations such as the United States, was succinctly outlined by Mr. Nathan Leites in his book entitled "Operational Code of the Politburo." Since the Soviet bloc is still completely and totally controlled by Leninists I insert this interesting chapter entitled "Deals" into the RECORD at this point, so that we will have a better understanding of the Communist thinking behind the increase in economic exchange with the United States. We must attempt to understand the other fellows thinking, if we are to anticipate the results of our overtures to him. We must understand the meaning which he attaches to a particular act which determines the way in which he will react:

DEALS

1. Any agreements between the Party and outside groups must be regarded as aiding the future liquidation of these groups and as barriers against the liquidation of the Party by them. Thus, "'Reformism,' 'the policy of agreement' and 'particular agreements' are different matters . . . with the Mensheviks agreements are transformed into a system, into a policy of agreement, while with the Bolsheviks only particular concrete agreements are acceptable, and are not made into a policy of agreement."

Therefore there is no essential difference between coming to an ostensibly amicable arrangement with an outside group or using violence against it; they are both tactics in an over-all strategy of attack.

In 1920, Lenin said, with reference to Soviet plans for granting economic "concessions" to foreign entrepreneurs:

The major theme of my speech will be the proof of two points, namely, first, that every war is the continuation of the policy conducted in peace, only by other means; second, that the concessions which we grant, which we are forced to grant, are the continuation of war in another form, by other means. . . . It would be a great mistake to believe that a peaceful agreement about concessions is—a peaceful agreement with capitalists. This agreement is equivalent to war. . . .[1]

2. When at attempt by the enemy, or by the Party, to advance by violent means has failed, the conditions for an effective agreement between the Party and the enemy come into existence.

"Every attempt to start war on us will mean for the states resorting to war that the terms they will get after and as a result of the war will be worse than those that they could have got without war or before war. This has been proved in the case of several states. . . . And thanks to this our relations with neighboring states are steadily improving. . . . Peace on such a basis has every chance of being . . . durable. . . ."[2]

In 1921, Lenin said:

"Can we obtain goods now? We can, because our international economic position has improved enormously. We are fighting against international capital, which, on seeing our republic, said: "These are robbers, reptiles" (these are literally the very words that were conveyed to me by an English sculptress who heard them uttered by one of the most influential politicians). . . . We said: If you are a mighty world power, if you are world capital, if you say "reptile," and have all the powers of technique at your command, go on, shoot! And when it did, it found that it had hurt itself more than us. After that, capital, which is compelled to reckon with real political and economic life, says, "We must trade." . . . Up to now they have not talked like this; up to now they said, "We will shoot you down and get you for nothing." Now since they are unable to shoot us, they are prepared to trade."[3]

3. The Party must always expect outside groups to violate agreements.

In 1920, Lenin said about the policy of granting economic "concessions" to foreign entrepreneurs:

"Of course, the capitalists will not fulfill the agreements, say the comrades who fear concessions. That is a matter of course, one must absolutely not hope that the capitalists will fulfill the agreements."[4]

These attitudes imply that a "settlement" with the Western Powers—that is, an agreement sharply reducing the threat of mutual annihilation—is inconceivable to the Politburo, although arrangements with them, codifying the momentary relationship of forces, are always considered.

Mr. Sutton's conclusion to his masterly work, "Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development 1917 to 1930," published by Hoover Institution Press is so historically significant that I insert it into the RECORD in full and recommend to all my colleagues that they pursue the entire work. It is necessary that we fully understand the effects of past Western economic and technological contributions to the Soviet economy before we legislate on this matter.

The conclusion follows:

CONCLUSIONS

The industrial structure of the Soviet Union between 1917 and 1930 was the reorganized tsarist structure. This consisted of several hundred medium-to-large manufacturing enterprises located in urban centers, notably Petrograd and Moscow. This manufacturing complex was supplemented by numerous self-contained mining enterprises in the Donbas and the Urals which were centers of incipient industrialization. Some of these plants were large by any standards. The International Harvester plant at Omsk for example was the largest in the company's world-wide network. The first major conclusion is that the tsarist industrial structure was not at all negligible. To say that 'Russia prior to 1917 was not unlike a country such as India on the one hand or large areas of southeastern Europe on the other,'[1] is rank absurdity. Airplanes and automobiles *of indigenous Russian design* were produced in quantity before the Bolshevik revolution. Although industrialization was restricted to a few population centers, it utilized modern, efficient plants operating on scales comparable to those elsewhere in the world. Further, there were obvious signs of indigenous Russian technology in chemicals, aircraft, automobiles, turbines, and railroad equipment.

The second major conclusion was that this structure was substantially intact after the Bolshevik Revolution. Intervention did not affect the main *manufacturing* areas. There was damage to the railroad system, particularly in the Donbas and Siberia, and the Port of Petrograd was heavily damaged and mined. Petrograd industry, however, was basically in operable condition. Industrial damage was concentrated in the Ukrainian sugar industry and in the Ural and Donetz Basin mines.

What, then, created the economic debacle of 1921–2?

It was not brought about by absence of operable production facilities. While plants were in a state of "technical preservation," work discipline collapsed, and skilled workers, engineers, and managers fled into the villages or abroad. The distribution system was abandoned as unnecessary in a socialist economy. Productivity consequently sank to abysmally low levels, and the "supply crisis" followed on the heels of the rejected distribution system. Systematic destruction of a viable economy was aided by the inflation of the ruble to zero value (on the basis that money was not needed in socialism), the "instant demobilization of industry" decree, "free" pub-

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniya*, 3d ed., Vol. 26, p. 6.
[2] V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 250.
[3] *Ibid.*, Vol. 9, pp. 115–116.
[4] V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniya*, 3d ed., Vol. 26, p. 22.
[1] M. Dobb, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

lic services, and the replacement of skilled managers with unskilled proletarians. By August 1922 the Soviet economy was at the point of collapse. This is not deduction. Lenin, Bogdanov, Arsky, Krassin and others have made the point clearly. The end had come. As Krassin phrased the problem, "Anyone can help pull down a house; there are but few who can re-build. In Russia there happened to be far fewer than anywhere else." [2]

The economic decline which directly followed the Revolution is unparalled in the history of industrialized society; however, the Soviets not only survived, but in 1924 were able to institute the Second Bolshevik Revolution and return to the path of State control of industry. The factors behind the miraculous recovery are detailed in the text.

In mid-1922 Soviet industry was at a standstill. Soviet inability, for lack of skilled engineers and workers, to restart the tsarist plants is well illustrated by the Russo-Baltic plant at Taganrog, moved during the war from Reval. Four massive buildings were visited (and photographed) by the 1926 Ford Delegation. The plant had furnaces, hammers, hydraulic presses, and a power station, as well as approximately 2,000 machine tools. These had been idle since 1917, although coated with oil to keep the tools in some sort of preservation. The photographs indicate the gigantic size of the plant, idle for at least nine years. It was operable although perhaps technologically out of date compared to the rapidly developing industries in the West. The urgent needs were two-fold: to restart the silent plants and modernize the equipment. The trust was the organizational vehicle adopted for these objectives. As Bogdanov pointed out, the primary aim of the trust was the transfer of foreign skills and technology to fulfill both these urgent requirements.

Trustification and technical transfer were achieved step by step. First, a selection from among important industries was made. Choice was on an ideological basis. Railroads, mining, and machinery sectors were selected on the basis of political, not economic, choice; they were only coincidentally key sectors in the economy. In the process of selection, several key economic activities, such as gear-cutting (Citroen plant) and air-brake manufacture (Westinghouse Air Brake Company) were left in foreign hands. The pragmatic Communists understood their own inability to run these rather complex enterprises. After selection, the remaining operable units were isolated from the inoperable, and the latter were left outside the trust structure. The inoperable units were offered to foreign firms as concessions (the Berger and Wirth dye plant, the Bergman ferrous metallurgy plant, the Kablitz boiler-making operation, the AIK textile plants, the Lena and Kemerovo mines, etc.) In sum, the isolation procedure eliminated two categories of economic activity from the trusts: first, complex operations requiring lengthy foreign assistance, and second, those units requiring substantial modernization. These were leased directly to foreign operators as pure concessions.

The remaining or operable units were then grouped into trusts. Most were either dormant or working on an intermittent basis; given technical and managerial skills, they were operable. The names were "proletarianized" and attempts were made to restart. In some plants "white" engineers took over from unskilled "red" directors—notably in the electrical and machinery sectors. But in all cases operation without the discipline of the market system led to hopeless inefficiency. The answer to a massive loss was a massive subsidy. These got out of hand by 1923 and were countered by the "contraction of industry's" policy.

Contraction (i.e., elimination of the most heavily subsidized plants) was concurrent with the injection of foreign assistance. Although this began as early as 1919–1920, it received a strong assist from the German Trade Agreement of 1921 and the Rapallo economic, military, and trade protocols. Extensive documentation in the German Foreign Ministry Archives attests to the thoroughness and completeness of German economic and technical help after 1922.[3] Such assistance was at first almost completely German, in fact. The Shakhta affair reflects the influence of Germany in the U.S.S.R. The Soviets were concerned about the massive infiltration and influence of German specialists in Soviet industry. They had penetrated most large industrial and mining enterprises, and in many cases had formed understandings with the prerevolutionary engineers. Whatever the judicial failings of the Shakhta "trials," the GGPU was probably correct in recognizing a threat to the Revolution. As late as in 1928, Soviet industry were run by a partnership of German and prerevolutionary engineers independent of nominal Party control.

The tendency at the end of the decade was to turn increasingly toward American technical leadership. Of the agreements in force in mid-1929, 27 were with German companies, 15 were with United States firms and the remaining ones were primarily with British and French firms. In the last six months of 1929, the number of technical agreements with U.S. firms jumped to more than 40.[4] It is this change which forms a logical break in the examination of Soviet technology and industrial development. The usual break point—1928 (the beginning of the first Five-Year Plan)—is meaningful only in propaganda terms; the Plan was implemented *after* a sequence of construction and technical-assistance contracts with Western companies had been let.

The Freyn-Gipromez technical agreement for design and construction of giant metallurgical plants is economically and technically the most important.[5] Despite the German work, the metallurgical industry was on a 1913 technical level. It had not incorporated current advances in rolling techniques such as the American wide strip mill or the powerful, heavy blooming mills developed in the mid-1920's. The A. J. Brandt-Avtotrest agreement for reorganization and reconstruction of the prerevolutionary car plant (the AMO) was overshadowed by the 1930 Ford Motor Company agreement to build a completely new integrated plant for the mass production of the Model A, the 2.5-ton Ford truck, and buses using Ford patents, specifications, and manufacturing methods. The plant was erected by Albert Kahnn, the builder of River Rouge and so enabled the Soviets to duplicate the immense advances of American automobile engineering with a few years of inception in the United States. Two agreements with Orgametal by other American companies completed assistance in the heavy engineering field. The electrical industry had the services of International General Electric (in two agreements), the Cooper Engineering Company and RCA for the construction of long-range powerful radio stations. The Stuart, James and Cooke, Inc., contracts with various coal and mining trusts were supplemented by specialized assistance contracts, such as the Oglebay, Norton Company aid agreement for the iron ore mines and the Southwestern Engineering agreement in the non-ferrous industries. The chemical industry turned to Dupont and Nitrogen Engineering for synthetic nitrogen, ammonia, and nitric acid technology; to Westvaco Dye Trust. This was supplemented by more specialized agreements from other countries; ball bearings from Sweden and Italy; plastics, artificial silk, and aircraft from France; and turbines and electrical industry technology from the United Kingdom.

The penetration of this technology was complete. *At least 95 percent of the industrial structure* received this assistance. To demonstrate this, all sectors of the economy have been examined impartially.

We may conclude therefore, that the basic Soviet development strategy was to learn from that country considered to have the most advanced processes within a given field of technology and to leave no industrial sector without the benefits of this transfer process. In 1929–30, some 40 million rubles were spent for technical-assistance agreements alone. When it is considered that the marginal costs to the Western supplier were very small, that this ensured extremely low purchase prices for technology (in the light of opportunity costs), and that much of the transfer was done informally at no cost as a part of equipment-supply agreements, then the magnitude of the benefits becomes very clear. The greater part of this sum was spent in the U.S.;[6] 'In America,' it was said, they do not guard manufacturing secrets so jealously.' [7]

The success of this strategy was not lessened by the fact that political interests always dominated economic requirements. When individual concessions threatened the hold of the Party even remotely, the reaction was sharp and ruthless. The Shakhta affair was an example of Leninist terror used to bring a 'united front' into line, whatever might be the economic consequences. The move from German to American technology was partially dictated by the probability the American engineers were less likely to get tangled in the meshes of counter-revolution, which had its origin in Europe rather than the United States. Import of equipment always reflected the domination of the political. One of the first imports from the U.S., after the lifting of the blockade, was 1,300 printing presses from the Fulton Iron Works. Production of long-range radio stations went ahead rapidly with the help of RCA and In-

---

[2] Krassin, *op. cit.*

[3] The writer examined rather cursorily more than 25,000 documents, including a small group of Russian documents relating to this cooperation and the work of the various committees and subcommittees formed to channel the assistance. Committees IV and V were mainly concerned with the economic and technical aspects.

[4] Bron, *Soviet Economic Development and American Business.*

[5] The U.S. State Dept. Decimal File contains a rather curious exchange of letters between Freyn Engineering and the State Dept. Obviously there had been a major communication of ideas and attitudes between both parties. Both sides, however, refrained from placing the understanding on paper, or at least an understanding has not been traced within the Archives. Those documents in the files suggest that Freyn was powerfully influenced by the State Dept. viewpoint. (See U.S. State Dept. Decimal File, 661.1116/62.)

[6] To place U.S. technical aid to the U.S.S.R. in perspective, the reader is referred to *Current Technical Service Contracts* (U.S. Dept. of State, 1966). Brazil is the largest country in this listing. Pages 62–6 list AID) technical-assistance projects in Brazil. Comparison of these with U.S. aid agreements in the U.S.S.R. in 1928–9 will convey the enormous size and scope of the latter. There is nothing comparable to the Ford Motor Co. agreement, for example.

[7] *Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn*, No. 225, September 29, 1929, p. 3.

ternational General Electric, at the time when the State Department files had ample evidence of subversion (see, for example, Microcopy 316, Roll 141 for Soviet activities in the Dutch East Indies in 1928, the cracking of the Bolshevik code and instructions to Soviet agents at precisely that time at which permission was given to RCA and IGE to export radio stations to Soviet Russia). One at least understands why RCA checked and then double-checked with the State Department on permission to export high-powered radio stations.

The dominance of the political aspects over the economic did not restrian development; the Soviets correctly foretold the inaction of major Western governments during the transfer of technology. The Soviets were determined and based their moves on accurate information. Western governments failed to cooperate one with another and made policy determinations inconsistent with material on file.

The concessions policy itself had two aspects. On one hand the Soviets described to the Western businessman the profitable opportunities awaiting entrepreneurs in the U.S.S.R. These were presented in hopeful little booklets, backed up by trade journals and trade delegations. On the other hand, the Soviets had only limited interest in the concession hence their eventual expropriation of the Western entrepreneur naïve enough to invest in the Soviet economy. There was no danger to the Revolution, said Lenin: "They are a foreign thing in our system . . . but whoever wants to learn must pay." The West was needed to build up socialism, did it matter if the Soviets gave away a few tens of millions in resources? As Lenin said, "afterward we shall get it back with interest." The closer the explanation got to the rank and file, the more explicit were the Communists in describing the fate awaiting the Western businessman. It was unlikely that W. Averell Harriman was reading *Komsomolskaya Pravda,* and on this the Soviets guessed correctly. It is less credible that the State Department did not investigate the ample data at its disposal—data backed by very accurate field reports—to determine the fate of investors in the U.S.S.R.

As the lesson penetrated Western business circles, the pure and mixed concessions were replaced by the technical-assistance agreement, under which the assistance was either bought outright or was included as part of a large equipment order. After the 1928 Gillette Razor Blade concession, no further pure concessions were concluded. Mixed companies persisted for a few years. The technical agreement remains and is currently in use.

THANK YOU, LOU

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter which I received on July 26 from my close friend, a distinguished neurological surgeon, Dr. Louis A. Hazouri of Columbus, Ga.

Dr. Hazouri is no ordinary man. His reputation is that of a man so fiercely dedicated to the Hippocratic creed that he is a holy terror to any one or anything which detracts from the best for those unto whom he ministers.

He is a good man. Beneath the exterior which can be gruff and demanding, he is gentle and kind; with a heart overflowing with love for his family, his fellowman and his country.

His letter is no ordinary letter. The moving narration served to remind me of my visit to Southeast Asia and of my return to the United States earlier this year and the particular gratitude I felt on that occasion to be an American citizen. May I, in commending this letter to the attention of the House, say, "Thank you, Lou."

The letter follows:

LOUIS A. HAZOURI, M.D.,
Columbus, Ga., 31906, July 20, 1971.

Hon. JACK BRINKLEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK: Only on rare occasion do I get my dander up, however I felt that I had to express myself not only to you as my friend, but as my representative.

The notoriety associated with Medicaid upset me and I was planning on sending a letter which I had already dictated and had signed, but I felt the truth of the matter would come out, and time has proven this.

My purpose for writing you at this time, is in reference to my trip to Europe. Katherine and I as well as my sister, Adelle and little Katherine have only returned recently from Europe where I had participated in The Fourth European Neurosurgical Congress, which was held in Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Part of this visit was to include a tour to Budapest, as well as to Moscow, with a group of neurosurgeons, who for some reason decided not to go.

Nonetheless, I felt that this would be an unusual opportunity to really see what is going on behind the iron curtain. So I took it upon myself to have my family accompany me and we went on from Prague to Budapest and into Moscow. This was all done within a period of some two weeks.

When we arrived in Prague, I have never in all my life seen such a demoralized, depressed nation. I had a good opportunity to speak with, not only physicians, but also with many of the people. I think the fact that I was a Doctor, gave me an entree to the population in all three nations.

I was informed that there were no further Russians within the city of Prague, but that the city itself was encircled still by Russian troops, they did not know how many, but it was certainly more than several divisions.

Only prior to my arriving there, they told me that Russian soldiers accompanied the police. This was to remind the Czechoslovakian nation as to who was the master.

On the streets one could see the red star on every street post. Food tickets were being given out and as I understand, they were allotted so much for their clothes and for their food, there was a maximum of one hundred dollars a month income.

Whatever beef they had was sent out of the nation and the diet was relegated to that of carbohydrates, particularly bread and pastry as well as chicken and pork. Mineral water of course was the order of the day.

We ran into a professor who taught German at the University and with tears rolling down his cheeks, he told me about the problems that he had, and he felt that the Czechoslovakian nation had been forgotten by the world and wanted me to be sure that I remember to the people in the United States, not to forget this noble nation.

I was appalled to hear that the services in the only Synagogue in Prague, were being conducted only by a cantor, since a Rabbi was not allowed.

It was just appalling to learn that services in the Catholic churches, which incidentally, as I understand, 99.9 percent of the Czechoslovakian nation is Catholic, were being conducted by a state supervised Priest.

They were quite vague from this standpoint, as I understand, and I am certain that the heel of the boot was quite heavy on the neck of religion. As a matter of fact, it was looked upon with considerable disfavor.

After we left Czechoslovakia we went on to Budapest, the change was quite dramatic to the point that one would have thought that they were on the Riviera.

The fact that the radio in Czechoslovakia broadcast, quite obviously soviet propaganda, immediately went off the air sometimes between seven and eight P. M. was in such sharp contrast to the music that we heard in the ultramodern hotel facilities in Budapest.

On the surface it appeared to be a town that was quite gay and everyone seemed to be quite happy.

It became quite obvious in making my contacts with the various Hungarian people, that down deep, they were quite resentful and that the yoke of the Russian was quite heavy and tight.

They seemed to hope at least, that they would try to make the best of it as far as they could and if they were allowed the freedom, at least of showing some form of happiness that of course they would be willing to go along with the Russians since they had no power to do otherwise due to their size and due to the fact that there again they were such a poorly industrialized nation.

Nonetheless the deep bitterness and the hesitancy to even speak of this, was quite obvious.

I am certain in my own judgment, as one would look on Hungary that the Soviet Union would like to make this a show place to allow outsiders to think that all would be so great under the umbrella of the soviets. Certainly nothing could be further from the truth.

Here again the obvious individual freedoms, from that of what could be earned, to that of owning property was quite stifled. I could go on and on from this standpoint, but I know that this letter is unusually long, but I hope you will bear with me.

When we left Budapest and arrived in Moscow, going into customs was as if one were being dragged out of one's home and placed in a penitentary. I am certain that the language barrier had some effect, however the fact that these people were so rude, were so brusque and so callous, made my hair stand on end.

If I had had some means or had known of some method that I could turn around and catch the plane and go back to the States, I would have so done. Frankly I was at near panic, having my wife, sister and daughter with me.

They would not allow any jewelry, they wanted to take away my ring as well as my lapel button, take away our watches, since as you know, jewelry of any nature, gold, etc. was absolutely forbidden in the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, after we finally got through to them, we went on to our hotel.

This left so much to be desired and we were supposedly in a super deluxe hotel. This was a National Hotel which was part of the entourage. The food was deplorable, here again carbohydrates, breads, pork and chicken with once again a paltry amount of beef, although in certain select hotels after waiting several hours one could obtain this type of food.

I was so damn mad when we were driving down one of the main highways, in the perimeter of Moscow, I saw this signboard of blazing coals and with bombs dropping into the coals and a configuration suggestive of Uncle Sam pouring coals onto the fire, my hair stood on end.

The Russian people on the surface, appeared to be very aggressive and hard working, but beneath the surface it was quite obvious that down deep it appeared that they were like a group of sheep being led by a Judas sheep. As Katherine put it, their buildings and monuments are quite obvious, but you certainly could not hide the people.

Their dress and the food left so much to be desired that one could not help but feel a lump in his throat and tears in his eyes to think that people could be herded into such a way of life.

The more knowledgeable Soviets that I contacted seemed to emphasize the gesture of peace, yet it was quite obvious as to their hostility and sense of disdain if not utter contempt for the American.

The entire concept of orientation toward the state and the de-emphasis of the individual, was quite obvious.

The fact that they had only some ten to fifteen churches in Moscow, and less than one percent even considered church made me chill. My guide laughed when I asked him about the churches. He stated that they were museums, what else could they be for? Certainly not to worship; who and what and why.

The idea of private property was ridiculous. As a matter of fact, I read in their newspaper, the so-called Moscow News, that they were making an audit of various areas within the Soviet Union so that they could list, not only sculpture, art or what have you, but they are actually listing cities and townships as belonging to the state.

I could go on and on. I hope that I shall have an opportunity to see you sometimes in the future and bend your ear even further.

When we got back to the States and were going through customs, it was just like manna from Heaven.

I ran into a Customs Inspector, badge No. 10033. He was firm, he was professional, but he was an American and I need not say more, it was such a blessing.

I can only thank God for the Country that we have and I hope that you will keep fighting for the beliefs that we have.

I hope that our Country will be able to maintain its posture of strength as it has in the past and the present, and am hopeful for the future.

I think we can only speak from a hand of strength since in my opinion, from what I have seen, although limited, how in God's creation can one communicate with these people who are so unlike us in practically every respect, with the exception of the fact that they are upright and have an uncanny mind for deception.

A nation without any God would seem to me one hell bent of self destruction and carrying the world along with it. I hope that in this day and age we will not lose sight of this, although certainly an overt effort is being made in this direction in our courts.

I write this diatribe simply to ventilate. I would not object to your showing this letter to any of your fellow Congressmen and especially to Senator Talmadge, whom I respect and revere.

I can only end this letter by saying that the poorest American is the richest individual in the world in that he has individual freedom.

I still have great confidence in our President and our Congress, but I still prefer the walk lightly but carry a big stick policy.

The current popularity of being internationally minded notwithstanding.

I am hopeful that we can maintain these freedoms that have been paid for and are paid for with blood and treasure them.

I am hopeful that our President and Congress, however cognizant of this and mindful of the privileges that we have had, will not fall into a false sense of security.

I am enclosing a copy of an article that was pointed out to me this past week which coincidentally cites the same hotel where we stayed.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

LOUIS A. HAZOURI, M.D.

F–111 CAPABILITIES PRAISED BY ARMED FORCES JOURNAL

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article about the F–111 aircraft in the July 19 issue of the Armed Forces Journal.

Written by George Weiss, the article gives a hardheaded appraisal of the fighting capabilities of the F–111, describing it as "the best aircraft yet developed for night and bad weather attack missions deep inside enemy territory."

It is gratifying indeed, Mr. Speaker, to have the F–111, which is produced in my home town of Fort Worth, receive praise from such a prestigious military publication as the Armed Forces Journal.

Here is the article, as it appears in the Journal:

THE F–111: THE SWING-WING MAY SURPRISE YOU YET

(By George Weiss)

If the United States finds itself in a serious shooting war next year . . . or a decade from now . . . one of the first aircraft to be committed to battle will be the "Little Orphan Annie," unloved by her relatives in Congress, eventually deserted for the international banking business by her illegitimate father, denied by her Navy foster brothers, but who finally found a home with friends of the family, the Air Force.

People have now taken to calling "Annie" by her given name, F–111, but some neighborhood critics still prefer her pre-natal name, TFX. Almost everyone remembers her nickname "Controversial." Perhaps they know her best by that name.

But the orphan, say the friends of the family, turned out to be a lady despite all the whispers behind her back and charges to her face that she would never amount to anything. Those who know her best, who fly with her and care for her ills, say they love her. She has won the approval of those who count the most—the men who will go with her into combat and trusting in her to see them home again.

She still has problems and faults and she will have more. No one ever denies it. And since she is famous there are those who will pounce on her, without thinking, slashing at her old reputation. But, say the airmen, it hurts those who honestly believe she is to be a faithful companion through the years.

In many ways she didn't have a chance. Here are some of the reasons.

The Air Force wanted a long range fighter-bomber with primary emphasis on high speed, low altitude, nuclear and conventional bombing capability. The Navy needed a carrier based interceptor to climb to high altitudes, medium range, for fleet defense. Somehow the services were expected to adjust their needs and the resulting aircraft would be everything to everyone. It didn't happen.

The Navy finally saw an opportunity to pull out and the Air Force stuck with the problem going through several model designations, doggedly improving the aircraft.

If the Air Force erred in its approach to the situation it was in not having changed the type designation from tactical fighter to tactical bomber.

When the F–111 was little more than a gleam in the Air Force's eye, TAC discarded the aircraft designations of day-fighter and fighter-bomber, combining them into an all inclusive term—tactical fighter. All future TAC aircraft were expected to bomb and fight air-to-air with more or less equal agility. But the bomb load to be hung on the F–111 was equal to or greater than that of either B–66 or B–57 tactical bombers. The F–111 today is a tactical bomber with many of the characteristics of a fighter.

From the very outset it was obvious the F–111 would never become an air superiority fighter in the sense of being a "dog fighter." Weight alone precluded that option being available. However, shooting down aircraft is always a last ditch effort in trying to win air superiority. Tacticians go air-to-air when they have no other choice. What is preferred, and what the F–111 can do, is win air superiority in that vital role of airfield interdiction.

The Israeli Air Force most recently demonstrated this tactical concept in the Six Days War. The F–111 is a far superior weapon for airfield interdiction than any other fighter in the Defense Department, or the world for that matter, the Air Force maintains.

One field grade F–111 pilot interviewed by The Journal was asked how this aircraft would have added to the IAF plan for the destruction of the Egyptian Air Force at the onset of hostilities. "They could have made their first strike during the night instead of waiting for first light," he said. "They would not have needed as many aircraft to knock out the enemy fighter and bomber bases. The F–111 weapons system would have covered more area on each of the enemy bases—and the destruction would have been greater."

F–111 VS. FOXBAT

What will the F–111 do if it meets the Mach 3 "Foxbat" MiG–23? Well, according to the men who fly the F–111 they are going to be very surprised if the meeting takes place. It certainly won't be at extreme altitudes where the Foxbat performs best. If the Foxbat pilots want to "have a go" at the F–111 they will be forced to come down to the deck and the Russian fighter isn't going to last long at that arena, the fighter pilots maintain.

The Mach 2, MiG–21, a beautiful sports car version of an interceptor, could not handle the F–105 at low altitudes in North Vietnam. The F–105, like the F–111, was designed to stand the brutal punishment of high speeds and low altitudes. The MiG–21 pilots were forced to break off, time after time, while chasing the "Thud" around North Vietnamese hills and valleys—and the F–105s were still able to carry out their missions. There are a lot of "Thud divers" in the F–111 program who haven't forgotten that. They know the F–111 is several hundred miles an hour faster on the deck than the F–105 and no aircraft in the world can stay with it.

The anti-F–111 doom-sayers still predict the Foxbat will eat the fighter alive, but TAC pilots aren't getting grey hair anymore than the Israeli Air Force pilots may face the MiG–23 with the F–4 Phantom. According to newspaper articles they too realize the Foxbat will have to come down to their altitude to fight. When the enemy pilots do they will be playing in a new ball game—and on the F–4 and F–111 pilots' home field.

But how about "look down-shoot down" capability? This is a possible new technique which would allow the Foxbat to fire missiles down from high altitude against fighters below.

Again the TAC pilots aren't too upset. The F–111, they say, has a few new "black boxes" to aid the two-man crew. The tail radar will notify them whenever the MiG–23, or any other enemy jet approaches. With sufficient warning in the cockpit, and the black boxes, the TAC crews believe they can manage the situation. Looking at it from another angle, the F–111 will be operating at night for the most part in the worst weather (an unavoidable fact in Europe) and at low altitudes. Those three facts alone offer considerable protection. Enemy ground based radar will be unable to continuously track individual fighters for proper interception by airborne units. They feel the enemy air threat won't cause them to worry on a full time basis.

The pilots of the F–111 can select the altitude they fly above the ground by simply setting an indicator on their terrain following radar. With that means they can stay below "enemy eyes" during each of the critical portions of their missions. The F–111 will maintain the desired altitude by scanning the terrain ahead and adjusting itself to surface elevation changes and obstacles. The most difficult part, pilots say, is to sit there at night pretending to relax, as the F–111 climbs an unseen hillside, goes over the top and into negative "g's" on the downside. In pitch dark situations the trust of the pilot for "Annie" must be absolute.

So far as has been determined no accidents have ever been attributed to terrain following in training or combat.

"You haven't lived," one F–111 pilot told The JOURNAL, "until you go into the Grand Canyon after midnight in a rainstorm, and come out the other side."

But suppose, just suppose, the F–111 and the MiG–21 or even the MiG–23 meet? What then? In a straight-on even-odds, no warning fight, the computer calculations point to the MiGs; but the TAC pilots still feel they have a few rabbits to pull from their hatful of tricks. The experts at Nellis AFB are working on some new maneuvers and tactics that should improve the odds. So if Annie walks the back alleys alone some dark night she will at least know there is more she can do in self defense than run and yell for help.

ACCIDENT RATE

Much of the continuing criticism of the F–111 hinges on the F–111's accidents. No matter what "Little Orphan Annie" does she attracts more attention than is deserved. But if you seriously examine her performance record in comparison with other fighters she comes off better than anyone expects.

Compared to the F–100 at 80,000 flight hours, the F–111 has had less than one-third as many accidents during those critical early states of development. The F–105 had twice as many accidents as the F–111 at the 80,000 hour point.

Both of these fighters were effective in Southeast Asia and carried more than their share of the combat load. Of course, both of them are single engine fighters. Comparing the F–111 with the popular F–4, another twin-engine, two-place jet, is more equitable. But the F–4 also had more accidents than the F–111 at the same stage of development.

No matter how you slice it, the F–111 comes out a safer fighter by far against all the Century series jets.

From this one might forecast that, like the F–100, the F–111 will become more and more reliable as the pilots and maintenance experts get to know her better and understand her various quirks and internal problems.

STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS

But, say the critics, how about the structural failures that have "plagued" the aircraft? Of the 23 F–111s that have been destroyed in accidents only *two* are known to have involved a structural failure. There were losses in Southeast Asia in which the aircraft were not found. They will remain a mystery. However, no one in the F–111 business appears concerned that a structural failure was involved. The odds are they are correct.

The first F–111 structural failure in flight was traced to a bad weld which caused loss of flight control. The second failure was more serious and involved the left wing pivot fitting. As a result the fleet of 344 F–111 aircraft in operation were put into one of the toughest testing programs yet devised. As of 25 June 270 had been returned to duty with a clean bill of health. Only 10% of the aircraft tested were found to contain minor flaws which might not have ever been noticed in routine checks. As a result of the tests four wing carry-through boxes and twelve wing pivot fittings were rejected.

The overall effect will be to increase the structural life of the F–111 and minimize future inspection requirements, a decided plus for the fighter.

The F–111 is now the most tested aircraft in the Air Force and the world. No other single aircraft has been subjected to the wide variety of reliability tests. Equipment and methods were invented to test the aircraft and some of these did produce ground failures as they were supposed to do. Because of these tests lives have been saved and the planes that passed are capable of withstanding stresses far higher than they are ever expected to encounter in normal operations or combat.

STRIKE ACCURACY

The F–111 went into combat in Southeast Asia when there were a limited number of targets available. All bombing was being conducted south of the 20th parallel. This did not allow the Air Force to fully explore the capabilities of the fighter to the extent desired.

Only 55 SEA combat sorties were flown by the six plane force. There were also restrictions placed on the F–111s which grounded them for a considerable portion of their stay in Thailand.

In fact, only two weeks of actual combat experience was gained during the time the fighters were in Thailand.

The fighter was flown in single ship night missions and mostly (80%) in bad weather to attack known enemy positions. Flying at high speeds and low levels the pilots penetrated well defended positions, attacked their targets and departed without being threatened by enemy action in most cases.

The only defense the enemy seemed capable of mustering against the F–111 was barrage fire whenever they realized the fighter was operating in an area. The F–111 crews spotted AAA/SAM defense activity on only 42% of their missions. No F–111 was ever hit by enemy fire.

The terrain avoidance radar proved itself in training in the U.S. and in North Vietnam. SAMs failed to locate the F–111s in their low level penetrations just above the tree tops at night along the Annam mountain chain between Laos and North Vietnam.

Post-strike reconnaissance bomb damage assessments of their radar bombing attacks offered final proof to the Air Force that the F–111 could hit a target under combat conditions with results comparable to daylight attacks by other fighter-bombers.

Operating in daylight in the U.S. on training missions the F–111 established a bombing rate 50% better than the best previous bomb scores in the Air Force.

In one test, called Combat Bullseye, the F–111 was tested for accuracy in the delivery of aerial weapons against the F–105 and F–4. She was an easy winner.

One Air Force pilot, no longer flying the F–111, told The Journal that after ten years bombing practice in the F–100 he topped his best previous score on his first practice mission in the F–111. He said his experience was not uncommon.

Pilots credit the F–111 itself as being responsible for the better bomb scores. The primary difference, they say, comes from the stability of the F–111 on bombing and strafing runs and the unusually smooth flight control system which, with the gun and bomb sight, makes a high degree of accuracy possible.

NATO COMMITMENT

Last September two F–111s left the U.S. non-stop for Upper Heyford, England, where they became a part of the 20th Tactical Fighter Wing. They did not employ air-to-air refueling on their trans-Atlantic flight. The wing has now converted from the F–100 to the F–111 which gives the fighter a NATO commitment.

The F–111 extends the combat radius of the wing to double that of old "Silver Dollar." The black underbellies of the new F–111s are mute testimony to their nuclear mission in Europe. Along with the aircraft came an entirely new all weather capability for the 20th. No longer will weather be a deciding factor for planning purposes. In fact, weather now enhances the capability, reliability and success potential of the wing.

Airmen maintaining the Upper Heyford F–111s in the NATO operational mission claim their job is easier than with the more familiar F–100s. While the Air Force stipulated that the F–111 should not exceed more than 35 manhours maintenance for each hour flown, the twin-engine fighter is averaging well under 30 man-hours per hour, according to current experience.

NUCLEAR CAPABILITY

SAC also has operational aircraft. The force of 66 FB–111 aircraft, armed with four SRAM missiles or nuclear gravity bombs, will soon be in place at both Pease AFB, N.H., and Plattsburg AFB, N.Y. With the FB–111s already delivered to the Air Force and crews completing training at Carswell AFB, Texas, it is admitted by SAC that the medium range SAC bombers have long held a back-up operational mission. The instructor pilots have formed the aircrews for use in the event of an emergency.

The FB–111s, like the B–52 force, will soon be dispersed to satellite bases once their crews are declared combat ready.

SAC takes some pride in the fact that an FB–111 was declared a winner against the B52 in the last SAC bomb competition. Another FB–111 flew to England on a demonstration flight during the RAF bomber competition. The RAF did not invite it to participate.

Air Force Chief of Staff General John D. Ryan told the Senate Committee on Appropriations this spring that the FB–111 has ". . . better penetration, bombing and navigation capability than the B–52 . . . (and) adds a new dimension in versatility to the bomber force." He did not need to add that the shortcoming of the FB–111 was its limited range for strategic bombing and bomb carrying capability. As an interim SAC bomber it is satisfactory. The command has no intention to purchase more, including the new stretched version being offered by General Dynamics, The Journal was told by General Bruce K. Holloway, SAC Commander-in-Chief.

One Air Force officer involved in the F–111 program recently told The Journal, "The F–111 is going to look like a bargain in a few years." His reasons why were all operational.

Based on current experience with the F–111 and other aircraft in SEA it required 5.91 Phantom sorties or 5.04 "Thud" sorties to attain the target damage obtained by a single F–111.

The highly automated A–7 came out

slightly better in comparison, 3.57 sorties as compared to the F–111.

The cost factor of operating fighters in a bombing role entails more than a single formation of jets. It includes electronic counter measures aircraft, ground based radars, tankers, air cap, flak suppression sorties and "Wild Weasel" anti-SAM missions. All must be coordinated and timed by a half dozen bases and units. The F–111 operated in SEA without such aerial support and will in the future.

Despite the cost and problems associated with the F–111 it still stands alone as the best aircraft yet developed for night and bad weather attack missions deep inside enemy territory. It is unique in its unrefueled range capabilities. No other fighter in the world can cross the Atlantic unrefueled which means that the F–111 alone can be rapidly deployed almost anywhere in the world without waiting for tanker support. Pacific missions would require island stops. Tankers would allow non-stop crossings.

It carries more bombs than any other fighter and surpasses all other known fighters for automatic navigation accuracy, weapons accuracy, maintainability and short or rough field operations. As a single ship attack aircraft it can operate as no other can without extensive air cover, tanker and electronic counter-measures support. In addition it has a 24-hour attack capability in bad weather, giving it an 80% advantage over other aircraft in the European theater.

Little Orphan Annie, the Texas turkey, is no lady, She's a Tiger.

SAFETY COMPARISON

The F–111 continues to have the lowest accident rate of any Century series fighter. This table compares the F–111 with other type fighters at the 80,000 hour operation mark.

Major Type	*Accidents*
F–100	77
F–101	42
F–102	48
F–104	59
F–105	42
F–106	33
F–4	39
F–111 *	21

* Excludes two combat losses.

CALIFORNIA WILD RIVERS STRUGGLE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the June 16, 1971, Burlingame Advance-Star contained an article by Mr. John Morrill which offered perceptive comments on the struggle in California to save the wild rivers from future damming. His reference to the western tradition of free flowing life style and rivers creates a mood that most Californians, including myself, both enjoy and feel slipping away. I offer Mr. Morrill's article for this RECORD in order to make known the feelings of many sports enthusiasts in my home State on this vital issue:

LEGISLATIVE MOVE TO SAVE STATE'S RIVERS

(By John Morrill)

Back in the early days of California, when vaqueros roped grizzlies, and herds of antelope ranged the great Central Valley, this state could boast 38 rivers that flowed unobstructed down out of its pine-carpeted mountains to the Pacific.

Today, only three of those rivers survive relatively unblemished.

The mighty Klamath, Eel and Trinity rivers, the finest steelhead and salmon rivers in California, could well be preserved in their present free-flowing state if Senate Bill 107, sponsored by State Senators Peter H. Behr and Robert Lagomarsino, passes this year.

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Bill, as it's called, won its way past the Senate Committee on Natural Resources, and is due for a hearing before the tough Senate Finance Committee early next month.

Joe Paul, the affable San Francisco public relations man who has spearheaded the campaign for the passage of SB 107 through the California Committee of Two Million, is optimistic about the fate of the bill, but not to the point of over-confidence.

He's been huddling these days with Sen. Randolph Collier, whose home base of Yreka places him close to the mountains that spawn the three rivers. Collier has been the stumbling block, so far, expressing concerns about flood control, although approving of the bill in principle.

"We have a large majority of the Finance Committee votes leaning our way," Paul told me this week, "possibly 10 out of the 13, and we only need seven. But Sen. Collier is the one to work on right now."

"Collier has moved from a position of passive opposition to one of support with some minor qualifications," Paul enthused. "We should be able to put together a bill for the governor."

What SK 107 would do is protect the Trinity, Eel, and Klamath rivers from the dammers and water exporters, and qualify the rivers for inclusion in the federal wild and scenic rivers system, which would mean protection from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

So far, the Middle Fork of the Feather River is the only body of water in the state that is included in the federal system.

Rep. Jerome Waldie has authored HR 7238, with Rep. Pete McCloskey and other conservationist legislators giving the three giants of northern California federal protection under the 1968 National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

If the bill passes and is signed by the governor, then an inventory of the three rivers will be conducted, classifying the various stretches of each river as "wild"—meaning free of barriers, essentially primitive and accessible only by trail; "scenic"—same as "wild", but with limited road access, and "recreational", which would mean easy road access and commercial development.

The bill also would send the controversial Dos Rios Dam to its final resting place in some planner's wastebasket.

There's no alternative to saving these three rivers.

Californians have destroyed the wild quality of almost every body of water in the state, but this is one chance we have to redeem ourselves.

If you're in a letter-writing mood, drop a courteous note to Sen. Collier at his office at 206 Fourth St., Yreka, 96097, and urge his unequivocal support of this vital measure.

THE KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts will have its formal opening in September. Already a widely publicized preview has been held at the Center.

Therefore, I think it is appropriate at this time to review some of the history of the Kennedy Center. I regret that time does not allow me to prepare a more thorough and complete account of the trials and tribulations of the first years of this project, and to pay proper tribute to those who worked so hard to bring it to conception. Many people have been involved, over a number of years, in making this Center possible. The development of the Center has not been without its problems and difficulties, but I believe we now have a focal point for cultural activity in the United States of which we can be proud. I hope that it will fulfill its purpose of making a broad range of outstanding cultural attractions available to the general public.

The opening of the Center comes 13 years after I introduced legislation in the Senate and Representative FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey introduced a companion measure in the House of Representatives on February 24, 1958, providing for the construction of a National Capital Center for the Performing Arts. A variety of proposals of this general nature had been under discussion for some years prior to the introduction of this legislation.

The site originally proposed in the bill was on the Mall, opposite the National Gallery. However, because of a bill introduced by Senator ANDERSON authorizing construction of an Air Museum on the same site, Senator ANDERSON, Representative THOMPSON, and I, along with other interested parties, agreed on an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, calling for the Center to be located on a site in the Foggy Bottom area near the Potomac. Senator ANDERSON and Senator Wiley of Wisconsin joined me in sponsoring the amendment and the legislation was passed unanimously by the Senate on June 20, 1958.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following articles printed in the RECORD at this point: Articles from the Washington Post, February 26, 1958; New York Times, March 2, 1958; by Richard Coe, Washington Post, March 16, 1958; New York Times, March 24, 1958; by Betty Beale, the Evening Star, Washington, April 14, 1958; Washington Post editorial, May 29, 1958; Washington Post, June 21, 1958.

I also ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Public Works of June 11, 1958, and excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 1958, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 26, 1958]

SENATE BILL PROVIDES FOR MALL ARTS CENTER

Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) has introduced a bill to provide for a "National Capital Center of the Performing Arts" directly across the Mall from the National Gallery of Art.

The measure, similar to one introduced last month by Rep. Frank Thompson Jr. (D-N.J.), puts it up to the Senate to decide between a cultural center and an air museum

the Smithsonian Institution wants to put on the site.

Both bills provide for the cultural center above, omitting a national auditorium which the District Auditorium Commission wanted to include in a single large project. The Commission became defunct last year after Congress failed to accept its recommendation of an auditorium site in Foggy Bottom.

An air museum measure, calling for use of the Mall site bounded by 4th and 7th sts., Independence ave. and Adams drive sw., was introduced last May by Sen. Clinton P. Anderson (D-N. Mex.).

Fulbright's bill, like Anderson's, has been referred to the Senate Public Works Subcommittee.

Thompson said the recent agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, calling for expansion of the cultural exchange program, underscores the need for adequate facilities in the Nation's Capital.

"I am confident," he said, "that the money for the National Cultural Center can be raised from private sources and that the American taxpayer will not have to be taxed to provide this much-needed facility." "Foundations may provide much of the money," he added.

An air museum could be located elsewhere —perhaps in the Southwest redevelopment area, Thompson declared.

The air museum may run into opposition. Critics say, its size would tend to make it overshadow the Capitol. It is opposed by the Fine Arts Commission, which feels the site ought to be used for cultural purposes.

Support for the Cultural Center has come from Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and from an array of organizations interested in recreation, education, music and other performing arts.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 2, 1958]

ART CENTER DRIVE PUSHED IN CAPITAL; FULBRIGHT AND THOMPSON OFFER BILLS ASKING UNITED STATES TO DONATE SITE ON MALL

WASHINGTON, March 1.—A Senator and a Representative joined this week in a continuing campaign to establish here a National Capital Center of the Performing Arts.

This plan is similar in purpose to that of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York's already developing Lincoln Square project. It would provide for presentation of opera, concert and ballet here, on a scale now impossible because of cramped quarters.

Sponsors of identical bills are Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, and Representative Frank S. Thompson Jr. of New Jersey, both Democrats.

The two declared that the idea of a cultural center, despite the decisive House of Representatives vote last year against one proposed auditorium and cultural center, was still alive. They said that the vote had been primarily against the site, not against culture.

CHOICE SITE SOUGHT

Their bills now call for the Federal Government to donate a choice site on The Mall for the cultural center only, with no plan for a huge auditorium.

The plan would be for the building to be financed by public contributions. Robert Dowling of New York, president of the American National Theatre and Academy, testified last year that if Congress would donate a suitable site, there would be no question as to the feasibility of building with private funds.

Representative Thompson said that he hoped the Ford Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation, each of which recently contributed $2,500,000 to New York City's new cultural center, "will do at least as much for the National Capital."

Mr. Thompson favors a site comparable to that of the Mellon Art Gallery. The first such site he found was ear-marked this week by the Senate Public Works Committee for Smithsonian's Air Museum.

ALTERNATE SITE PICKED

Representative Thompson and Senator Fulbright made a tour around The Mall and decided on an alternate site—a frontage on Independence Avenue, just across from The Mall. A temporary World War II building, used as the Armed Services Medical Museum, is on the site.

The New Jersey Democrat said that he had been promised hearings for his bill just as soon as it received the approval of Smithsonian Museum, under whose auspices the new center would be placed—as are the art galleries and museums already on The Mall.

The two sponsors of the project have the advantage of having already scored legislative victories in the cultural field.

Senator Fulbright is the author of the educational exchange act. With Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, Representative Thompson sponsored the law passed last year that made permanent this country's art and trade fair activities.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 16, 1958]

MALL IS FIT SPOT FOR HALL

(By Richard L. Coe)

How about that auditorium?

New Jersey's dogged Democrat Congressman Frank Thompson has been joined in his efforts by the lucid Senator from Arkansas, William Fulbright, in trying to latch onto Mall property opposite the National Gallery of Art for a National Cultural Center of the Performing Arts.

What could be a more fitting spot?

In the way and very much in the way is a concurrent attempt to latch onto the same land for an Air Museum. It doesn't take much imagination to see that a worthwhile Air Museum would soon be busting at the seams in such comparatively restricted space. Rep. Thompson points out that Bolling Air Base is soon to be evacuated and that it would make an ideal setting for the air exhibits. An auditorium would need space—and parking underneath it—but nothing like the space a worthy collection of air age mementos would require.

To resolve this impasse hearings will be held shortly before Sen. Pat McNamara's subcommittee on Public Buildings. The Michigan Democrat heading this subdivision of the Senate Committee on Public Works, plans to give good warning of the hearings since he's aware there is "a definite conflict between the auditorium and air interests for the site."

What can Washingtonians who want an auditorium do to let their interests be known about this?

Looks like it's the old answer for this voteless community—letters, wires, public discussion and whatever pressures can be mustered.

One outfit that's been supremely quiet about supporting an auditorium adjacent to the Mellon gallery has been the Board of Trade. Now is the time for its cultural development subcommittee to start cracking.

One reason the Board of Trade may have lost interest was the failure of last year's auditorium commission to gain the Foggy Bottom site it envisioned for a far more ambitious project which would have included a huge convention hall.

Somebody should alert Board members to the fact that a worthy auditorium could well attract visitors to the city just as the Mellon gallery has done. And someone should also remind the members that the projected annual performing arts festival could have no future at all unless a suitable building is created.

Rep. Thompson's new bill (H.R. 9848) benefits from his experience last year with the more ambitious project in Foggy Bottom. When that was defeated its opponents said "We can still have the cultural center and quicker, on one of the several available government-owned sites."

Now he has pin-pointed, with eminent logic it seems to me, the land Congress picked out in 1938 for a national art center. That project has been moved to the old Patent Office building (7th and F sts. nw.) but aviation interests have been trying to move in on the Mall property.

Thompson says that his bill would provide a cultural center similar in purpose to the $205 million Lincoln Square Center of the Performing Arts now under way in New York. Once the Government grants the land, Robert Dowling, president of the American National Theater and Academy, foresees financing on non-governmental level.

The Ford and Rockefeller foundations contributed two and a half million each to Gotham's Lincoln Square project and there are indications they also would contribute to a similar venture here. Private individuals and public groups also have promised contributions.

The ultimate set-up would be similar to the Smithsonian Institution, regents of which are directed to solicit gifts, bequests, subscriptions and moneys to construct, furnish, equip and maintain. The procedure is the same which set up the Mellon and Freer art galleries and is now working on the bell tower memorial to the late Sen. Taft.

The need for such an auditorium can hardly be exaggerated. It was glaringly reflected last week when a "full stage production" of "Back to Methuselah" was pushed onto the hopelessly ill-equipped platform of Constitution Hall. It should never have been there, nor should operatic or ballet events, but so long as the platform is the only choice, the managers will be using it, a system under which the public and the artists are the losers.

What chance of success does this Fulbright-Thompson effort have?

With no D.C. vote and only a few spokesmen, fruition of the auditorium dream depends on letting the members of Congress know how both Washingtonians and home state voters feel about the glaring cultural lack in what is supposed to be the Capital of the Western World.

Thompson pointed out the other day that "The real Trojan Horse is the declining level of education with its vulgarization of cultural standards. If this is not reversed, and immediately, we shall soon become a big but second-rate people, fat, Philistine and self-indulgent."

Granting by Congress of the Mall land for a fitting twin to the world-respected Mellon gallery could clearly be a fruitful achievement. Surely with the space and equipment already at Bolling, the Air Museum already has a potential home. For our own and visiting foreign performing arts the Capital of the Western World has none.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1958]

FULBRIGHT URGES NATIONAL OPERA; SENATOR BACKS THEATER IN CAPITAL TO COUNTER SOVIET PROPAGANDA ON CULTURE

Construction of a National Opera and Ballet Theatre in Washington was urged here Saturday by Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, so that "we will not hang our heads in shame whenever people tell us about the Bolshoi Theatre" in Moscow.

The Senator spoke to 200 opera producers and managers from twenty states during a luncheon at the Biltmore Hotel. The event was part of the second day's program of the fourth annual conference of the Central Opera Service and the National Council of the Metropolitan Opera.

Mr. Fulbright announced in behalf of the Opera Council that March 23–29 would be named "National Opera Week." He appealed

for support of two bills now before Congress intended to increase Government participation in the arts. Both bills were introduced by him last month.

One calls for the establishment of a National Capital Center of the Performing Arts next to the National Gallery of Art in Washington. The Government would have to provide the land, which is Government-owned, while actual construction could be financed from private funds.

The center would symbolize "the cultural interests and achievements of the people of the United States." It would be under the supervision of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. They include the Vice President, the Chief Justice of the United States and representatives of Congress.

The second bill provides that the United States become copyright owner of all music now in the public domain.

The Federal Government, acting through a National Music Council, would collect the royalties and would spend them "to encourage the creation, understanding and appreciation of music." Some of this money could be used for the maintenance of the proposed Washington Opera Center.

"This country should have an appropriate building for performance of opera and ballet," Senator Fulbright told his audience.

HEARINGS ON CULTURAL CENTER TO DRAW PROMINENT FIGURES

So many society figures are going to crowd into Room 412 in the Senate Office Building Friday morning they ought to serve tea.

That's when the hearings will be held on Senator Fulbright's bill for establishing a cultural center on the Mall for the performing arts. Everybody in Washington with a deep interest in acquiring this long-sought opera house, concert hall, etc., is expected to turn up.

Senator McNamara's Public Buildings Subcommittee will do the listening from 10 to 12, and the first people they will hear will be Senator Fulbright and Representative Frank Thompson testifying in favor of the bill, and Senator Anderson testifying in favor of another bill for an air museum on the same site.

Besides such well-known Washington women as Perle Mesta, Mrs. Merriweather Post, Mrs. Charles Carroll Glover and Grace Phillips, who will be on hand and ready to testify, coming from out of town to speak in behalf of the Fulbright bill are Mrs. Frank Coolidge, a leading figure in the Detroit Symphony association, who is flying here with Marie Hurley, legislative chairman of the National Federation of Music Clubs (700,000 membership); Robert Dowling, president of ANTA; Edwin Hughes, executive secretary of the National Music Council (1 million members), and Metropolitan Opera star John Brownlee, president of the American Guild of Musical Artists, who will come down from New York, and Reginald Stewart, director of the Peabody Conservatory of Music, who will come from Baltimore.

Benjamin Thoron will speak for the National Symphony, Oscar Cox will speak for the Opera Society of Washington, Gerson Nordlinger will appear on behalf of the Washington Ballet Guild and Mr. Frank Jelleff, one of Washington's most public-spirited citizens, who has been sick, says he is "going to testify if he has to crawl in."

It should be a dramatic presentation from those who have long been disgusted over the vacuum in our cultural facilities.

The chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, David Finley, is also expected to appear. The Fine Arts Commission, by the way, recently added advisers representing the performing arts—Howard Mitchell for the National Symphony, Paul Callaway for the Opera Society, and Father Hartke for the theater.

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1958]

HAPPY COMPROMISE

Senator McNamara's Public Works Subcommittee has handled the rival proposals for development of the Mall tract opposite the National Gallery with restraint and wisdom. In a city accustomed to unending conflicts over municipal ventures of this sort, it is refreshing to find an apparent accommodation of views on the Air Museum and Performing Arts Center. The supporters of each project had sought the attractive Mall site. There was the risk that the Subcommittee would shelve both ventures rather than choose one. But, with the cooperation of various District officials and private groups, the sponsors of the rival legislation have produced a package proposal to allow both projects to be advanced and the Subcommittee promises early action.

The Performing Arts Center is now proposed to be located on a tract in Foggy Bottom, already mostly Federally owned. It has many of the advantages which led the former District Auditorium Commission to favor another site in this same area for the somewhat larger project it was developing. There would be an attractive river view and better access roads, for this kind of facility, than the Mall site offers. The Air Museum would be given the Mall site. Although we continue to believe that a larger, outlying location would be preferable in some ways, this plan would at least keep together the main buildings of the Smithsonian Institution, of which the Air Museum would be a part.

The National Capital Planning Commission has made important contributions to effecting the settlement, both in its analysis of the sites and in offering to provide at least part of the money that would be needed to round out the Foggy Bottom tract. The Commission of Fine Arts also has emerged from its cloister to play a decisive and helpful role. Some of the civic groups have rallied over the years to one cultural center plan after another almost to the point of exhaustion. No doubt they would have preferred to push further for the Mall site, but most have wisely chosen to "go along" with the alternative plan in the interest of getting something started.

The proposals which have now been developed are, directly and indirectly, the fruit of many years of exhaustive studies on which a great deal of public money has been expended. They deserve more than routine handling by Congress and will require the continued, energetic support of Washingtonians who want to see their city move forward.

NATIONAL CAPITAL CENTER OF THE PERFORMING ARTS

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3335) to provide for a National Capital Center of the Performing Arts which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on part of the land in the District of Columbia made available for the Smithsonian Gallery of Art, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the bill, as amended, does pass.

The amendments are indicated in the bill as reported by linetype and italics, and are as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert new language as a substitute.

Amend the title to read:

A bill to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 3335, as amended, is to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, composed of 15 specified Federal officials, members ex officio, and 15 general trustees appointed by the President, to cause to be constructed for the Institution, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, a building to be designated as the National Cultural Center on a site in the District of Columbia bounded by Rock Creek Parkway, New Hampshire Avenue, the proposed Inner Loop Freeway, and the approaches to the authorized Theodore Roosevelt Bridge.

The Board would maintain and administer the National Cultural Center and site thereof, present programs of the performing arts, lectures and other programs, and provide facilities for other civic activities. There would also be established an Advisory Committee on the Arts, designated by the President, to advise and consult with the Board and make recommendations regarding cultural activities to be carried on in the center. The lands for the National Cultural Center and related activities would be acquired by the National Capital Planning Commission, with plans and specifications for the building approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds held hearings on S. 3335 concurrently with those on S. 1985, a bill authorizing preparation of plans for a National Air Museum, since both buildings were proposed for approximately the same site. In general, the Federal agencies had opposed the site on the south side of the Mall opposite the National Gallery of Art, largely because of the size and shape of the site, the lack of parking area, and because it had previously been approved as a site for the National Air Museum. Several alternate sites for the National Cultural Center were proposed. The Bureau of the Budget opposed the provisions of S. 3335 assigning to the Smithsonian Institution responsibility for operating cultural activities, believing that encouragement of the arts is primarily a matter for private and local initiative.

The author of S. 3335, and a companion bill in the House of Representatives; national and local representatives of all branches of the performing arts, music, opera, drama, letters, dance, and others; civic and trade organizations; and individuals; testified as to the urgent need in the District of Columbia for more adequate public facilities to present programs in the performing arts, provide for adequate instructions in such arts, and the provision of adequate facilities for other civic activities. There was unanimous agreement among all witnesses who testified at the hearing of the many benefits that would accrue, and the interest and appreciation that would develop in this country, for the opera, the ballet, drama, and music in every form, if an adequate cultural center for the performing arts is developed in the city of Washington, D.C.

AMENDMENT

Because of the controversy that developed over the proposed site for the National Capital Center of the Performing Arts, and opposition to certain provisions of S. 3335, the coauthors of the two bills pending before Congress, the interested Federal agencies, and others, cooperated in working out an amendment to S. 3335 in the nature of substitute language, with the proposed building to be located on a site in the Foggy Bottom area near the Potomac River. This site and the proposed language changes has the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Bureau of the Budget, the Washington Board of Trade, and others. The committee heartily endorses this amendment to S. 3335.

DISCUSSION

The committee was presented testimony at great length on the dire need, long over-

due, for a National Cultural Center in the city of Washington, D.C., to provide adequate facilities for the performance of opera, ballet, symphonic and chamber music, drama, and reading of poetry. All Americans are very proud of their National Capital, yet the cultural facilities here are inferior to all leading European capitals, and numerous small European cities. Adequate facilities are not available for presenting grand opera in full performance with suitable stage and scenery equipment. This lack of an adequate center for the arts in Washington detracts from our international prestige. Visitors from abroad to Washington inquire about our opera house and are told we have none.

In recent years, there has been several international cultural exchange programs between various countries. The exhibits and events at the Brussels Fair place an emphasis on culture as well as on science and trade. Our citizens are not without talent or interest in the arts, and these faculties should be developed to provide common ties which will unite the United States with other nations and assist in the further growth and development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the other nations of the world.

The committee believes that music, art, poetry, drama, and dance, transcends language barriers, and provides a means of communication between people of different nationalities, which will permit conveyance to people of other countries some of the basic concepts of the American way of life.

The committee commends the sponsors and proponents of S. 3335 for working out a satisfactory amendment which has been found to be so widely acceptable. The site selected is in an area of street and highway development, and adequate routes of ingress, egress, and parking areas can be developed as the plans proceed. The bill provides that the site be provided by the United States, which would be the only Federal expense involved. The National Planning Commission estimates the cost of acquiring the additional private property in the proposed site not in Federal ownership as $650,000, and proposes to utilize funds appropriated under the Capper-Cramton Act for that purpose. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia approve this proposal. Funds for construction of the Cultural Center building would be raised by voluntary contributions, which would be administered and disbursed by the Board of Trustees.

The committee is of the opinion that enactment of this legislation will permit careful planning and construction of a National Cultural Center worthy of the city of Washington and of America, and to permit our cultural development to keep pace with our economic and scientific develoment. It believes that vast public benefits will result in awakening and advancing our artistic, creative, and cultural development, and recommends enactment of the legislation.

The comments of the Federal agencies on the bill, as amended, are shown in the following communications:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1958.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: This refers to your letter of May 13, 1958, requesting views of the Bureau of the Budget on a tentative draft bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Cultural Center.

Although the Bureau has no recommendations on the location of the proposed center, we tend to agree with the National Capital Planning Commission that the site described in the draft bill would be generally suitable for an activity of this nature.

In connection with the establishment of a National Cultural Center, we must, of course, withhold final comment until an administration position can be developed on an introduced bill, particularly as to the policy questions involved. It would appear, however, that the draft removes most of the objections as to form of legislation advanced in review of the earlier bill, H.R. 9848.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. JONES,
Assistant Director.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1958.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In response to your request for the comments of the Commission with regard to the newest version of your bill providing for a National Cultural Center, please let me say that we find it to be in conformity with the stand taken by the Commission at its April meeting. At that time the Commission heartily endorsed the concept of the Cultural Center and strongly urged the consideration of the site on the Potomac River.

We are delighted to see that many persons and groups in the community and Members of Congress are concurring with our recommendation. We urge the passage of your new bill and pledge our continuing support toward the building of this most important project.

Very truly yours,

HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW,
Chairman.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1958.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: In response to your request for further information concerning the feasibility of utilizing the United States Navy Potomac Annex site for the proposed Cultural Center, and for a clarification of the Commission's position with regard to the use of the site on the Potomac River, please let us submit the following information.

Our project planning staff has reanalyzed the two sites and finds that the Navy Hospital site in its present form would not permit the ingress and egress of the large number of passenger cars which would be generated by the proposed Cultural Center. The high wall along 23d Street and the steep grades on E Street and to the south permit most inadequate vehicular access. The present entrance at the intersection of 23d and E would, if used for major access, create congestion serious enough to be detrimental to the popularity of such a center. The proposed inner loop to the west would not permit access from that direction. This high-speed traffic facility has been designed according to the most modern standards and to redesign it to provide access to the subject site would reduce its efficiency and safety to a disastrous degree. Concerning parking, we find that the State Department space could not be relied on and the proposed Potomac Plaza Hotel to the north could provide parking only for its own use.

One solution would be to reduce the level of the hill approximately 30 feet, which would provide easier access at several places. Aside from the serious question of whether or not such a site of prominence should be lowered, the sheer cost of such an undertaking would be very great. According to the engineers supervising the excavation of the adjacent State Department site, and the estimates prepared by our technical staff, the cost of lowering the elevation of this site would be somewhat in excess of $3 million. It is difficult to believe that such a cost would be justified when the result, trafficwise, would still be less than satisfactory.

You will be interested in knowing that Lt. Col. Thomas Hunter, Assistant Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, indicated at the meeting called by the Fine Arts Commission, that it would be "practically impossible" to bring traffic in and out of the site during peak hours. It should be noted that our most recent studies indicate that approximately 10 acres of land on this site would be suitable for actual building and parking purposes.

Concerning the river site, a reanalysis of the area reveals that nearly 10 acres would be available at this location without disturbing the private property east of 26th Street. We have been in constant communication with the design engineers of both the Highway Department and the National Park Service and still find that the bridge approaches will not reduce the size of this site.

As our Commission indicated by its action at its May meeting there is a genuine desire on its part to be helpful in the acquiring of the site for the Cultural Center. Upon examining the slightly more than $1 million of the funds already appropriated under section 4a of the Capper-Cramton Act, we find that it would be feasible, if specifically authorized by Congress, and subject to the approval of the District Board of Commissioners and the Bureau of the Budget, to utilize approximately $300,000 toward the purchase of the remainder of the river site. According to our estimates, this would be nearly one-half of the remaining property. The Commission could then, in its regular budget request for fiscal year 1960, ask for sufficient funds for the last portion of the site. By that time the Commission will have exhausted already appropriated funds for acquisition of park and playground sites in the District, and would in the normal course of events be requesting further appropriations. To expend more than $300,000 from present appropriations would seriously endanger park and playground sites in several of the District's residential neighborhoods. Attached you will find a map indicating the river site and environs.

Please be assured that the Commission will continue to support the proposed Cultural Center in every way possible.

Respectfully submitted,

HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW,
Chairman.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING,
Washington, May 28, 1958.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, which was held on May 22, 1958, the members considered the draft legislation containing the proposals sponsored by you and Senator Fulbright to appropriate as a site for the National Center of the Performing Arts, the land owned by the Federal Government, along the Potomac Parkway, bounded by the projected Inner Loop Freeway on the east, the newly authorized Theodore Roosevelt Bridge approaches on the south, Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway on the west, and New Hampshire Avenue and F Street on the north, as approved by the National Capital Planning Commission for this purpose.

We hope the National Capital Planning Commission will be authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the additional land which may be necessary to provide an adequate site for the National Center of the Performing Arts and related facilities in the location referred to above. We would suggest that not only the design and specifications of the buildings for the Performing Arts should be approved by the

Commission of Fine Arts but also the approaches and landscape treatment of the grounds. The Commission also recommended that highways in the neighborhood of the buildings shall be located as not to restrict access to the buildings and the parking areas. We further recommend that the draft legislation be changed to give the bridge its official title, "The Theodore Roosevelt Bridge."

The Commission will be delighted to see such a site provided for the Center of the Performing Arts in Washington. We feel that it is of the greatest importance that a handsome building should be available for the performance of symphonic music, opera, ballet, and drama in the Nation's Capital. We hope that, if the Government is willing to provide a suitable location such as the river site, it may be possible to secure by private donations the funds with which to erect the buildings. We also hope the committee will give consideration to the proposals advanced by Senator Fulbright and Congressman Thompson in the draft legislation.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. FINLEY,
Chairman.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1958.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
U.S. House of Representatives, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Reply is made to your telephone conversation requesting information on the proposed location of the Cultural Center.

This matter was considered at the meeting of the Board of Commissioners on Tuesday, June 3, 1958, at which time Mr. William E. Finley, Executive Director of the National Capital Planning Commission and Lt. Col. Thomas B. Hunter, Assistant Engineer Commissioner were present.

Previously, in reporting on legislation, the Commissioners had expressed a preference for the Mall site. Subsequently they learned that due to a building restriction line imposed by the Planning Commission the Mall site was considerably less than the 11 acres which they thought was available and that the Mall site is now limited to about 5½ acres.

During the meeting, Mr. Finley of the Planning Commission presented to the Commissioners an analysis of the Capper-Cramton projects and funds and presented a schematic layout of the river site, showing possible building arrangements, parking, and egress and ingress areas, including street and highway system adjacent thereto.

After a discussion, the Commissioners agreed to the river site for the Cultural Center and the use of Capper-Cramton funds by the Planning Commission to acquire the remaining private property within the boundaries of the proposed site.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBT. E. MCLAUGHLIN,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 20 1958]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Members of this body are aware of the many futile attempts by the Congress to provide the Nation's Capital with a center for the performing arts. The fact that Washington has no adequate facility for this branch of the arts is glaringly obvious—not only to the Members of Congress, residents of the area, and our many foreign visitors, but to the millions of Americans from every State in this Nation who annually make the pilgrimage to this great Capital of the free world.

That our failure to provide for a National Cultural Center for the Performing Arts has resulted in the unfortunate assumption that we are a culturally barren people cannot be denied. Though this may be an unwarranted assumption, it is, nevertheless, one which prevails; and whether or not it is unwarranted is immaterial, so long as we have this reputation internationally. It is unfortunate that our Nation, as rich and powerful as it is, has allowed such a picture to be formed in the eyes of the world.

In an attempt to help dispel the impression that we are disinterested or lack appreciation of things cultural, and to provide Washington and the Nation with a center in which we can all take pride, I introduced in the Senate, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, introduced in the House, companion bills to provide for erection of a National Capital Center for the Performing Arts, to be constructed with funds raised by voluntary contributions on land donated by the Government, located in the District of Columbia.

The site originally provided for in the bill I introduced was on the Mall, opposite the National Gallery of Art. The Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of the Public Works Committee, held hearings on this proposal and at the same time, the Committee considered a bill introduced by Senator ANDERSON, authorizing erection of a National Air Museum on the same site. Because of the controversy which developed over the proposed site for the cultural center, Senator ANDERSON, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, and other interested Federal agencies and individuals, and I cooperated in working out an amendment to my bill in the nature of a substitute, calling for the proposed National Cultural Center to be located on a site in the Foggy Bottom area, near the Potomac River. This change in location and changes in the proposed language was approved by Senator ANDERSON, Congressman THOMPSON, members of the Public Works Committee, the Commission on Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Bureau of the Budget, the Washington Board of Trade, and other interested persons; and my distinguished colleague, Senator WILEY, joined with Senator ANDERSON and me in sponsorship of the new proposal.

The bill, S. 3335, as it was approved by the Committee on Public Works, establishes in the Smithsonian Institution a Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, composed of 15 Federal officials, members ex officio, and 15 general trustees to be appointed by the President. The bill authorizes this Board to cause to be constructed for the institution, with funds raised through voluntary contributions, a building which will be known as the National Cultural Center. The Center would be located on a site within the District of Columbia in the area known as Foggy Bottom. This site consists of 9.46 acres, more or less, and is bounded by Rock Creek Parkway, New Hampshire Avenue, the proposed innerloop freeway, and the approaches to the authorized Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. Under provisions of this bill, the Board of Trustees of the Center would maintain and administer it. The Board would provide for presentation of programs of the performing arts and other types of programs related thereto. The bill also authorizes establishment of an Advisory Committee on the Arts, to be designated by the President. The Advisory Committee would advise and consult with the Board for the purpose of making recommendations regarding cultural activities to be carried on in the Center.

The bill authorizes acquisition of the site for the National Cultural Center by the National Capital Planning Commission, and provides that plans and specifications for the building be approved by the Commission of the Fine Arts.

At present, 8.23 acres of the site is owned by the Government, with the remaining 1.23 acres in private ownership. It is estimated that the portion of the site privately owned can be acquired by the National Capital Planning Commission at a cost of $650,000. It is my understanding that the National Capital Planning Commission proposes to utilize funds appropriated under the Capper-Cramton Act for purchasing the land now in private ownership. The Commission at the present time has available approximately $300,000 which has been appropriated for acquisition of park lands within the District of Columbia. The remaining funds necessary for completing acquisition of the privately owned land will be available from the appropriation for the next fiscal year. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have approved this procedure.

Donation of the Government-owned land, together with the cost of acquiring the remainder of the site which is in private ownership, will be the only cost to the Federal Government. Funds for construction of the cultural center will be raised by voluntary contributions.

The report of the Senate Public Works Committee on this bill is an excellent one. It is well prepared, and succinctly states the case for adoption of the measure. The report, in part, states that the committee is of the opinion that enactment of this legislation will permit careful planning and construction of a National Cultural Center worthy of the city of Washington and of America and will permit our cultural development to keep pace with our economic and scientific development. It further states that it is the belief of the committee that vast public benefits in awakening and advancing our artistic, creative, and cultural development will result if this measure becomes law.

The committee strongly recommends enactment of this bill. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will approve it this session.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate has completed action on S. 3335.

Our prompt decision will, I am sure, help to make certain early action in the House of Representatives.

I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that it appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

THE STEPS BEFORE US IF WE ARE TO ACHIEVE THIS GREAT CENTER

(Statement by Senator Wiley)

As senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am naturally deeply interested in this legislation because of its international significance. I shall discuss this point a little bit later on in detail.

Because of that international significance I have spoken repeatedly on the National Cultural Center. I invite my colleagues' attention to my comments in the June 11 RECORD, beginning on page A5319; and to the 1957 RECORDS, on March 25, page A2378, and March 18, page 3360.

My interest is, of course, shared by the leading sponsor of S. 3335, my able and industrious associate from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who is the ranking majority member of our Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

EARLY ACTION BY JONES SUBCOMMITTEE

The next step for S. 3335 is, of course, the House Public Works Committee. I respectfully urge the chairman of that committee, our colleague from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] and, in particular, the chairman of the Pub-

lic Buildings Subcommittee, our associate from Alabama [Mr. JONES] to see if it is at all possible to schedule action on this legislation at the earliest possible date.

A number of House bills have been introduced by various distinguished Representatives to achieve the same purpose as S. 3335. I refer in particular, to legislation offered by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey; Congressman CARROLL KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, and Congressman JAMES FULTON, of Pennsylvania.

MAJOR STEPS AHEAD

As I see it, the steps before us are as follows:

1. As I have indicated, early approval by the House Public Works Committee.

2. Final action by the House of Representatives. This should come well in advance, I hope, of any last minute logjam of legislation which might possibly endanger this bill.

THIRTY-MAN BOARD

3. Consideration of the best possible appointees who will serve on the Board of Trustees which will administer the National Cultural Center. The Board will, as we know, consist of 9 Federal officials—3 Members of the Senate and 3 Members of the House of Representatives as members ex officio.

There will be in addition 15 general trustees appointed by the President for 10-year staggered terms. These trustees must be the very highest caliber of civic leader—active, dedicated, able, in the public interest.

The President would also appoint an Advisory Committee on the Arts—a number, not specifically limited, of expert members to advise and consult with the Board and to make recommendations to the Board regarding cultural activities to be carried on in the National Cultural Center.

NEED FOR FULLEST NATIONWIDE SUPPORT

4. Next, there must be a revitalization of contact with the 104 national organizations which had been contacted by the former Auditorium Commission.

This is, I must emphasize, a National Cultural Center. It is not a District of Columbia center. We want the people of the United States to know and understand that this is their center. We need their help and support. We need their financial contributions.

Many of the national organizations had been in contact with the Auditorium Commission and were prepared to render service.

SECURING FUNDS FROM PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS

5. And, of course, the funds must actually be raised from private philanthropists, from Foundations, and from the American public, so as to actually build this Center.

And, speaking of funds, let me note in this connection that the National Capital Planning Commission must be enabled very promptly to acquire the small amount of additional private property in the proposed site not already in Federal ownership. Needless to say, the rounding out of the site is an indispensable initial step.

I reiterate to my colleagues that this bill is now completely beyond the field of controversy, so I hope that the House of Representatives does not find it necessary at all to prolong the time for its final decision.

I invite the attention of my colleagues on the House side to the hearings held before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on S. 1985, the Air Museum bill, and on S. 3335, the Cultural Center bill.

LEADING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITIZENS TESTIFIED FOR S. 3335

An outstanding array of local private citizens and local public officials in addition to Members of Congress, appeared on this legislation.

The welcome outpouring of community sentiment reflected in their appearance was, of course, a tribute to the greater Washington area. It was a tribute, as well, to the civic consciousness of these individual citizens, and of the organizations they represented.

This is the type of local responsibility, local initiative and pride in this great Capital, which are indisensable if the project is to succeed.

I list, now, some of the individuals, aside from legislators, who testified at those hearings. This is, by no means, a complete list, and it does not include the correspondence filed with the committee; but at least it gives an indication of broad-gaged interest in the project.

Among those who testified were (in alphabetical order):

Mr. Robert Low Bacon.

Mr. Harland Bartholomew, Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. Ralph E. Becker, chairman, cultural development committee, Washington Board of Trade.

Mrs. Morris Cafritz.

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary, the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Milo Christianson, District of Columbia Recreation Board.

Mr. Richard L. Coe, drama editor, the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mrs. Frank W. Coolidge, National Federation of Music Clubs.

Mr. Oscar Cox, trustee, Opera Society of Washington.

Mr. Hy Faine, executive secretary, American Guild of Musical Artists.

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. George A. Garrett, president, Federal City Council.

Mrs. George B. Green, president Washington Chapter, the National Society of Arts and Letters.

Rev. Gilbert V. Hartke, Jr., O. P., Department of Speech and Drama, Catholic University of America.

Mr. Patrick Hayes, Hayes Concert Bureau.

Mr. Edwin Hughes, executive secretary, National Music Council (which is, I may say, chartered naturally under the Thompson-Wiley law).

Miss Marie A. Hurley, national legislative chairman, National Federation of Music Clubs.

Mrs. McCall Henderson Imes, State president, Federation of Women's Clubs of District of Columbia.

Mr. Frank R. Jelleff, member, Washington Board of Trade.

Mr. Sam Jack Kaufman, president, District of Columbia Federation of Musicians.

Mr. Herbert P. Leeman, member, Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia.

Mrs. Perle Mesta.

Mr. Gerson Nordinger, Jr., chairman, board of trustees, Washington Ballet Guild, Inc.

Mrs. Marjorie M. Post.

Mrs. R. I. C. Prout, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. Robert Richman, director, Institute of Contemporary Arts of Washington.

Mr. Curt Schiffeler, president, National Opera Guild of Washington.

Mr. Rachel Frank Skutch, legislative department, National Federation of Music Clubs.

Mr. Reginald Stewart, director, Peabody Conservatory of Music.

Let us remember that, even if this bill, S. 3335, were on the President's desk today for signature, it is simply one step in a long, long chain of actions which must still occur. It will be years and years before the cultural center will have been built and have been in operation. It will take considerable time simply to raise the private funds which are going to be necessary for this project in view of all the other solicitations for funds throughout America.

That is why I stress urgency; It is why I stress speed. It is why I look back at the past and say—with no criticism at anyone, personally, but with simply a factual commentary—that it has taken us much too long to get only this far.

At least, however, we are grateful for this step.

We are grateful, in particular, for the leadership of my friend from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are grateful for the enterprise and the zeal of Congressman THOMPSON of New Jersey, whose latest helpful comments on this subject may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18—comments which I warmly invite my colleagues to read and note in detail.

Of all the bills which are being considered by the Congress at this time, this is a relatively modest bill. Yet, I do not hesitate to say to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. RAYBURN, to the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, and to our good friend from Massachusetts, the leader of our House Republicans, Mr. MARTIN, that here is a bill which I earnestly hope will have their attention so that it does not get caught in any last-minute logjam.

[From the Washington Post, June 21, 1958]

GOVERNMENT WILL FURNISH LAND: FOGGY BOTTOM CULTURAL CENTER BILL APPROVED BY SENATE, SENT TO HOUSE

The planned National Capital Center of the Performing Arts won unanimous Senate approval yesterday.

Without debate, the Senate passed and sent to the House a bill to locate the opera house and theater on a site—mostly Government-owned—in Foggy Bottom near the approaches of the projected Constitution ave. bridge.

The Government will provide the land. Funds needed to build the center, an estimated $25 million, will be collected by private subscription.

District Commissioner Robert E. McLaughlin said "we are delighted with the increased prospects of having a cultural center in the Nation's Capital."

The bill is part of a compromise package cleared by the Senate Public Works Committee, under which the center will be located in Foggy Bottom and a Smithsonian Air Museum on the Mall opposite the National Gallery of Art.

Originally the center measure, introduced by Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) called for the Mall location. So did an Air Museum bill by Sen. Clinton Anderson (D-N. Mex.).

However, the Fulbright bill was amended to call for the Foggy Bottom site and at his suggestion Majority Whip Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) motioned it up for floor consideration yesterday. Fulbright's office explained that this will give the House an opportunity to act quickly on the measure.

The House could either vote approval of the Senate-passed measure, which would expedite enactment, or it could act on any of three identical bills introduced by Reps. Frank Thompson Jr. (D-N.J.), Carroll D. Kearns (R-Pa.) and James G. Fulton (R-Pa.).

The National Capital Planning Commission has funds on hand to buy part of the privately owned portion of the site.

Chairman Dennis Chavez (D-N. Mex.) of the Senate Public Works Committee said the Anderson bill is not so urgent at this time and will be called up later.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on August 22, 1958, the House of Representatives approved this legislation by a

vote of 261 to 55. Representative THOMPSON was the leading spokesman in the House, but a number of others were active in supporting the legislation. At this point I would like to include several items which tell the story of the passage of the bill in the House. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of July 30, 1958; an article from the Washington Post, August 17, 1958; and excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 22, 1958, date of passage in the House.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 30, 1958]

EFFORTS MADE TO GET HOUSE ACTION ON BILL FOR CULTURAL CENTER HERE

(By Grace Bassett)

Washingtonians rallied today to save a National Capital Center of the Performing Arts from a dusty death in files of the House Public Works Committee.

The Senate unanimously passed a bill authorizing a cultural center to be built in Foggy Bottom on June 20.

Since then, the bill has rested in one of the House committee's brown folders, along with pleas from 73 individuals for action.

Today Robert E. McLaughlin, president of the Board of Commissioners, sent to Capitol Hill his second request for hearings and a floor vote.

"The bill represents a culmination of years of effort and is strongly supported by a majority of civic groups in this city," William J. McManus, vice president of the Federal City Council, wrote Representative Jones, Democrat of Alabama.

Representative Jones controls the fate of the bill at this point as chairman of the Public Buildings subcommittee charged with its consideration.

FEARS HOUSE DEFEAT

He told reporters earlier this week that he thought the proposal could clear committee without trouble. But he added, "I don't have the votes for House passage. And I don't have time to go after them."

He was reluctant to take the bill to the floor, he said, unless he was assured passage.

House Majority Leader McCormack, Democrat of Massachusetts, has withdrawn his earlier objection to the Foggy Bottom site. The bill has bipartisan backing of sponsors Thompson, Democrat of New Jersey, and Republican Kearns and Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Still, Representative Jones said he has had such "poor luck" with legislation for Washington buildings on the floor that he needs a promise of passage to take floor time this late in the session. House leaders are aiming for an August 9 adjournment.

NO PRESSURE EVIDENT

Asked if he had felt the pressure of community groups pushing the bill, he said:

"No. Very few people have even talked with me about the center.

"What I've heard has been third and fourth hand," he explained. "Somebody tells me he doesn't know much about the bill, but he has a friend who is very interested."

Back in the committee files, however, the cultural center record is 2 inches thick.

Numbered among proponents are national and city political, civic, cultural, labor and church leaders. Senator Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, one of the bipartisan sponsors of the Senate-passed bill, has written he is "hopeful this bill will not be lost in the legislative shuffle during closing days of the 85th Congress."

"Failure to act would necessitate starting cultural center efforts from scratch next January and would present discouraging evidence that Congress is unwilling to assume its responsibility for providing the Nation's Capital with adequate cultural facilities," echoed Mr. McManus, in his fresh appeal.

NO FEDERAL FUNDS

Communications stressed that the bill required no Federal funds.

Money to build the center would be raised by private subscription. All but 1 acre of the 9 acre site bounded by New Hampshire Avenue and the Potomac parkway. Twenty-sixth street and approaches to the proposed Constitution avenue bridge is owned already by the Federal Government.

Some $650,000 in Capper-Cramton funds would be used by the National Capital Planning Commission to buy up the remaining acre. District Commissioners have promised to refund this Federal advance within eight years. So, site costs would be borne by District taxpayers.

Twenty-eight community leaders from diverse fields signed petitions forwarded to Mr. Jones by Frank R. Jelleff. Signers pledged "every effort to assist in raising necessary construction funds once legislation is enacted."

WIDE BACKING

In unusual agreement, the Fine Arts Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the District Commissioners, the Board of Trade, the Federal City Council, the AFL–CIO have urged Congress to permit the city to put up the center.

Among letters received by the committee are these excerpts:

David E. Finley, chairman, Fine Arts Commission—"We have long favored enactment to ensure adequate facilities for music and the performing arts." Mr. Finley gained majority acceptance of the river site in the bill from 20 community leaders at a meeting May 20.

Roger Ernst, Assistant Interior Secretary—"The site in Foggy Bottom is recommended by this department." He asked for an amendment so the Secretary could designate his representative on the center board of directors. The National Park Service director would serve, as the bill is written.

Budget Bureau—Legislation should make it clear advisory committeemen could collect no pay but travel and per diem money. The bureau also suggested that language barring appropriations of Federal funds for the center be written into the bill. It questioned whether members of Congress constitutionally could serve as trustees, as provided in the bill. This question was answered by Representative Thompson, who inserted in the record an opinion of the Library of Congress counsel that congressional members could.

Edwin Hughes, National Music Council—"It would be a catastrophe if this fine legislation were caught in a last-minute log jam."

Mrs. Leslie D. Fain, Louisiana Federation of Music Clubs—"Our entire membership would be most grateful for passage."

J. Tatian Roach, Music Publishers Association of the United States—Addressed to Representative Buckley, Democrat of New York, and full committee chairman, this letter said, "I have been one of your most loyal supporters for 40 years and never asked you to vote for anything." Now, that he has moved out of the Representative's district, Mr. Roach felt "constrained" to request favorable action on this bill because this country "should not play second-fiddle to other nations in the realm of art and drama."

Representative Buckley answered he had been informed by the subcommittee chairman that the legislation would receive consideration at an early date. This assurance was dated July 9.

Andrew J. Biemiller, AFL–CIO—"The Nation's Capital as a showplace for America's cultural achievements would be much enhanced by this legislation."

A. L. Wheeler, District Democratic Central Committee—"Many civic and professional leaders wholeheartedly supporting this bill and project unanimously indorsed by our committee."

Edward L. R. Elson, National Presbyterian Church—"Perhaps the greatest single need in the Nation's Capital is for ample facilities to handle large conventions or national assemblies."

Albert P. Shirkey, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church—". . . Tremendously interested . . . know of nothing as greatly needed for civic and religious life of our city."

Frederick E. Ressig, Council of Churches, National Capital Area—"Hoping for favorable action . . . tremendously interested."

State Department—"A department officer should be designated trustee because there are undoubted implications for our foreign cultural relationships in the provision of more adequate facilities for performing artists, including visiting artists from other countries," wrote William B. Macomber, jr., Assistant Secretary.

Health, Education and Welfare Department—"The center will be evidence that we as a Nation are as interested in activities that contribute to rich, cultural life as we are in those things that affect our physical and material well being."

Representative McGregor, Republican of Ohio, ranking minority member of the subcommittee—"I have been asked to give the bill a little 'push' in committee. I assure you I will do my best."

L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress—"Of course, I would be happy to serve ex officio as a member of the board of trustees of the . . . center."

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—"I am delighted to hear of (Senate) passage. This is a wonderful achievement . . ."

Leon Chatelain, Jr., American Institute of Architects—"As a public service. AIA would gladly set up . . . an advisory committee to assist in selecting an architect. Perhaps there should be a national competition for the job."

Neill Phillips, American Planning and Civic Association—"We are very glad to support the compromise bill to place the cultural center on the river site."

The only letter in opposition was from L. J. Esunas, of 410 East Capitol street. He wrote as secretary of the Andrews Air Force Base AFL–CIO employes that the center should be on the Mall, not in Foggy Bottom.

Frank L. Dennis, who operates the National Historical Wax Museum at Twenty-sixth and E streets N.W., the site to be acquired for the center, asked for permission to keep in operation until the center construction is ready to start.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, August 17, 1958]

STILL SOME HURDLES, BUT LOWER ONES

(By Robert C. Albrook)

Congress works in mysterious ways its wonders to perform. Just when things seem hopelessly entangled in conflicts, conferences and confusion, the waters are miraculously calmed and a storm-tossed piece of legislation sails smoothly into harbor.

This, last week, was the case with the District Cultural Center project. Already approved by the Senate, it will come before the House with a strong endorsement from

a seemingly enthusiastic Public Works Committee. Although a two-thirds vote will be needed for passage under suspension of the rules as customary procedure this late in the session, sponsors are optimistic.

The chief credit probably should go to Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, the bill's sponsor, and his indefatigable aide, George Frain, who has worked assiduously on behalf of the District's art and music facilities for many years.

But their labors would have been in vain except for the support of President Eisenhower, Senator FULBRIGHT, who put the project through on his side of the Capitol, and Representatives JONES, MCGREGOR, MACK, DOOLEY, AUCHINCLOSS, and other members of the House Public Works committee who have pushed the legislation along or indicated broad sympathy with its objectives.

AUCHINCLOSS, a veteran in District affairs on the Hill and the real father of the postwar home-rule movement, has some reservations about procedure. He would like to be assured that this privately financed project, to be built on publicly owned land in Foggy Bottom, will indeed be able to stand on its own feet, as its sponsors believe it will.

AUCHINCLOSS explained his position to fellow subcommittee members this way:

"I think the committee ought to go into this thing with its eyes open. I am not against culture. I think it is an excellent thing for the District of Columbia to have. I do think we ought to have some assurance, if they are to construct some kind of building, that we can have a look-see at it and have some kind of prospectus which will show whether they will be able to operate it at a profit without the necessity of coming to the local government, which is hard pressed for funds anyway, or to Uncle Sam."

But AUCHINCLOSS did not vote against the bill in committee, recording himself instead as present. And he went on to say: "I do not want to be in the role of trying to be in opposition in any way to the advancement of this kind of center. I think it is necesasry and I think it is a good thing for the community."

Representative MCGREGOR, however was impressed—and so, apparently, were a majority of the committee—with the prospectus for the center worked up by the District Auditorium Commission, under a Congressional mandate, and presented to Congress in January 1957.

This $95,000 study appeared, a year ago, to have been wasted, and the project doomed, after Congress refused to endow the Commission with authority to select and acquire a site for the proposed center. The Commission wanted to buy a site in Foggy Bottom, parts of which were earmarked for other public and private projects.

But early this year, THOMPSON and FULBRIGHT proposed the new legislation, now before the House, which settles the site question by authorizing use of land, already mostly federally owned, also in Foggy Bottom but south of the tract favored by the Commission.

The new legislation also would provide for appointment of a new commission and for general supervision of the project by the Smithsonian Institution, all along the lines of the Mellon Gallery's creation.

The old Commission's reports convinced the House committee, however, that all the advance planning that could reasonably be expected had been done and that this effort ought not to go down the drain. Said MCGREGOR of the Commission's prospectus: "I have never seen a prospectus as nearly complete as the one which has been presented in behalf of this legislation."

Representative DOOLEY seemed to bespeak general committee sentiment in noting: "I think there is so much public interest over the Nation in this cultural center that no doubt it will be a success financially. I used to be in that business, and I know money is available."

If the House approves the bill this week, the big job of raising $15 to $50 million and settling on detailed plans will be the next order of business, once a new commission is named.

[Excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 22, 1958]

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, enactment of the bill S. 3335 during this session of Congress has been specifically requested by the President of the United States. The bill has been endorsed by the Department of Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia and the Commission on Fine Arts. It was passed in the other body by an overwhelming vote. Your House Committee on Public Works, after open hearings and committee discussion, recommends the bill to you with an amendment which is acceptable to its sponsors.

This legislation is designed to fill a long-felt deficiency in our Capital City. As President Eisenhower pointed out in his letter of August 1 to Chairman BUCKLEY:

There has long been a need for more adequate facilities in the Nation's Capital for the presentation of the performing arts. An auditorium and other facilities such as are provided for in (this) pending legislation, established and supported by contributions from the public, would be a center of which the entire Nation could be proud. I hope that the Congress will complete action on this legislation during this session.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, I will gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just wonder why there should be opposition to this bill. It does not cost the Government any money. They are going to have a magnificent structure here. The money is going to be raised by voluntary contribution and they will have a magnificent building here for the performing arts. It is very badly needed, and we get it free, and the only reason I can see why anybody would object to this bill is because it does not cost the Government any money.

Mr. WRIGHT. I certainly concur in what my colleague has said.

The bill would permit the construction here in Washington, of a national cultural center. It would be financed—not by the Government—but by private funds donated by the public. The site would be provided by the United States, and this would be the only Federal expense involved. The committee amendment which we are recommending would require that, if sufficient funds for the erection of this center shall not have been raised from the public and received by the trustees within 5 years after enactment of this law, the act shall cease to be effective and the land be returned to the United States.

Alone among the major capitals of the world, Washington has no facilities suitable for the presentation of grand opera. There is no building in Washington which can accommodate the requirements of the more elaborate theatrical, ballet, and orchestral presentations which have enriched the lives and expanded the cultural horizons of the citizens of many much smaller cities both here in the United States and the world over. American musical and theatrical companies play to enthusiastic overflow audiences in capitals throughout the world. Yet neither these American companies nor their counterparts from other lands can be invited to perform in Washington because we have here no appropriate accommodation for them.

This bill would establish within the Smithsonian Institution a Board of Trustees for the National Cultural Center. The Board would be composed of 15 specified Federal officials and 15 general trustees appointed by the President. It would be the duty of the Board to supervise and oversee the construction of the center with privately donated funds, to maintain and administer it, and to present programs of the performing arts—opera, popular musicals, ballet, and folk dancing, plays, lectures, and pubic meetings of a sorts. There also would be established an Advisory Committee on the Arts, selected by the President, to advise and consult with the Board and recommend appropriate activities to be conducted in the center.

The site proposed for the building is in what is known as Foggy Bottom almost due north of the Lincon Memorial, in an area bounded by Rock Creek Parkway, New Hampshire Avenue, the Proposed Inner Loop Freeway and the authorized Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. This is the location which, after an exhaustive study of all possible sites, has been recommended by the Department of the Interior and the National Capital Planning Commission.

The reason, of course, why Congress must concern itself with meeting this critical need is that Congress serves as the governing body for this great city. In the typical American city, the local municipal government would handle a matter of this kind—and indeed many have. By the most recent accounting, there are some 382 other American cities which already enjoy such facilities as are proposed here. By our inaction, were we to turn a deaf ear to the President's request, we would be denying the residents of the Washington area the opportunity to have a resource they greatly desire and one to which the size and stature of this metropolitan area otherwise would certainly seem to entitle them.

But we probably would be doing more than that. For this is our National Capital. This city belongs to all Americans. When George Washington in 1789 commissioned Maj. Pierre L'Enfant to plan the Federal City he directed that it be planned as a cutural and civic center for the new United States. Our Capital City is in many respects a magnificent showpiece of our way of life. It is the window through which much of the world sees the United States. I am proud of its grandeur and its spacious beauty, its gracious buildings and monuments, its unsurpassed libraries and its splendid art galleries.

Yet here is one deficiency which is broadly acknowledged. The authorities agree that Washington needs a center for the performing arts. The public seems anxious to correct that deficiency by popular donation and by their continuing patronage. Many impressive figures in the financial and theatrical worlds have pledged their backing. The American Institute of Architects has offered its wholehearted cooperation without fee in designing the structure. The President has asked that we permit this planning to get underway without further delay by acting before this Congress adjourns. The other body has acted. They are waiting now only for the "green light" from us. Your committee recommends that we give it to them by suspending the rules and passing this bill today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include tap-dancing, toe dancing and can-can dancing?

Mr. WRIGHT. I presume it would include any of those performing arts. Perhaps even the Grand Ole Opry.

Let me say this in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important. I suppose that I have done my share of demagoging. All of us like to portray ourselves as real, sure enough corn-fed, homegrown, log cabin boys. All of us have been just a bit guilty of that. In striking such a pose, it is always kind of easy to ridicule and poke fun at things of a cultural nature. I plead guilty to having done my share of it, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have reached a state of maturity in this Nation when that kind of attitude no longer becomes us. Sooner or later, we have to grow up and stop poking fun at things intellectual and cultural.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGregor].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the statements made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] and especially those of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I honestly cannot see what is wrong with this bill—some feel it is in error—unless it is the fact that it is not costing the taxpayers of the United States a single penny. It is rather amusing to me that certain Members of Congress and certain members of our committee and other committees are opposing this legislation, and when we check their record we find they have voted consistently for foreign aid, or to build stadiums or cathedrals, and everything else, in foreign countries. Yet when we come back to the United States and have the opportunity to give the people of the United States the privilege of making a contribution toward a cultural center, they are prohibited.

The point is going to be raised, as it was in the committee, that we have no definite plans. I am hoping that every member of the committee has taken the time to read the plans which are headed, "A National Civic Auditorium and Cultural Center for the Citizens of the United States." It covers 95 pages. I have been in Congress only for the short period of 20 years, but I have never seen anyone submit to a committee of Congress of which I have been a member a specific plan any more elaborate, any more detailed than this one.

So I repeat, seemingly there is something wrong, according to the view of some there is something in error with this legislation, and that something is that it is not costing the American taxpayers a single penny.

I sincerely hope that we will give the opportunity to the people of the United States to contribute to this cultural center and that we shall pass this bill in this Congress, at least one bill that will not cost the taxpayers anything.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of this legislation I rise in strong support of this bill for a national cultural center. It has been said that this will not cost the Government any money. No, it will not.

The people of the country should be pleased that the civic minded citizens of Washington, D.C. and of this country are taking on themselves the civic obligation to provide this cultural center for this great and growing city. There are such centers in many of our United States cities, and many more in every country of Europe. We in Pittsburgh are doing the same job at public expense. We are building an auditorium to take care of events of this type which we believe are necessary to our culture and civic growth.

* * * * *

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished author of the bill, the gentleman who has done so very, very much by his legislative skill to bring this bill to the House today, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to those Members of this body and of the other House who have worked long and hard for this great project of a National Cultural Center.

To my colleague from Pennsylvania, CARROLL D. KEARNS, who has worked longer for this program than any Member of this House, I pay a special tribute. The gentleman from Pennsylvania introduced and cosponsored legislation for similar purposes with my predecessor Charles R. Howell, who shared this same great vision.

To the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who had the courage to join me in this venture, and the drive and imagination to enlist the sympathetic support of his colleagues, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, as cosponsors, and the rest of his colleagues on June 20, 1958, when this measure passed the Senate unanimously, a special debt is owed by the citizens of our country. His contribution is, indeed, an historic one. This legislation is, I am confident, a further and important addition to Senator FULBRIGHT's contribution to cultural matters which began with the historic Fulbright Act of 1944.

I want to say how grateful I am for the bipartisan spirit which has supported this legislation and worked hard and faithfully for it at every step in the House.

I want the Members of this House to know that the ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] not only sponsored this legislation but has been one of its most valuable and consistent supporters. Without his help, given generously and without stint to the chairman of the Public Buildings Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], this legislation would not have had a chance of adoption.

There are enough and more honors for those who have contributed of their time and strength to this fight.

I would like to mention the other sponsors this afternoon, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], each of whom deserve the enthusiastic support of their countrymen today, tomorrow, and at the voting booths in November.

There is the historic phrase in connection with the first telegraphed message, asked by Mr. Morse, "What hath God wrought?"

My dear friends and colleagues from both sides of this House, I feel impelled to ask this same question this afternoon, "What hath God wrought?" for this is an historic occasion which will grow in importance as time goes on.

I know all of us will look back to this moment, and be proud that we have contributed to the growth of our country in cultural matters.

No one has worked harder for this on the Democratic side of the aisle than the chairman of the Public Buildings Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] and no one has shown a greater grasp of the vast potential of this measure than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] whose magnificent statement we have just heard.

If this legislation proves anything, it is that Members of both parties can work together in harmony for the advancement of our country. The fine arts and education reflect the true status of our Nation, and make our civilization endure and flourish.

There is a rare unanimity of opinion in support of the National Cultural Center, extending from President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, all the Federal and District Agencies, the Board of Trade, the General Federation of Women's Club, the National Federation of Music Clubs to the AFL–CIO.

We have the President's fine statement in the printed Report of the Committee on Public Works and referred to by our distinguished colleague, Mr. Wright of Texas.

Some months ago, Vice President Nixon wrote me as follows:

"As you know, for some time I have been in favor of the development of such a center here in Washington. It would not only provide a much needed facility for the residents of this area, but more important, it would also serve as a symbol of the interest of our Nation and Government in the rich cultural traditions and experience of America."

The Wall Street Journal in a front-page story on May 15, 1958, declared that while Vice President Nixon and his entourage were running into angry mobs the New York Philharmonic Symphony on its South American tour at the same time was everywhere greeted with warmth and affection by cheering symphony fans.

It is important to note that upon his return the Vice President recommended that we send cultural groups to South America where the New York Philharmonic Symphony was received with such great ovations at the very time the Vice President was being abused and his life endangered. This is not art for art's sake, but a question of survival against a ruthless enemy which uses art as propaganda.

The legisaltion today calls for the Federal government to contribute some little-used land it owns in a public park area where no office buildings will be built. The Government to contribute the land just as it did to the Bell-Tower Memorial to Senator Taft.

The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners have offered to contribute an acre that is in private ownership, by the only device open to them—that is, that the land be purchased by the National Capital Planning Commission with Capper-Cramton funds, which the District will repay through ad valorem taxes raised in the District of Columbia.

Since the taxpayers here pay some $170 million in local, not Federal taxes—more than several states—and this tax money is allocated by the Congress it seems eminently fair that the District be allowed, as provided in S. 3335, to add its contribution to this National Cultural Center.

Compared to the $40 billion we appropriate each year for Defense and Government's contribution of six acres of land, acquired through the years at a cost of about $900,000 seems little enough for the contribution to the arts of peace.

Certainly, the arts of peace must be cultivated, too.

We fail to get our message of peace across, and we have failed in this very badly. Yet the cost of the arts of peace are infinitesimal compared to the cost of the arts of war.

Unfortunately, as many keen observers have pointed out, we are inclined to rely altogether too much on propaganda handouts, and informational media which fail to get across the story of our peaceful intentions. They will fail to get our story across as long as we fail to pay attention to the arts of peace at home—the arts, in other words, which other peoples regard as the very soul of a nation and a people.

* * * * *

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for the work done in this whole matter and also to the distin-

guished chairman of the subcommittee as well as to the members of the full committee. Some indication of the enthusiasm which a National Cultural Center in our Capital City would generate across the country can be seen from what has happened here in Washington since President Eisenhower's letter of endorsement was released.

S. 3335 was passed in the Senate without a dissenting vote. After long and considered hearings, the bill had been approved by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, by the National Capital Planning Commission, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Washington Board of Trade, the Bureau of the Budget and many other agencies and individuals, who testified before the Senate committee.

Along with many other beauty-loving Americans, I have long been aware of our lack of cultural facilities here in our National Capital.

In addition, my work on the Foreign Affairs Committee has brought me an increased realization of the importance of the arts in our foreign relations, and of the use other countries make of these in their foreign relations. I have asked myself and others the question: "Why is it that Washington should lack the needed facilities for the performing arts?"

The District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, headed by Mrs. Eugene Meyer, and which included a number of Members of Congress from both Houses, found that 332 American cities have cultural facilities. Americans as well as foreigners visiting Washington find it difficult to understand why our Capital City has no center for the arts, especially when they know that we have helped a number of European cities restore their great theaters and opera houses.

Feeling a definite sense of responsibility to my own people I joined with other Members in introducing a companion measure, H.R. 13193. It would seem exceedingly timely for us to demonstrate our recognition of the fact that beauty in all its phases is a vital human need.

Only recently the Congress passed, and the President signed, a bill for a second stadium to seat 50,000. Surely the need of an art center is one that cannot be gainsaid.

It is my earnest hope that this bill do pass.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I shall close my remarks with a tribute to the person who has worked longer and harder for this legislation than anyone else. Earlier, I said that the idea is not new; it originated, in fact, with George Washington, this Nation's first President. In his first inaugural message, General Washington called to the attention of the Congress the need for recognition of music and the arts. Since Washington's day the cultural center has been advocated by Jefferson, Madison, Truman, and, as Mr. WRIGHT stated, Eisenhower. The great amount of work necessary to bring us here today, however, was done by my able and devoted legislative assistant, George Frain. Mr. Frain has worked night and day for years, literally, to see the culmination of this great project. Words cannot express my appreciation and admiration of his work. My cosponsor in the other body, the great Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), has often paid similar tribute to George Frain. The art and music lovers of this Nation are indebted to Mr. Frain, as are all of us here today.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HYDE) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of the bill to establish a National Cultural Center in the Nation's Capital. The establishment of such a center is long overdue in this Nation. We have been negligent in proper recognition of the cultural arts; it is my hope that the House will give this bill a unanimous vote of approval. This is a fine example of the realization of social goals through private initiative. This project is being paid for by the voluntary subscriptions of the citizens of this country; we cannot deny them the benefit and joy of a National Cultural Center.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BALDWIN).

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3335.

The most remarkable thing about this bill which came before the Public Works Committee is the fact that this group of people who are interested in providing a National Capital Cultural Center are willing to actually assume the burden of raising the funds to finance it. That is quite a distinctive approach to those of us in Congress who have been working on many projects involving the construction of buildings. It seems to me when people have the demonstrated initiative such as there is in this case to assume voluntarily the cost of construction of the National Cultural Center that we should respond to that initiative and encourage it and do everything we can to cooperate with them in bringing this building to a reality. This building will add to the beauty, the attractiveness, and the greatness of this Nation's Capital. We should pass this bill as presented to us.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the need for this cultural center is apparent. It is in the national interest.

I join in supporting this measure and to warmly endorse the site which has been selected for the cultural center. Not only should the center itself afford adequate facilities for any fine arts performance, but the site from every viewpoint offers the best advantages of accessibility, esthetic beauty, proximity to residential, business areas and hotels, good public transportation, restaurants, and parking facilities. My support is also based and conditioned on the provisions for financing through donations solicited for that purpose with the provision that if such funds are not forthcoming, the amount collected would go to the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WOLVERTON).

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express gratification at the commendation that has been extended to my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) for the effort he has put forth in this matter. It is well deserved. I am strongly in favor of this bill.

The bill is most worthy. It would fill a longfelt want in our National Capital. Cultural centers exist in practically every European capital. We have none. This Nation that leads in so many worthwhile activities is terribly delinquent in failing to provide a cultural center in this the greatest Capital in all the world. We should no longer delay in providing such a center.

A center of this kind will enable us to have presentations in cultural subjects such as music, art, drama, and all the other activities of a cultural character. The failure to have such a center, in my opinion, detracts from our national prestige.

Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that a cultural center, where representatives of foreign nations will participate in performances can be helpful in building understanding and good will between ourselves and the people of other nations.

I repeat, the bill has a most worthy objective and should have the support of the House. And, in concluding, I would like to bring to the attention of the House that the establishment of the center, as provided for in this bill, will be at no cost to the Federal Government. The cost is to be met by voluntary contributions.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KEARNS).

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago when I came to Congress we were about to build a monument in honor of the soldiers of World War II. That was before the Korean war. I suggested at that time that we had enough monuments around Washington for pigeons to roost upon, and I thought it would be very good to do something along a different line, perhaps a living memorial to members of our Armed Forces. I see my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), on the floor. He had a bill for this purpose pending in Congress before I was privileged to be a Member of this body.

We decided to build a cathedral of the arts, an opera house. I do not believe that any other Member of Congress has had the privilege I have had of conducting the United States Air Force Symphonic Band and Orchestra in many parts of the world. A year ago today I was in Tokyo, at the height of the Girard case, conducting before 50,000 people there. There was no incident even though a Member of the United States Congress was conducting—because music is an international language.

I want to give great credit to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON), also to his predecessor, former Congressman Charles Howell, and the others who have been working on this project for a long time.

The Capital of the Nation, Washington, D.C., should have a cultural center. It should be the cultural center of the United States of America; and, furthermore, I would like to see the greatest school system in the country functioning here in our Nation's Capital.

Let us make this Nation's Capital a world capital today, a cultural center, an educational center. The bill before us today, if passed, will be a great step in that direction and I believe the people of the world will rise and say: "Well done, United States of America."

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, many visitors from Europe come to my office here in the Capitol each year. Almost invariably, they speak of their admiration for Washington as one of the most beautiful cities of the world. Then they go on to express their amazement that it contains no cultural center for the performance of opera, ballet, music, and drama. Every provincial city, every grand ducal seat of France and Germany has its beautifully appointed home for the performing arts. I refuse to believe, Mr. Speaker, that what a Louis Napoleon or a Frederick the Great could do, the free people of the United States, by their own initiative, cannot do.

I hope that S. 3335 will overwhelmingly pass, and that the National Cultural Center will become a reality.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. Many, if not most, of the great capitals of the world have theaters built by the government and subsidize the drama, the opera, music, and the ballet. I do not feel we should follow this practice. On the other hand, I regret the lack of these cultural activities in our great Capital. This bill meets this situation in a truly American way, by making it

possible for private citizens, for the people of the country, to create a cultural center on Government premises. I congratulate the sponsors of this legislation in Congress and in Washington; I particularly want to mention Mrs. Virginia Lorve Bacon, a great civic leader and widow of a distinguished American who served in this House. This bill provides the right way to go ahead with a national cultural center, the right place to locate it. Now is the right time to act on it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my compliments to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. He has done an excellent job, and I hope he clears up somewhat of an error that seems to have gone around, emanating from my distinguished friend from Washington, that this is going to cost the Federal Government a considerable sum of money. I hope he will show us that the contributions that are going to be collected will pay $693,000 for the land that is now owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman personally as chairman of this commttee that has given great deliberations to this problem, and I hope that this legislation will be passed unanimously. I would like to pay tribute, also, to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McGREGOR) on our side.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, erection of the National Cultural Center will have national significance, since it will serve as a mecca and magnet for people from all over the country who visit the Nation's Capital.

There should be no question about the need for this building and about the soundness of the method under which it is to be constructed. Careful thought and planning has gone into all aspects of this project, and I commend all concerned for having worked out such a reasonable solution to the complex questions involved.

It should be noted that the land to be occupied by this structure is not now being used for any significant purposes, that the center will not be subsidized by the Federal Government, and that it will be self-supporting. We have a precedent for this project in the National Gallery of Art, which now houses a world famous collection of priceless works of art. Yet no Federal money was expended to construct that building.

We in the United States are justly proud of the accomplishments of our writers, actors, and related performers. We have a great history of achievement and success in these fields which is certain to be enhanced in the years ahead. One sure means for stimulating this growth in the performing arts is to provide proper places in which they can be performed. All over the country, drives and projects are going forward with this exact object in mind.

It is only fitting that the Nation's Capital should house a structure worthy of the great performing arts of the United States. That is exactly what will be provided by this legislation.

Special commendation is due to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], and his dedicated coworkers in and out of Congress, who have worked so long and so hard to make the National Cultural Center a reality. Mrs. Robert Low Bacon and other tireless civic leaders have provided uncounted hours of hard work and planning to make this legislation possible. I congratulate all of them for a job well done, and urge every Members of this body to give their efforts an overwhelming vote of approval.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as these articles and statements make clear, this legislation could not have passed without the diligent support of many civic leaders and persons interested in the arts as well as Members of Congress and their staffs. In his statement of August 22, 1958, Representative THOMPSON paid tribute to one of the staff members who did a great deal to make this idea a reality, Mr. George Frain. Mr. Frain, as Representative THOMPSON said:

> Worked night and day for years . . . to see the culmination of this great project.

Mr. Frain worked very closely with Mr. Lee Williams of my staff and many others in laying the groundwork for today's Kennedy Center. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an undated article from the Washington Post in 1958 concerning Mr. Frain's contribution.

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

MANY HANDS PULLED "CULTURAL CENTER" BILL

(By Richard L. Coe)

Frain is one that seldom gets into print but he was the behind-the-scenes hero of Capitol Hill's action, George Frain, an assistant to Rep. Thompson.

For years now Frain has been the legislative gadfly it takes to get an idea acted on by Congress. I first heard Frain bring up the matter in 1946 when the city was realizing what the local theatrical policy of racial discrimination implied. The more Frain learned of what music, dance and drama could mean the more insistent he became. I hate to suggest plaques already for an unbuilt building, but there ought to be one in the cultural center with George Frain's name on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, following the passage by Congress, S. 3335 was signed by President Eisenhower on September 2, 1958, as Public Law 85–874.

Planning and preliminary work on the Center got underway in the following years, and on September 11, 1962, Mrs. John F. Kennedy unveiled the model of architect Edward Durell Stone's design for the Center.

I am quite proud of the fact that Ed Stone, a native of my hometown of Fayetteville, Ark., was the architect for the Kennedy Center. Mr. Stone is one of our foremost architects and I believe he did an excellent job in his planning of the Center. In the early days, when funds were in very short supply, Mr. Corrin Strong was especially generous with his personal fortune in keeping the project alive.

On June 4, 1963, on behalf of Senator Saltonstall, Senator Clark, and myself, the three Senate Members then serving on the Board of Trustees, I introduced S. 1652, to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date and to enlarge the Board of Trustees. This bill became Public Law 88–100 on August 19, 1963, when signed by President Kennedy.

On October 8, 1963, President Kennedy, who took a direct and personal interest in the Center, was host at a luncheon at the White House for members of the President's Business Committee on the National Cultural Center.

Only a few weeks later the President was assassinated, and intense desire was expressed throughout the country for the establishment of an appropriate memorial to perpetuate many of his aims and ideals. Along with many others I felt that this Center would constitute a fitting memorial to the President, particularly since he had taken a deep interest in and played an active role in the development of the Center.

On November 26, I introduced legislation for this purpose. A number of other proposals were being discussed as well and on December 3, 1963, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 136, eventually cosponsored by 55 other Senators. The joint resolution authorized the redesignation of the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center and authorized an appropriation therefor.

The move to designate the Cultural Center as a memorial to the late President drew widespread support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of November 26; articles from the Evening Star of November 27 reporting the support for this proposal; and a statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 3 concerning the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 136.

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

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 26, 1963]

A KENNEDY MEMORIAL

His own best memorial will live in his own memorable words, for he spoke in trumpets, summoning us to seek our finest nature and to fit it to the difficulties and dangers of our time.

Our own best act of remembrance must continue to be the faith we keep with his imperatives.

But the heart desires and the slain leader deserves a more tangible, more specific memorial, a physical place in the Nation's Capital corresponding to his place in prayer in the Nation's heart.

There can be no more fitting memorial than the dedication now, to him, of the National Cultural Center.

The President and Mrs. Kennedy brought to the center of things the service performed by the arts for men and women. In thought and speech John F. Kennedy moved with familiar friendship among the poets and the prophets. It was the same in his and Mrs. Kennedy's home. The White House became a place of welcome for musicians and painters, dancers and writers.

The idea of the Cultural Center preceded the Kennedy administration. But President Kennedy gave the idea force and form, and a singularly personal leadership, without which it could hardly have achieved its present development.

Mrs. Kennedy, from whom we have learned to bear loss with dignity, was even more deeply involved. To salute her loss as well as ours, a Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center would speak intimately of part of her gift to us.

Other memorial proposals have been made, chiefly of re-naming athletic stadia already in existence. The Cultural Center as a memorial to Mr. Kennedy is not only uniquely expressive of a purpose shared by the President and his wife. Since it is now in early process, since funds are still being raised, it

also would give all Americans the chance to remember the President by bringing to completion an intent and wish of his.

The change of name and the dedication should be made at once. The building should be brought to reality as soon as possible.

John F. Kennedy will live in the hearts of men. Let him live also in the arts he loved.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 27, 1963]

SUPPORT GIVEN CENTER AS KENNEDY MEMORIAL; BIPARTISAN GROUP OF SENATORS OFFERS BILL ASKING U.S. FUNDS OF $5 MILLION

(By Orr Kelly)

A spontaneuos wave of support grew today for the proposal to build the National Cultural Center on the banks of the Potomac as a living memorial to the late President Kennedy.

A bipartisan group of four Senators joined late yesterday in introducing a bill to name the proposed center for Mr. Kennedy and to authorize the appropriation of $5 million as the final portion of the $30 million cost of the center.

Senator Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, who introduced the bill, said he hoped his proposal would help to stimulate public contributions to construct the center.

"I hope," he said, "that the Federal contribution will help to get the center built in the near future and that additional contributions from the public can be used to provide the beginning of an endowment fund to finance performances at the center."

THREE ARE COSPONSORS

Joining with Senator Fulbright as cosponsors of the bill were Senators Saltonstall, Republican of Massachusetts, Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania, and Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota.

Senators Fulbright, Saltonstall and Clark, who are trustees of the center, joined yesterday in inserting in the Congressional Record an editorial from yesterday's Evening Star suggesting the center as an appropriate memorial to the late President.

Members of the late President's family, to whom the suggestion concerning the center has been made, were reportedly delighted with the appropriateness of the center as a memorial, as was President Johnson.

The late President last inspected the model of the $30 million Center on October 8, when he called 60 of the Nation's top business leaders to the White House to urge their support for the project.

"He was very enthusiastic, both about the plans and the site." Edward Durell Stone, architect for the Center, recalled. "I think it would be poetic if his name were to be identified with it."

On the House side, three members announced independently that they intended to introduce legislation to name the Center in memory of Mr. Kennedy.

In a public announcement, Representatives Ullman, Democrat of Oregon, and Senner, Democrat of Arizona, declared:

"President Kennedy brought to this Nation, and to this Capital, an intellectual and cultural reawakening that has made a profound impact on our national life. The Cultural Center is one of the most dramatic expressions of that reawakening. The Nation needs his continuing guiding spirit to insure that we do not lose the stimulus to a higher realization of our cultural heritage."

CHAIRMAN ADDRESSED

The Representatives also wrote to Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the center board of trustees, asking his support and that of the board for the proposal.

"We wish to urge you and the members of the commission to support this effort as a fitting tribute to the man we all loved so well," they wrote.

Mr. Stevens said he did not think it was appropriate for him to comment on the proposal before getting the opinions of other members of the board. But, even though his office is in New York, he said he had heard considerable favorable comment based on The Star editorial during the day.

The bill proposed by Mr. Ullman and Mr. Senner provides that the center be called the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center and provides for a Federal contribution to the center of $25 million on a matching basis.

M'DOWELL OFFERS BILL

Another bill, introduced in the House by Representative McDowell, Democrat of Delaware, was modeled on the Fulbright bill, but with several important differences. It proposed that the center be called the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts and provides for competitions, fellowships, scholarships and prizes for young composers and writers.

A meeting of the board's executive committee will be held here on Tuesday, he revealed, and the proposal to name the center in honor of the late President will be one of the major items to be discussed, he said.

VICE CHAIRMAN IN FAVOR

Less restrained in his on-the-record comments was L. Corrin Strong, vice chairman and member of the center and one of its earliest and strongest supporters.

"I think it will be a wonderful idea," he said "I have nothing but praise for the idea. I think it is an excellent one."

Senator Fulbright's bill proposes that the Center be called the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Cultural Center.

But there seemed to be a strong feeling among many of those who have been active in working for the center that the word "cultural" was inappropriate. Suggestions for a name included the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, the Kennedy Memorial, the Kennedy Center, the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center and the Kennedy Living Memorial.

ENDOWMENT FAVORED

Among those who favored the proposal, there was also a strong feeling that the center should be built soon and that it should be complete—including some form of endowment to aid in filling it with the sound and movement of music and drama.

Mr. Stone, whose earlier architectural works have drawn favorable comment throughout the world, said that he hoped work could begin in about eight months.

Funds for the center—either already in hand or pledged—now total in the neighborhood of $16 million, including a recent pledge of $1 million from the Rockefeller Foundation, an earlier pledge of $5 million from the Ford Foundation, and a promise of marble for the center from the Italian government.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 27, 1963]

CULTURAL CENTER: TRUSTEES BACK DEDICATION TO KENNEDY

There was overwhelming support today from members of the National Cultural Center board of trustees. Congressmen and others connected with the project to dedicate the Center to President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

They had the following to say:

Senator Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas: "I certainly do favor naming the center after President Kennedy."

Senator Mansfield, Majority Leader: "This would be a perpetual monument."

Senator Dirksen, Minority Leader: "President and Mrs. Kennedy were pioneers in the cultural field and it would be most appropriate for the center to be so dedicated."

Senator Humphrey, Democratic Whip, of Minnesota: "Not only do I indorse the idea, but I began thinking of making such a proposal on Saturday and had already held some conferences on the subject."

Senator Douglas, Democrat of Illinois also indorsed the proposal.

Representative Frank Thompson, jr., Democrat of New Jersey: "It certainly would be appropriate. I can't think of anything more fitting than a living and vibrant memorial to a man who was so vibrant himself. He was the first President to give the arts and cultural affairs their proper place and emphasis in our national life." Mr. Thompson added he would have to give further thought to the question of whether he would support legislative authority for a Federal contribution to speed construction of the Center.

Ralph J. Bunche, Undersecretary of the United Nations Secretariat. "Personally I think it is a very interesting idea. I think it would be a good idea. Both President and Mrs. Kennedy were actively interested, and were a very good and great help." Mr. Bunche added that he felt it would be inappropriate to indorse the idea in his official capacity as a trustee of the Center until he confers with other board members.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President, and Mrs. Eisenhower, said at this time they were in "no position to comment," and wanted to study further the proposal before making a statement, according to an assistant of Mr. Eisenhower. The idea of the Cultural Center originated during Mr. Eisenhower's term of office. His wife and Mrs. Kennedy are honorary chairmen of the Center's board of trustees.

Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the board, also declined to comment at this time, but L. Corrin Strong, former chairman and now vice chairman and a trustee said: "I think it will be a wonderful idea. I have nothing but praise for the idea. I think it is an excellent one."

William Walton, center trustee and chairman of the Fine Art Commission: "I am entirely in favor of it. But I think the word 'cultural' should be left out. It's a deadly word. And I think the need for an adequate endowment is the most important of all—more important of all—more important than a roof. It would be terrible to erect a beautiful, empty shell."

Senator Pell, Democrat of Rhode Island, chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts, in a statement prepared for delivery in the Senate: "Great art speaks in a universal language. The great poet or painter, or sculptor or musician . . . goes beyond narrow limits of time and place. . . . He illuminates our vision, so that we can better understand each other and better comprehend the goals we seek.

"In this sense, I believe President Kennedy was a true artist—not alone in the words he used to motivate us, but in the impulses which motivated him. And therefore . . . I think it would be appropriate that our National Cultural Center—as it is contemplated, as it is planned, as it emerges to reality—should bear his name."

Floyd Akers, a Center trustee: "I would be for it. I think it would be a very fine thing. It would stand for something he represented. He represented the youth, the progress, the things, we need for the future, and the culture we need for the future. I think it is a grand movement, and I think we should do it, because he has spearheaded the renewal of this since President Eisenhower started it."

Dr. J. George Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, which recently announced a $1-million grant to the Center: "Naming the Center after President Kennedy is an intriguing idea, an imaginative one, certainly very appealing. It seems to me that in memorializing a great leader, it is always better to do so with a living monument, something that is dynamic and continuing.

"And since the late President and his family have been the prime moving force behind the Cultural Center, it seems to me most appropriate to name it for him and to expedite its construction. The memorial would be in an area he personally espoused—culture."

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution: "I think this is a very interesting and very significant suggestion and would advocate its most sympathetic consideration by the board."

Mrs. Herbert May, patroness of the arts: "I think it is a very good idea. But I think the word 'cultural' should not be included in the name of the center. It could be, as a suggestion, the John F. Kennedy Art Center."

Charles A. Horsky, special adviser to the President for the National Capital Affairs: "Certainly there was nothing closer to the President's personal interest than the Cultural Center. If anything is to be named for him the Center would seem to be very high on the list. However, I think we need more time to determine what would be the most appropriate memorial."

Walter N. Tobriner, District Commissioner "If the Kennedy family agrees to naming the Cultural Center after President Kennedy I would be heartily in favor of it. It seems to me that naming both the Cultural Center and District Stadium after President Kennedy would reflect the manifold nature of his interests since he was a man with wide cultural interests as well as one with an interest in competitive sports."

George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO: "I would be heartily in favor of the proposal to name the Center in honor of the late President. I always felt that the name 'nation Cultural Center" left something to be desired. I feel that in view of the President's close relationship to the concept of the Center, naming it in his honor would be ideal."

Ralph E. Becker, Washington attorney and Center trustee: "Not only am I heartily in favor of dedicating the Center to the memory of President Kennedy, but I think it is most important that we plan with care to make it a living memorial. We must be sure that there is an adequate endowment to fill the Center with the sound of music and drama that so delighted Mr. Kennedy during his life. Sufficient funds must be provided to make this Center the last word in view of the fact that we have waited so long for such a Center."

John Nicholas Brown, chairman of the Cultural Center board for Rhode Island, according to his wife, said that within 24 hours of President Kennedy's death he declared that in his opinion the Cultural Center would be the ideal memorial to Mr. Kennedy.

Daniel W. Bell, former president of the American Security and Trust Co.: "I would rather not comment. I think it is a matter to be discussed in the board of trustees. I don't think it would be right for me as a trustee to discuss the matter prior to a meeting of the trustees."

Mrs. Albert Lasker, a New York trustee: "I think it's a wonderful idea—couldn't be better. It is very suitable. He was deeply interested in the Cultural Center, and did a lot to help it. I think Congress ought to change the name of it to the Kennedy Memorial Center and to pay for the remainder of the cost. It would be a more prompt way to raise the money than the public fund raising, but in any case, I am sure it is the will of the people. I can't think of a more suitable and living memorial."

Garfield Kass, a member of the Advisory Committee: "I said to my wife when we came back from the funeral, wouldn't it be a wonderful thing to dedicate the Cultural Center to Kennedy? It would be the greatest memorial they could give to him. I am 100 per cent in favor. It's a splendid idea. The advisory board has a meeting next week and I'm going to push for it. I also think Congress should help with an appropriation."

William H. Waters, Jr., chairman of the D.C. Recreation Board, said: "I don't think the idea should be entertained unless the immediate family of President Kennedy feels it is appropriate. If they do, then in the light of the President's interest in the arts, which certainly was deep and strong, it is up to the trustees to consider renaming the Center in honor of Mr. Kennedy. It would be a very fitting gesture."

George A. Garrett, Chairman of the Federal City Council: "I think it would be not only proper, but a very fine thing not only for us to do, but it would be an awfully fine thing for the Cultural Center itself. I think it would insure the success of the Cultural Center. As chairman of the Council, I was one of those who interviewed the President about having his entire cabinet enrolled as trustees of the council. He did it. He not only did that, but he sent messages to Congress as to what he thought Congress owed the Federal City."

Richard S. Reynolds, Jr., a trustee: "I would vote for such a proposal. I am in favor of it.

L. Corrin Strong, vice chairman of the Center trustees: "I think it will be a wonderful idea. I have nothing but praise for the idea. I think it is an excellent one."

Conrad L. Wirth, National Park Service director and Center trustee: "There should be some way of commemorating the very strong stand he took on developing the arts. That might be the way to do it."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 3, 1963]

DESIGNATION OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY CENTER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that it remain at the desk until Friday, December 6, for the addition of the names of those of my colleagues who may wish to join as co-sponsors.

This joint resolution authorizes the redesignation of the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center and authorizes an appropriation of funds by the Congress, which in the aggregate will equal amounts given, bequeathed, or devised to the trustees of the Center from sources other than appropriated Federal funds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on December 12, 1963, the Senate and House Public Works Committees held a unique joint meeting to consider Senate Joint Resolution 136. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the printed hearing of that date printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The joint committee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in the caucus room, Cannon Building, Representative Charles A. Buckley (chairman of the House Committee on Public Works) and Senator Pat McNamara (chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works) presiding.

Chairman MCNAMARA. The hearing will be in order.

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you here this morning. I think it is unnecessary to repeat the purpose of the hearing. We are glad to have such a fine turnout of the joint Public Works Committees of the House and Senate and all the rest of you, showing your interest in the proposed memorial.

My part of the program is pretty simple. I just want to say hello, and turn it over to Chairman Buckley of New York. Chairman Buckley heads the committee in the House.

Chairman BUCKLEY. Senator McNamara, Senators, Congressmen, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to be here for an unprecedented meeting, the only joint session which has ever been held by the Committees on Public Works of the House and the Senate.

The purpose of our meeting is to engage our two committees in probably the most important joint committee hearing that have ever been held.

Our further purpose here is to pay tribute to our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. All Americans insist that we have a proper institution to memorialize his services as our late President. He served with us as Members of the House, he served with us as Members of the Senate. All of us have been afforded his intimacies with his great dedication.

Nothing could please me more than being the chairman of this joint committee to present the bill that we have before us today and to acknowledge the acclaim of people from all the country who join with me in asking for this legislation that is to be considered.

We of the Public Works Committee, I am quite sure, have been afforded a great opportunity in making a public dedication to this institution that will keep alive the name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Now, gentlemen, I am prepared to turn this meeting over to Congressman Robert E. Jones of Alabama. As you know, he is the very able chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee.

I feel that I would be remiss, gentlemen, if I did not seize this opportunity to recall a few facts about our colleague, Bob Jones, which appear to have been overlooked in the rush of events here in Washington, indeed around the country itself.

Bob Jones was the prime mover in the writing of the Public Building Act of 1959. This was a splendid piece of legislation which brought order and efficiency into our public building program after more than half a century of chaos.

This vision and good legislation by Bob Jones truly has given our American people a new era in public building which in fact has attracted more attention abroad than it has at home.

I am very glad to be able to pay this delayed compliment to Bob Jones, whose work has resulted in better Government buildings and better cities everywhere in the United States.

Mr. Jones, will you take over the chair?

Representative JONES (presiding). There are a number of bills; in all, there are 17 or 18. Therefore, the bills will not be printed in the record at this point but will be included by reference and identified by their respective numbers.

Senate Joint Resolution 136 introduced by Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Can-

non, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Engle, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Holland, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Keating, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Symington, Mr. Walters, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

Also H.R. 9252 by Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, H.R. 9253 by Mr. Ullman, H.R. 9254 by Mr. Senner, H.R. 9259 by Mr. Boland, H.R. 9269 by Mr. McDowell, H.R. 9271 by Mr. Morse, H.R. 9276 by Mr. Sickles, H.R. 9300 by Mr. Pepper, House Joint Resolution 820 by Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, House Joint Resolution 828 by Mr. Buckley, House Joint Resolution 829 by Mr. Martin of Massachusetts, House Joint Resolution 830 by Mr. Wright, House Joint Resolution 831 by Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, House Joint Resolution 833 by Mr. Morse, House Joint Resolution 835 by Mr. Halpern, House Joint Resolution 836 by Mr. Jones of Alabama, House Joint Resolution 839 by Mr. Brademas, House Joint Resolution 841 by Mr. Rosenthal, House Joint Resolution 843 by Mr. Fogarty, House Joint Resolution 844 by Mr. Roybal, House Joint Resolution 847 by Mr. Healey, House Joint Resolution 851 by Mr. Widnall, House Joint Resolution 871 (Supersedes H.J. Res 828) by Mr. Buckley, House Joint Resolution 872 by Mr. Auchincloss, House Joint Resolution 873 (supersedes H.J. Res. 836) by Mr. Jones of Alabama, and House Joint Resolution 874 (supersedes H.J. Res. 830) by Mr. Wright.

The record at this point, without objection, will contain the letter addressed to the chairman of the House and Senate committee from the President.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 11, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I should like to take this opportunity to express my wholehearted support for the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136 or H.J. Res. 828) presently before the Congress to rename the National Cultural Center in honor of President Kennedy. It seems to me that a center for the performing arts on the beautiful site selected would be one of the most appropriate memorials that a grateful nation could establish to honor a man who had such deep and abiding convictions about the importance of cultural activities in our national life. In this connection, it is my understanding that the Kennedy family would prefer to have the Center named "The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts" in order to indicate more specifically the nature of the memorial to him.

In a speech a month before his death, President Kennedy said, "I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist." He understood that history remembers national societies less for the might of their weapons or for the mass of their wealth, than for the quality of the artistic legacy they bequeath to mankind. By carrying forward the project of a national cultural center, we can all help strengthen the traditions and standards of the arts in American society. And in doing this we carry forward the spirit and concern of John F. Kennedy.

That the Federal Government should participate in this undertaking by providing funds to match the contributions which have already been made, and will be made in the future, by people throughout this Nation and the world is entirely fitting. This action should insure prompt completion of the Center to which President Kennedy gave his full support and which he saw as an embodiment of our Nation's interest in the finest expressions of our cultural activity.

I hope that the Congress will take early action on this resolution.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Representative JONES. Of course, there has been great interest manifest in this proposed legislation coming from all quarters of the country, and almost uniform applause from the Members of the House and Senate.

No one has given greater attention and effort to this proposal throughout the years than our first witness today, Senator Fulbright.

Senator, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Senator FULBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, Chairman Buckley, and Senator McNamara, I consider it a great honor indeed to be allowed to be the first witness before this unprecedented joint session of the Committee on Public Works.

I may say that I entirely agree with what has been said about Congressman Jones. He was chairman of the subcommittee that held hearings on the bill back in 1958 which originally authorized the creation of this Center as a great cultural center for the Nation and has followed it with a great deal of interest and, without his help and that of his colleague, Mr. Frank Thompson, who collaborated on the original plans, I am sure we would never have gotten to the point where we are now.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that you have some 20-odd witnesses scheduled, I do not believe I should take the time of the committee to read it. I would like, with your permission, to ask that it be inserted in the record and that I be allowed to summarize it as briefly as I can.

Representative JONES. Thank you, Senator. Without objection, it may be received and printed in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 136, TO PROVIDE FOR RENAMING THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER, AND AUTHORIZING AN APPROPRIATION THEREFOR

Chairman Buckley, Chairman McNamara, and members of the Senate and House Public Works Committees, for me to say it is a privilege and a pleasure to appear before your combined committee is an understatement, for it is much more than that. It is a unique honor to appear before you, because during my 20 years as a Member of the U.S. Congress I do not recall ever having been before a joint meeting of full committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The uniqueness of this meeting of your two committees, however, is very appropriate because of the nature of the proposal which we are here to consider I wish to commend and thank Chairman Buckley and Chairman McNamara and each member of the respective committees for their spirit of cooperation in scheduling these hearings during such hectic and trying times when each member has so little time and such heavy responsibilities and obligations.

I appreciate, too, being accorded the honor of being allowed to be the first witness to testify in support of Senate Joint Resolution 136, which I introduced on December 3 for myself and on behalf of 50 of my colleagues in the Senate who have joined as cosponsors of this measure.

This resolution, as all of you know, would redesignate the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in honor of and in tribute to our late President, and would, in addition, authorize appropriation by the Congress of funds on a 50–50 matching formula to help insure the construction of this great Center.

Before I proceed to discuss the merits of the pending proposal, it would perhaps be helpful for me to give the members of the committees the benefit of a very brief history of the Center.

Back in 1958, Representative Frank Thompson and I had a discussion about the need for a national cultural center. As a result of our conversations, I introduced in the Senate and Congressman Thompson introduced in the House companion bills to establish a National Cultural Center and to set aside certain lands owned by the Government as a site for such a center.

I recall at that time that the now chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, Senator Pat McNamara, was chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings, to which my bill was referred. And I recall that Representative Bob Jones of Alabama was chairman of the House subcommittee to which Congressman Thompson's bill was referred.

Through the cooperation of Senator McNamara and his subcommittee, hearings were held in April of 1958 on S. 3335, the bill I introduced, at which time testimony was heard, not only from Members of Congress but from many distinguished Americans who felt that the establishment of a national cultural center was of prime importance.

The bill, after some revisions, was favorably reported to the Senate and was passed unanimously by that body. It then went to the House where Representative Jones held hearings; the bill was then passed by the House and signed by the President.

These companion bills, which Frank Thompson and I cosponsored, resulted in the enactment of Public Law 85–874 of the 85th Congress, which created the National Cultural Center, authorized the establishment of a Board of Trustees, and set aside land for the construction of the Center on the site in an area we know as Foggy Bottom.

The public law authorized the Board of Trustees of the Center to receive private donations for the construction of the Center and set a time limit of 5 years for obtaining the necessary funds to construct it. Last year, because the funds had not been raised, the Congress extended the period for the fund drive for an additional 3 years. Under existing public law, the funds needed to construct this Center must be available by 1966. It is my understanding that through the efforts of those involved in raising the money, the Cultural Center has received from private donations approximately $13½ million.

This, briefly, is the history of the legislation and the current status of the fundraising program. In this capsulized version of the attempt to construct a national cultural center, I do not wish to minimize the strenuous endeavors of those who have labored so long to bring this project to fruition. The drive has involved the work of many, both in and out of Congress, who have devoted their time, money, and abilities to make a long-standing dream come true.

Perhaps the leading figure in this whole effort—one who envisioned a truly national center for the arts—was our late President John Kennedy. From the time of his inauguration on January 20, 1961, which we can all recall with pride, he devoted his very limited time and his great energies toward bringing this project to completion, and—if I may be permitted a personal comment—on many occasions I discussed with him the dire need for such a center as a symbol and as a showcase of that which evidences the true nature of those facets of the American society which are enduring to this country and its historical background. On each of

those occasions, he displayed enthusiasm and understanding of the need for this Center.

President Kennedy had a keen sense of history and of the lasting values of our society. His particular insight was that of a leader who envisioned and championed, not those things which resulted in advantage of a transitory nature, but, rather, one with the foresight to be concerned with that which would result in the establishment of values representative of this Nation with those virtues which would endure throughout man's history.

I would not dwell on the horrible tragedy which has befallen us, nor do I believe President Kennedy would wish us to indulge ourselves in a surfeit of sentimentality. But I can think of no greater or more lasting tribute we could pay to this fine man, and to our memory of him, than to name this Center in his honor.

Senate Joint Resolution 136 has the endorsement of this administration. I understand that the respective chairmen of the Senate and the House Public Works Committee have received, or will receive, a letter from President Johnson indicating his approval of this proposal.

It is also my understanding that Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and our late President's family endorse the move to name this Center as the Nation's memorial to him.

There has been discussion at some length about the appropriateness of a name for the Center, and I wish to assure the committee members that I certainly am not committed to any particular designation. As a matter of fact, I would suggest for your consideration as an alternative to the designation contained in the resolution, if it meets with the committee's approval, that the resolution be modified to designate the Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts since I believe this is the preference of the Kennedy family and many of those involved most intimately with the Center.

I do not wish to prolong my testimony since there are many present who wish to be heard and who have greater knowledge of the details of the Center than I. I would conclude by saying that I think it is fitting and proper that the Congress authorize the appropriation of funds to match amounts donated to the Center from private sources.

STATEMENT OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Senator RANDOLPH. I have to return to chair the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Public Works Committee and before I go to that hearing I wish to make this very brief statement.

The purpose to be consummated in the passage of the legislation embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 136, introduced by 50 Members of the U.S. Senate with Senator Fulbright the principal sponsor, is altogether timely and proper. I am gratified to have the privilege of joining as one of the sponsors. The House joint resolution was introduced by Chairman Buckley, of New York. Other bills have been introduced in the House.

My sentiment in the immediate matter before us is an enthusiastic endorsement of the proposed National Cultural Center being renamed the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center. This will be a most appropriate action to honor our late and great President.

I wish to place in the hearing record, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, the following editorial from the New York Times of December 5, 1963, entitled "Monuments That Endure."

It is my hope, Mr. Cochairman, that we will move forward toward a prompt enactment of this proposal, a really meaningful memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Representative JONES. Without objection, the editorial will be received and printed in the record at this point.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1963]

MONUMENTS THAT ENDURE

The proposals offered in the best of faith to rename various colleges, bridges, airports, and other places after John F. Kennedy must be respected as a measure of the affection held for the late President and his family. All Americans hope that his personal example of devoted duty and the boldness of his goals for the country will never be forgotten. Yet in this moment of sorrow and mourning we must be careful not to debase our grief by attaching the Kennedy name to everything in sight. Surely, no one had a greater sense of the fitting and appropriate gesture than President Kennedy.

In May of 1864 Representative Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, died. He was a beloved friend of Lincoln, and friends wrote to the President to join them in effort for a marble monument to Lovejoy. The last sentence of Lincoln's letter of response said: "Let him have the marble monument along with the well-assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty, unselfishly, for all men." We believe that President Kennedy, who had a noble sense of history, deserves not the emotional but the more enduring monuments of dedication to his aspirations for a better nation and a better world.

Representative JONES. Are there further questions?

Now we have a distinguished and outstanding leader from the State of Massachusetts, the fine and lovable friend of ours over the years, Senator Saltonstall.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Senator SALTONSTALL. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator McNamara, Mr. Buckley, and members of the joint committees.

May I add my words of pleasure in having the honor to address a joint committee of the Public Works Committee of the Congress?

Mr. Chairman, I have a very brief statement and I would like to supplement what Senator Fulbright has said as we have discussed this subject together several times. I speak also as a colleague of the late President for 8 years when he was a Member of the Senate where we worked very closely together on matters that concerned our State and even the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the designation of National Center for the Performing Arts here in Washington as a memorial to President John F. Kennedy is a most fitting and lasting tribute to him. Although the Center had its genesis under the previous administration, President and Mrs. Kennedy took such a strong personal interest in it that the Center began to give promise of realization.

The late President often, with members of the Board of Trustees and the Advisory Committee on the Arts, counseled with them and encouraged them as the project progressed. He called in leaders of the business community to enlist their support and with Mrs. Kennedy attended the fundraising dinner last fall.

We all know that Mrs. Kennedy designed beautiful Christmas cards this year to benefit the Cultural Center.

Last month's tragedy has taken from us not only our President but a former colleague and friend. He was a man of many interests but one interest which has shown perhaps more brightly than the others because it brought forth something new to Washington official life was his interest in and support of the sciences and performing arts.

What a note of freshness and national pride Robert Frost brought to us all on that cold inaugural day. How many visiting heads of state to the White House have enjoyed the music and drama sponsored by its occupants.

President and Mrs. Kennedy brought to the center of our Government the finest which America has to offer in the performing arts.

This recognition truly sparked the interest of us all and our pride in this country's artistic development.

In dedicating the Robert Frost Memorial Highway at Amherst College in Massachusetts on October 26 of this year, President Kennedy said, and I quote him:

"I look forward to an America which will reward achievement in the arts as we laud achievement in business or statecraft. I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well."

That was President Kennedy at Amherst.

Mr. Chairman, I join with Senators Fulbright and Clark and other Senators and for the other Senate Members who are trustees of the Center and other Senators in sponsoring this resolution because I believe it is a fitting tribute to our late President.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Representative THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a unique opportunity for me as well since it is my first appearance before these two great committees in joint session. I am very grateful for it. I am grateful particularly to Mr. Jones, whose handling of the earlier bills on this side of the hill has been in large measure the reason for their success.

Mr. Wright mentioned the L'Enfant plan and the hope of the city of Washington and its inhabitants for a cultural center, the hope of the Nation has been frustrated for many, many years. There were attempts in the 1880's. There have been almost innumerable attempts to complete this which is so near completion now.

In 1955, a Commission was established. It ran into difficulties and it expired.

In 1958, the present Commission was established and thanks to the work of Mr. Stevens and the other members, the public trustees, a great deal has been accomplished toward raising the requisite moneys. Thanks also to the enormous interest which the late President and Mrs. Kennedy had it has gotten off the ground really for the first time.

It is singularly appropriate, I think, that at this stage in its development that this proposal by Mr. Buckley, in the House with me and many others as cosponsors, and by Senator Fulbright and Senator Saltonstall in the other body, come before us now. There is little or no doubt that ultimately there would be a memorial to President Kennedy.

If the traditional rule referred to by the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Cramer, were followed, there would be established a Commission. It would need moneys for planning, it would need time, and it very likely would come back to something such as this model sitting behind me now. It might well, however, have the history of earlier Commissions, which have been in being for a number of years and which have yet to succeed in erecting their memorials, most of which are not in any sense living as this one would be.

There is no question in my mind of the need for a Center for the Performing Arts in Washington.

As Senator Fulbright has said, we are the

only major nation on earth which does not have one.

It happened as a coincidence with this terrible tragedy, the assassination of President Kennedy, that something which is probably the most perfectly suitable memorial to him had already been designed and many millions of dollars raised for it. It seems to me, then, that it is most appropriate for all of the reasons mentioned earlier that the Government do its part by renaming it either the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center or the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and that it allows, through its enactment and through its appropriation, participation by all of the people in its completion.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROGER L. STEVENS, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER; ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD D. STONE, ARCHITECT; AND RALPH E. BECKER, GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to appear at this hearing which has under discussion the dedication of the presently named National Cultural Center as a living memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

In presenting my testimony as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Center, I have furnished each member of the committee with an up-to-date report . . . This report is part of my statement and I request that it be made a part of the record:

RECORD OF PROGRESS OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER, DECEMBER 12, 1963

ESTABLISHMENT

The National Cultural Center was established by act of Congress during the Eisenhower administration in 1958, as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution. The passage of the bill received full bipartisan support, and the composition of the Center's Board of Trustees reflects fully the bipartisan spirit in which it will be brought to reality.

Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Eisenhower have served as honorary cochairmen.

While Congress designated the land upon which the Center would be built—on the banks of the Potomac River in Washington, D.C.—it stipulated that money for the building must come from the voluntary contributions of the American people. Congress further authorized a nationwide fundraising campaign, the first ever specified for a cultural undertaking.

On August 19, 1963, President Kennedy signed a bill, passed with full bipartisan support, to extend the fundraising period to September 1966.

FUNDRAISING

The authorization of the fundraising campaign did not, however, provide the Center with funds for planning and overhead. It was during this early stage of the Center's life that the Honorable L. Corrin Strong, former Ambassador to Norway, who served as Executive Vice Chairman of the Center for several years, made funds available for administrative purposes. Mr. Strong most generously agreed to underwrite those expenses until the fall of 1963.

With the appointment of Roger L. Stevens, well-known theatrical producer and businessman, as Chairman of its Board of Trustees in November 1961, the Center put into operation a number of nationwide fundraising programs.

As of December 11, 1963, pledges and cash received totaled $13,122,042.46. Of this amount, $5 million represents a Ford Foundation grant which is a matching grant on a 3-to-1 basis. A financial statement as of November 30 is attached as part of this report.

The Center's major fundraising programs are as follows: The President's Business Committee has been established under the chairmanship of Ernest R. Breech, former chairman of the Ford Motor Co. This committee is composed of prominent industrialists and businessmen each of whom will seek contributions from that area of industry with which they themselves are identified. The goal set for this committee is $6 million, of which more than $2 million has been raised to date.

A Seat Endowment Committee, under the chairmanship of Edgar M. Bronfman, president of Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc., launched a program whereby individuals and organizations can endow permanent seats in one of the Center's three halls, with a tax-deductible donation of $1,000. Each endowment will be marked with a plaque affixed to the back of the seat. The goal for this program is $6 million.

A Special Gifts Committee is currently being formed to seek substantial donations of cash, materials, and facilities for the Center.

A Greater Washington Area Committee, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Hugh D. Auchincloss, is seeking funds in the Washington area. Since the Center will be located in the Nation's Capital, this committee has taken as its goal the considerable sum of $7.5 million, of which approximately $2.6 has already been raised.

One of the most gratifying contributions made to this particular program was that made by the area's schoolchildren. A drive centered on parochial, private, and public schools realized more than $19,000.

Earlier this year, recordings went on sale of the music of the four U.S. military bands. The albums were made on an out-of-pocket basis by RCA Victor and all proceeds from their sale are being paid to the Center. This project was made possible by the close cooperation of the American Federation of Musicians, the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, the Department of Defense, and the White House. In addition, all composers, music publishers, and arrangers waived their fees and royalties in favor of the Center.

Two Christmas cards designed by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy are making a most significant contribution to the Center's fundraising. They have been reproduced by Hallmark Cards, Inc., who are donating their net profits to the Center.

FOUNDATIONS

In addition to these specific fundraising programs, the Center has enlisted the support of several important foundations. We have been fortunate in receiving a grant of $5 million from the Ford Foundation, payable when $15 million has been raised by voluntary contributions from the public.

The Rockefeller Foundation has contributed an unconditional grant of $1 million, and we have recently received a similar unconditional grant of $500,000 from the Old Dominion Foundation, whose founder and chairman of trustees is Paul Mellon.

SPECIAL GIFTS

The Center's fundraising has been greatly stimulated by a gift from the Government of Italy of all the marble needed in the construction of the building. It is estimated that this generous contribution represents over $1 million.

We have also secured gifts from smaller foundations and we are receiving further consideration from others.

On his recent visit to President Kennedy, the Prime Minister of Ireland, Mr. Sean Lemass offered a gift from his Government of a Waterford chandelier, to be made to our architect's specifications.

I am pleased to inform the committees that other foreign countries are considering substantial gifts to the Center.

ARCHITECTURE

In 1959 the distinguished architect, Edward Durell Stone began working on the Cultural Center project as architect-adviser. In March 1963, he was appointed architect by the Board of Trustees.

The presentation of Mr. Stone's final concept—a 2,750-seat symphony hall, a 1,200-seat theater, and a 2,500-seat hall for opera, ballet, and musical theater—was made to President and Mrs. Kennedy and General and Mrs. Eisenhower in September 1962. The presentation later was repeated to the Center's Board of Trustees and Advisory Committee on the Arts, the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Cabinet, and the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners. In each instance, the design has met with enthusiastic approval.

The Center recently entered into an agreement with the General Services Administration whereby GSA would serve as the agent for design and construction of the building.

PROGRAMING

As laid down in the act creating the Center, the Board of Trustees shall—

1. Present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries.
2. Present lectures and other programs.
3. Develop programs for children and youth and the elderly (and for other age groups as well) in such arts designed specifically for their participation, education, and recreation, and
4. Provide facilities for other civic activities at the Cultural Center.

The Center will be far more than an entity of bricks and mortar. The programs will be drawn up with the greatest care and with the counsel of experts in the performing arts in order that the Center shall quickly attain national significance and international importance. For the first time in the Nation's Capital we shall provide a setting for the presentation of distinguished performers from abroad, and encourage the performing arts activities at the community level.

Even in advance of the building, two specific programs are now being actively prepared.

On October 12, President Kennedy announced the formation of a permanent national company of the Metropolitan Opera, to be presented jointly by the Metropolitan and the Cultural Center. It is intended to launch the new company on a nationwide tour in the autumn of 1965. Mr. Kennedy pointed out that the tour will include as many colleges and universities as possible in its itinerary. The national company will place emphasis on ensemble perfection rather than on individual stars, and will bring its productions to cities where live opera is not now available. It will also serve as an effective training ground for America's new operatic talent.

In addition, plans have been announced for the Center to join with the American National Theater and Academy and the American Educational Theater Association in presenting a drama festival in which the more than 700 colleges and universities throughout the country will be invited to participate. This will initially be conducted on a regional basis, with the final groups being brought to Washington for presentation. The festival will take place in the spring of 1965.

CONCLUSION

In the past 2 years, nationwide interest in the Center has grown to the point where its purposes and goals are now known throughout the country.

Addressing the Center's closed-circuit telecast in November, 1962, President Kennedy said: "* * * I am certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we will be remembered not for victories or defeats in battle or in politics, but for our contribution to the human spirit."

It is the mandate of the Congress to the National Cultural Center to be an integral part of this "contribution to the human spirit."

Mr. STEVENS. Shortly after I assumed chair-

manship of the Center in November 1961, President Kennedy decided that the plans and concept of the Center were unnecessarily extensive and costly. These plans were consequently reviewed and the concept reduced substantially in size and cost. As I am sure you are aware, the architect, Edward Durell Stone, has now grouped the three halls under a single roof, effecting a significant saving in building and operating costs, with no loss in architectural grandeur.

President Kennedy took a keen personal interest in these changes and, as always, kept a close watch upon our progress.

It was also both his and Mrs. Kennedy's earnest desire that groundbreaking for the Center should take place during 1964, as the fulfillment of one of his most cherished projects during his first term as President of the United States.

The interest and positive support given to the Center by President Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy were unwavering. This support was there when it was needed, and the knowledge of their intention to continue this interest and support as invaluable to our planning.

A tragedy of dreadful proportions has prevented President Kennedy from seeing the realization of many of his dreams. We all know that a national center for the performing arts, so long overdue, was one of these dreams.

Within hours of his untimely death, however, a spontaneous reaction spread through the country, manifested by letters to the newspapers, to the Center itself, by stories in the national press, with accompanying editorials. All the voices were unanimous in their desire to see the Cultural Center renamed and dedicated as a memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The suggestion may be summed up in these words of Charles Bartlett, a close friend of President Kennedy's, in a column written the week following Mr. Kennedy's death; and I quote:

The proposal to construct the National Cultural Center in the name of John F. Kennedy is one answer to the hopes that his death may yield some of the aspirations of his life.

President Johnson lent his enthusiastic support to the proposal. He consulted with President Kennedy's family, and learned that the dedication of the Center was their wish. From all sides came the same response: That the Center was without question the most appropriate memorial—a living memorial and one which would continue to live by its service to all the American people—a memorial to a man who held its aims and ideals so close to his heart.

On December 3, the Center held a meeting of its Executive Committee and passed the following resolution:

That the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center endorse the proposals known as House Joint Resolution No. 828 and Senate Joint Resolution No. 136 to rename the National Cultural Center the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and authorize to be appropriated governmental funds to match funds raised from voluntary contributions. The passage of this legislation will strengthen the Board's efforts to create this national center for the performing arts as soon as possible.

Fully realizing that proposals are coming from all sides to name other undertakings for the late President and that there is an understandable desire to perpetuate his memory the length and breadth of the country, I should like to reiterate my views and that of my Board of Trustees that no more suitable memorial exists than a national center for the performing arts.

Dedicated to the memory of John Kennedy, who, by his positive actions, paid tribute from his high office to America's poets, painters, singers, dancers, and actors, the Center will take on an even greater significance. Its programs will begin even in advance of the building. They will serve this generation and the generations to come by bestowing the much-needed national recognition upon the performing arts of this country that President Kennedy demonstrated to the world he felt to be so important.

A year ago, he said:

"Today, as always, art knows no national boundaries. Art and the encouragement of art is political in the most profound sense, not as a weapon in the struggle, but as an instrument of understanding of the futility of struggle between those who share man's faith."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Edward Stone, who would like to comment on the site.

Representative JONES. Mr. Stone, we are pleased to have you.

Mr. STONE. It is an honor for me to appear before this joint meeting of the committee of the House and the Senate. If I may have your forbearance, I would like to speak as an individual and as an architect.

You realize in historically great periods when arts flourished there was peace, stable government, and prosperity. We have had good fortune to enjoy this climate. It remained, however, for President and Mrs. Eisenhower and for President and Mrs. Kennedy to provide the inspiration and leadership. This they did in full measure so that we are in reality in the beginning of a great renaissance in the intellectual and artistic life of this country. As a creative artist, I find consolation in the statement that all great periods in history were only great because of the art they produced.

We architects especially cherish the memory of President Kennedy and feel that not since Thomas Jefferson has there been a President so interested in architecture. He had a knowledge and an understanding and gave us encouragement. He aspired in this country to a beautiful physical environment.

I had the honor to present this project to both President and Mrs. Kennedy and to President and Mrs. Eisenhower.

I am honored to say that they expressed great enthusiasm both for the building but especially for the site. The site, as you know, was selected by the Congress. It has the blessing not only of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy but the Fine Arts Commission and all of the people concerned, the National Park Service, the District traffic planners; in fact, we have encountered no official obstacles any place en route.

I have had a chance to reflect on this site for some 5 years. Mr. Stevens is a monument to patience. He listened to innumerable proposals for other locations and in acquainting me with them I, too, have inspected all possibilities.

We, following the President's own convictions, are convinced that this is really a poetic situation for a building which should be an inspiring building.

First of all, the tradition of Washington is that of a white building in a parklike setting. This started with Washington, who built a classical house in Mount Vernon. Subsequently, Jefferson did the same thing, as did Lee. The precedent is followed in the White House, its setting and, of course, the Capitol, itself. This site provides this idyllic parklike setting.

The way I envision a park is a green area with trees, grass, water removed from any other structures. It is actually to the south 2,400 feet to the Lincoln Memorial, to the east it is 600 feet to the nearest structure, and to the north 300 feet.

Of course, our building emphasizes the outlook over the Potomac River and a beautiful island which will always remain in its natural state, dedicated to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt.

The question has been raised about the approaches to the bridge. I find them a blessing in disguise. Actually, the highway is 27 feet below the level of our building. There is 400 feet between our building and this parkway. Of course, that will be beautifully landscaped and will be a park. So that one point is a blessing rather than a handicap, in my humble opinion.

Representative JONES. You are relieving a lot of minds on that point.

Mr. STONE. Mr. Chairman, the people who look at this site in the plan do not visualize the third dimension. We have of course, in our studies, reassured ourselves so that from the Center itself, except the one highway, one road that provides access to our Center, that is the only place that cars will be visible, and it is all in a parklike setting.

I hope that is reassuring because it is a very important point and it has not been made in any of the observations about the so-called bridge approach. There are actually 85 acres of park land on the Washington side of this building measured between the buildings to the south, to the east, and to the north. Of course, it is traversed by a highway as is Central Park, as is Rock Creek Park, and so on.

In the 20th century you accept that.

Adding to that, and we can fairly think of this, it is 3,000 feet to the nearest building on the Virginia side of the Potomac, and go another 200 acres with the most poetic prospect, I feel, in the city of Washington. So, you have a building in a setting of 280 acres with this overlooking the river and this island.

This is not a large building by Washington standards. It is 630 feet long. The National Gallery, for instance, is 150 feet longer and innumerable departments here have larger buildings. So it is not oversized or out of scale, we architects say.

Furthermore, as Mr. Stevens pointed out, we would like to emphasize that we have had estimates made on the possibility of three separate auditoriums. Careful estimates demonstrate that this adds 30 percent to the cost. Lincoln Center, which has five buildings, regret that they did not have one building. For instance, the servicing, the stagehand unions have to have separate crews for each of these auditoriums. Here, we can serve the whole Center with one contract with the union and one crew. So, we not only save money but we save the maintenance cost through the years. Transparently one heating system, one cooling system is more economical and extremely practical and economical, the most economical way.

Repesentative JONES. Thank you.

Mr. Stevens?

Mr. STEVENS. I have finished my remarks. I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Representative JONES. Mr. Becker, do you have any statement for the committee?

Mr. BECKER. No; I am very happy to be here and answer any questions.

Representative GRAY. I would like to commend Mr. Stevens, Mr. Stone, and Mr. Becker for the outstanding job they have done on this Center.

Mr. Stone, how tall is this building going to be?

Mr. STONE. It is 60 feet high. It might be of interest to you that when we presented this building to President Kennedy in Newport, he asked how high it was, as you have, in relation to the Lincoln Memorial. We had already made at the same scale a drawing of the Lincoln Memorial, placing it at its distance from this building so that he could visualize it. This building is approximately 18 inches lower than the Lincoln Memorial.

Representative GRAY. You would say the equivalent of a five- or six-story building?

Mr. STONE. This is approximately six stories.

To give you an idea of height, the National Gallery is 90 feet high at the corners. As I say, it is 150 feet longer. So this is a much more modest building.

The legislation was reported by the Senate Public Works Committee December 17, and passed by the Senate the following day. It was approved by the House on January 8, 1964, and on January 10, 1964, the Senate agreed to House amendments. President Johnson signed Public Law 88–260 on January 23, 1964.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the Arkansas Gazette of December 13, 1963, and excerpts from the report of the Senate Public Works Committee, December 17, 1963.

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

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Dec. 13, 1963]

FULBRIGHT URGES RENAMING CULTURAL CENTER FOR JFK

WASHINGTON.—Sen. J. W. Fulbright Thursday urged two Congressional committees meeting jointly to approve legislation renaming the proposed National Cultural Center in honor of President John F. Kennedy.

As author of both the bill creating the center and a current resolution to rename it, Fulbright was the lead-off witness at the joint hearing of the House and Senate Public Works Committees.

"I would not dwell on the horrible tragedy which has befallen us," he said. "Nor do I believe President Kennedy would wish us to indulge ourselves in sentimentality, but I can think of no greater or more lasting tribute we could pay to this fine man and to our memory of him than to name this center in his honor."

SYMBOL AND SHOWCASE

Fulbright recalled the many times he spoke with Mr. Kennedy about the need for such a center as a symbol and as a showcase of that which evidences the true nature of those facets of the American society which are enduring to this country and its historical background."

The Fulbright legislation, enacted into law in 1958, created the National Cultural Center, set aside land on the banks of the Potomac as a site and formed a Board of Trustees to receive private donations for a period of five years. In 1962, the donation period was extended another three years.

With a strong boost from the late president and his widow, donations spurted in recent years and stand now at the $13.5 million mark. Total cost of the center is estimated at about $30 million.

WOULD MATCH FUNDS

Fulbright's current resolution would rename the center the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center and authorize the appropriation of federal funds to match on a 50–50 basis any private donations.

The Senator said he is not committed to the new name and suggested as an alternative, the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, which, he said, is preferred by the Kennedy family.

He also said the whole idea has President Johnson's backing and also that of many ordinary people, judging from the letters he has received from over the country.

[EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 17, 1963]

The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 136, as amended, is to rename the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, in honor of the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to provide within such Center a suitable memorial in his honor; to authorize appropriations in an aggregate amount equal to the gifts, bequests, and devises held by the Board of Trustees, but not in excess of $15,500,000; provide borrowing authority by issuance of revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $15,400,000 to the Secretary of the Treasury to finance necessary parking facilities for the Center; to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept on behalf of the United States any gift in honor of or in the memory of the late President; and provide that the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts designated by this act shall be the national memorial to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy within the city of Washington and its environs.

It should be noted that when George Washington in 1789 commissioned Pierre L'Enfant to plan a Federal City, he directed that it be planned as a cultural and civic center for the United States. Completion of this Cultural Center will carry out the wishes of our first President as well as those of our late President Kennedy, and fulfill the hopes of the Nation that have been frustrated for so many years.

The committee is aware of pending legislation that would establish a Memorial Commission to consider memorials to the late President Kennedy. Authorization of such a memorial in the city of Washington, D.C., should not supersede such legislation. Many memorials and changes in designation have been proposed all over the country. It is believed that such a Commission could establish priorities, set up standards, and give consideration to appropriate memorials in the various States of our Nation.

Senate Joint Resolution 136, as amended, would add an additional duty to the Board of Trustees to provide within the Center a suitable memorial in honor of the late President, and report to Congress a detailed report on such proposed memorial. The committee was advised that such a memorial had not been thoroughly studied, but would probably consist of photographs, statues, carvings, works of art, or exhibits, and that no increase in the overall cost of the Center prom provision of such memorial was contemplated.

The location and setting of the memorial is believed ideal. It is remote from adjacent buildings, surrounded by open and park areas, overlooks the Potomac River, and the Virginia countryside beyond, and is not too far distant from other memorials to other great Presidents. If other memorials are established in future years, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, established by this act, will be the main national monument to his memory within the city of Washington and its environs.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee believes it to be fitting and proper to rename the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and to dedicate it as a living memorial to our late and beloved President who contributed so much to the cause of culture in our Nation's Capital, and lent his undivided support and personal attention to early completion of the Center in order that needs of the performing arts could be furthered, and the expressions made available to all the American people.

It further believes that appropriation of Federal funds to match funds raised from voluntary contributions is a worthy method to permit all the citizens of our country to take part in the final realization of this Center giving national recognition to the performing arts of our Nation, and perpetuation of the aims and ideals dear to the heart of our late President.

The committee is of the opinion that parking facilities in connection with the Center are essential, that such facilities can be self-liquidating, and that authority for issuance of revenue bonds to provide such facilities in the Center is advisable.

Therefore, the committee recommends enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 136, as amended, as a lasting tribute and memorial to President John F. Kennedy, in honor of his recognition of the performing arts and interest in this country's artistic accomplishments and development.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the groundbreaking ceremony for the Kennedy Center was held December 2, 1964, with President Johnson, the late Robert F. Kennedy, Sir John Gielgud, Jason Robards, Jr., and other dignitaries taking part.

I quote from a statement prepared for the occasion by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., which expresses the reason for the construction of such a Center and the appropriateness of dedicating it to John F. Kennedy:

President Kennedy, like the great Presidents of the early Republic, saw America not just as a state or a system but as a civilization. His leadership looked to the elevation of the quality and tone of the national life.

A vital society, he believed, found its highest expression in its passion to create—not just goods and arms, but writing, painting, sculpture, drama, film, music, dance. Art, he felt, could give permanent form to its memories of the past, images of the present, visions of the future.

He therefore saw the arts, not as an interruption or distraction in the life of a nation, not as a luxury, but as the heart of a nation's purpose. He saw vulgarity and ugliness as threats to a nation's well-being. He saw excellence as a public necessity. He wanted his country to be not only a good society but a brilliant civilization.

In this spirit, his Presidency established the arts as a concern of the national government.

In this same spirit, the American people today dedicate the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Times of December 3, 1964, concerning the groundbreaking ceremony.

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1964]

JOHNSON BEGINS WORK ON KENNEDY CENTER; POLITICAL FIGURES AND CELEBRITIES ATTEND GROUND-BREAKING

(By Nan Robertson)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 2.—President Johnson broke ground with a gold-plated spade today for a national cultural center that will keep alive the memory of President Kennedy and fulfill one of his dreams.

Gathered on the banks of the Potomac at the ceremony for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts were witnesses from what Mr. Johnson called "the words of poetry and power."

Sir John Gielgud read in his famous, mellifluous voice from Shakespeare's "Henry V." Jason Robards Jr., who had forgotten his notes on the plane that brought him to Washington, quoted President Kennedy from memory on artists and the arts.

Senator-elect Robert F. Kennedy told of his brother's belief "that America is judged as every civilization is judged—in large measure by the quality of its artistic achievement."

And President Johnson said that the center "will symbolize our belief that the world of creation and thought are at the core of all civilization."

A HISTORIC SHOVEL

The spade the President thrust into the earth with his left foot was first used by President William McKinley in 1898 to plant a scarlet oak on the front lawn of the White House. In 1914, President William Howard Taft broke ground with it for the Lincoln Memorial. In 1938, President Franklin D. Roosevelt used it at the site of the Jefferson Memorial.

Construction of the marble, glass and bronze Kennedy Center is scheduled to begin next summer. The $31 million building containing an opera, concert hall, two theaters and a cinema, is scheduled for completion by late 1967. Its architect, Edward Durrell Stone, has called the site, upstream from the Lincoln Memorial, "one of the most exciting and glorious settings for a public building in the world."

The site is at the junction of New Hampshire Avenue and Rock Creek Parkway on the east bank of the Potomac.

Before the ceremony today, celebrities, political, performing and otherwise, stood shoulder to shoulder, chatting amiably.

In the second row were:

Vice President-elect Hubert H. Humphrey, rosy-cheeked in this chill; his wife, Muriel, in a white mink beret; Mel Ferrer, the actor, in chin whiskers; his wife, Audrey Hepburn, in a black mink pillbox and ascot; Rex Harrison, shaggy-haired under a Henry Higgins-type of checked wool hat; Lady Harlech, the patrician-looking wife of the British Ambassador and Lord Harlech, who sat beside Laureen Bacall, Mr. Robard's wife.

Facing them from the first row of the platform were Sir John, bundled up against the cold in a navy pea jacket and a ranch mink overseas cap; President Kennedy's sister, Mrs. Stephen E. Smith, in ranch mink from neck to knees; the Most Rev. Philip M. Hannan, auxiliary bishop of Washington, who gave the inovacation; Senator-elect Kennedy, hatless and coatless; the President, who shed his white raincoat to speak; the First Lady, in mink hat and cream wool coat; Roger L. Stevens, Broadway producer and chairman of the center's board of trustees; Associate Justice Byron R. White, a lifelong Kennedy friend, who wore his black judicial robes over an overcoat; another Kennedy sister, Mrs. Sargtnt Shriver, and Mr. Robards, in a short "British warmer" coat and green Bavarian hat.

Spotted through the crowd were Erich Leinsdorf, conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra; Mr. Stone, Mrs. Edward M. Kennedy, wife of the Massachusetts Senator, a dazzling blonde in dark mink; the historian Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., Senator J. W. Fulbright, and yet another Kennedy—Robert's wife, Ethel. The mother of Mrs. John F. Kennedy, Mrs. Hugh D. Auchincloss, was also there.

President Johnson paid high tribute to Mrs. Auchincloss's efforts to raise funds for the center, and her other endeavors on its behalf. Congress has authorized $15.5 million in funds, to be matched by an equal amount in private contributions.

"The role of Government must be a small one," the President said of the center. "No act of Congress or Executive Order can call a great musician or poet into existence. But we can stand on the sidelines and cheer."

In his readings, Mr. Robards quoted extensive passages from a speech President Kennedy made 27 days before his death. It was during the dedication of the Robert Frost Library at Amherst, Mass. Mr. Kennedy called any great artist "a solitary figure. He has, as Frost said, a lover's quarrel with the world."

Mr. Robards commented: "I would like to say of John Fitzgerald Kennedy what he once had to say of Malraux [Andre Malraux, French writer and Minister of Cultural Affairs].

"In his own life he has again demonstrated that politics and art, the life of action and the world of thought, the world of events and the world of imagnination, are one."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in September 1964, Senator Saltonstall, Senator Clark, and I, who were continuing to serve on the Board of Trustees, reported to the Senate on the Kennedy Center. At the time, there had been some suggestions that an alternate site might be preferable. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 30, 1965, be printed at this point.

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

THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, I have received from Chairman of that Board, Mr. Roger L. Stevens, a copy of the annual report of the Chairman to the Congress, covering the period July 1, 1964, through June 30, 1965.

Mr. President, this report represents the culmination of a magnificent achievement. The Kennedy Center, the national memorial to the late President who was my colleague and friend, has been brought to the point of fruition. Dozens of dedicated, public-spirited citizens have, since the passage of the original Cultural Center Act in 1958, devoted enormous energy, effort, and thought to the Center. Let me mention a few, without in any way detracting from the others. L. Corrin Strong, by his personal efforts and out of his personal funds, saw the Center through its difficult organizational days. Ambassador Strong was succeeded as Chairman of the Board by Mr. Stevens, whose contribution has been unstinted. Ralph E. Becker of this city has served as General Counsel and Trustee from the outset and has encountered and solved some difficult and even unique problems. Robert O. Anderson, Mrs Albert D. Lasker, K. Lemoyne Billings, Mrs. Jouett Shouse, Leonard Carmichael, and his successor as Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Dillon Ripley, Conrad Wirth, and his successor as Director of National Park Services. George Hartzog, and Walter Tobriner, President of District of Columbia Commissioners, have rendered devoted service as members of the Building Committee and Executive Committees. Time does not permit me to identify the many other persons who deserve great credit and commendation for their contributions, since I wish to address myself to the report.

PRESENT STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION

The distinguished architect of the Center, Edward Durell Stone, is working on the final drawings and plans. After the plans have been reviewed by the General Services Administration, they will advertise the general construction contract.

The demolition contract has been awarded and demolition of structures on the site is underway.

The National Park Service has already invited bidders for the relocation of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, with bids to be opened on October 14. The parkway is being relocated to the edge of the river for two purposes: to provide greater flexibility of access to the Center and to make possible the construction of a cantilevered main floor over it. This construction will mean that the view from the Center is not interrupted by the flow of traffic.

Finally, plans for the excavation of the building site have been completed by the architect and are being reviewed by the General Services Administration who will invite bidders very soon.

This is a truly remarkable record of progress. It has been a matter of great satisfaction to me to serve on the Board of Trustees with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, the junior Senator from Arkansas, Senator FULBRIGHT, and the junior Senator from New York, Senator KENNEDY, and many other outstanding citizens. I am sure that all of us here in Congress who knew and worked with the late President will watch with pride as the Kennedy Center rises on the banks of the Potomac.

THE POTOMAC RIVER SITE

As we all know, there has been some division of opinion as to the most suitable site for the Center. I am confident that the Potomac River site is where we will attend the opening ceremonies of the Kennedy Center in 3 or 3½ years. Because of my service as Trustee of the Center from its inception, as well as my membership on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian dating back prior to establishment of the Center as a Bureau of the Smithsonian, I have some personal knowledge of the process by which the Potomac site was chosen. This location was recommended as the site of a multi-purpose auditorium by the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission in its final report on January 31, 1957. No action was taken on this report, and meanwhile, plans were developed by the Smithsonian for the National Air Museum. A location on the Mall was approved for this facility by the National Capital Planning Commission on March 8, 1957. Almost a year later, on February 24, 1958, the Senator from Arkansas and Representative FRANK THOMPSON introduced simultaneous bills to provide for the creation of the National Cultural Center. These bills designated the Mall site, which had been preempted for the Air Museum, as the location of the proposed Cultural Center. The Public Works Committees, to which the bills were referred, requested the views of the Planning Commission. The Commission then began a staff study of potential locations, and on May 1, 1958, the Commission approved the Potomac River site for the Cultural Center and recommended it to the Congress.

UNIFORM SUPPORT IN HEARINGS

The NCPC was not alone in its preference for the Potomac site. It was also supported specifically in hearings before the Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works by the Commission of Fine Arts, the District of Columbia Recreation Board, the American Planning and Civic Association, the Bureau of the Budget, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Washington Star, the Washington Post, the American Institute of Architects, the Federal City Council, the Washington Board of Trade, and Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, a member of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission.

Mr. President, because the cosponsors had agreed to the recommendation of the Planning Commission for the Potomac River site, the bill being considered by the committee of the other House had been amended to incorporate the Planning Commission's choice of site. This bill, including the Potomac site, was enthusiastically endorsed by President Eisenhower and by many organizations including the AFL–CIO, the American Educational Theater Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, the American National Theater and Academy, the Mount Pleasant Citizens Association, the Dupont Circle Citizens Association, the National Opera Guild of Washington, the National Symphony Orchestra Association, the Washington Ballet Guild, the Opera Society of Washington, and the National Federation

of Women's Clubs. Surely, ample opportunity was provided interested individuals and groups to indicate their preferences as to the site. There was an impressive degree of agreement among those heard that the Potomac site was superior.

These hearings were held on August 1 and 5, 1958, 3 months after the site was recommended by NCPC. Another month elapsed before the Cultural Center was signed into law by President Eisenhower. From the time the bill was introduced until it was approved by the President, a period of over 5 months elapsed, so one cannot accurately term the decision a hasty one.

ACCESSIBILITY AND LANDSCAPING

As I have mentioned, the site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts has been questioned. Some say that it is not suitable because of its location on the banks of the Potomac. Washington is probably the only city in the United States that was planned by those who believed that the example of most of the great cities of the world was worth study and emulation; and those who have followed have always been very careful to adhere to their concepts of open avenues, great vista, and large parks and public areas. All that has been done and has been for the enjoyment and use of not only those residing or working within the city but also for those who come from other areas and indeed, from across the world to see the Capital of the United States. The beauty of Washington's great public buildings and monuments traditionally has been enhanced by the setting, either as an axial focal point or a body of water or a large park area. The Center will profit from all of these.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the statement on the John F. Kennedy Center by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. On February 24, 1958, I introduced in the Senate the bill to create a National Cultural Center. An identical bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey. I have served on the Center's Board of Trustees from its beginning and have always been most appreciative of the dedicated efforts which have brought this dream I have shared with so many others to the point of realization. I may say, Mr. President, that this has been a bipartisan dream and a bipartisan effort, just as the congressional representation on the Board is bipartisan.

To my personal knowledge the Trustees and officers of the Center have had splendid cooperation from all the agencies interested or involved. These have been principally the National Capital Planning Commission, General Services Administration, the Fine Arts Commission, the government of the District of Columbia, and the National Park Service, but the aid of many others has been enlisted from time to time. For example, the Secretary of State and officials of the Department of State became participants when several foreign governmens indicated their desire to make gifts for use in the Kennedy Center. By an exchange of diplomatic notes, the center became the grateful recipients of gifts of marble valued at $1,100,000 from the Italian Government, furniture for the grand foyer valued at $155,000 from the Danish Government, bronze doors valued at $250,000 from the German Government, and crystal chandeliers for the concert hall valued at more than $180,000 from the Norwegian Government. Likewise, a red and gold silk curtain, valued at $140,000 is the joint gift of the Government of Japan and the American-Japan Society. The expressions of amity from our friends abroad are most gratifying and most deeply appreciated. The Kennedy Center will appear as a jewel of white Carrara marble in its park setting on the Potomac.

With regard to the Potomac River site, Mr. President, I should like to say that no more appropriate setting for the Center is available. Although the original bill I introduced specified another site for the Center, when it was found that the site on the Mall had been reserved for the Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institute, and when the NCPC recommended the present river site, I was glad to acquiesce in their recommendation. I have never had occasion to regret the adoption of the Commission's recommendation, and do not now. A conclusive consideration, to my mind, is that the view from the Center is perhaps as important as the view of it from outside. Literally nowhere else in the District of Columbia will such a prospect from the Center be possible as that across the river and toward the unspoiled panorama of Roosevelt Island. What other setting is available where office buildings, including those of Government agencies would not be a part of the immediate environment on all sides?

The distinguished architect of the Center, Edward Durell Stone, has taken full advantage of the river and island setting in his design for the Center. As a Trustee, as one of the original sponsors of the act creating the National Cultural Center, and a cosponsor of the act designating the Center as the Nation's memorial to John F. Kennedy, I have the utmost confidence in Mr. Stone and heartily approve the aesthetic concept of the Center. I believe that this feeling is shared by the entire Board of Trustees. Certainly I have heard no criticism of the architectural concept from any of them.

In developing his plan and design for the Center, Mr. Stone has proceeded upon the assumption, which I believe to be correct, that each city has its own individual character and tradition, and that the architect should respect this and work within it. As Mr. Stone conceived the architectural tradition of Washington, it is that of large white buildings in park areas. A drive down Independence or Constitution Avenue will readily illustrate this, as does the setting of the Capitol, the White House, the Supreme Court, the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial and many other public edifices. Mr. Stone's design is in this tradition, as well as taking fullest advantage of the river site and the vista afforded by New Hampshire Avenue.

Now, Mr. President, let me say that the actual appearance of the exterior of any building, like that of any work of art, is a matter of taste. And I think we all realize that esthetic taste is a highly subjective matter, that one man's architectural meat is another man's architectural poison. This is true not only among laymen, but among artists and architects, and certainly among professional critics. For example, I would agree with Ed Stone that in Washington, buildings with walls largely of windows are office buildings, and I would not have wanted the Kennedy Center to look like another office building, no matter how well suited that type of design is to office buildings, which often all serve quite a different purpose.

As I have said, I have the utmost confidence in Ed Stone as an architect. In my opinion and that of many others, he is one of a handful of truly outstanding architects in the world today. I think, Mr. President, that we in the Nation's Capital most emphatically do not want, as the memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a camel of a building like the Rayburn building. We do not want a building which has been put together by a committee, where there is no unity of concept and execution. For this reason, the design and location of the Center cannot be dictated by purely local groups. We are building the Nation's memorial to President Kennedy, and not merely a local facility.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to support the position taken by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], with whom I have worked as a Trustee of the Kennedy Center. I, too, salute the Chairman of the Center, Roger L. Stevens, for having surmounted many obstacles large and small since President Kennedy asked him to get this project underway. I do not feel that at this time any question can reasonably be raised about proceeding as expeditiously as possible to construct the Kennedy Center on the site recommended in 1958 by the planning agency responsible and accepted by the Congress. Not only have contributions been solicited from all over the country and accepted on the representation that this building would be built at this place, but some $3,300,000 has been spent by the National Capital Financing Commission to acquire land under a mandate from Congress. Perhaps most important of all Congress has already designated this Center as a memorial to J.F.K., and made a substantial contribution toward its completion. Opponents of the Potomac site are urging at this late date, at the very moment when demolition at the site is about to proceed—that all the present plans be scrapped and that the NCPC and the Trustees of the Center start again from the beginning. Where have they been these past 7 or 8 years? Why did they not come forward sooner? It is obvious that changing plans now would delay completion of the Center for at least 5 years and perhaps 20. I point out that the Southwest L'Enfant Plaza has not been commenced 10 years after it was planned.

HIGH COST OF CHANGE

Opponents of the Potomac site have proposed that Congress choose a site on Pennsylvania Avenue. They are asking that the Congress intervene in the legally defined and orderly planning processes of the National Capital Planning Commission, and substitute its judgment for that of the Commission. According to the Commission land values in the Pennsylvania Avenue area proposed are exceedingly high; the 6 acres on Pennsylvania Avenue acquired for the Federal Bureau of Investigation building cost $11,871,000. This is close to $2 million an acre.

The Potomac River site contains 18 acres, Mr President. Even if a suitable 18-acre plot could be found in the proposed new area, and I doubt if it could, it could well cost upward of $36 million. The argument is made that this might be available from urban renewal funds. The District of Columbia has a good many things to do with urban renewal money before it should spend it this way.

The costs to the District of Columbia must be also considered, since acquisition of this valuable commercial property for public use would remove it from the tax rolls and amount to a very substantial loss of tax income to the District of Columbia.

The Kennedy Center is being built for the Nation, not merely as a local facility. It is to be the Nation's memorial to the late President, and not that of the District of Columbia. The Trustees believe that it will become very rapidly a monument to which the people of the Nation will flock, as they do to the Lincoln Memorial nearby, and to the last resting place of President Kennedy immediately across the river. It is here in Washington and the people of this area will have the good fortune to benefit by its presence—as they do our other national shrines. But the Center is being built and paid for by national voluntary contributions and by money from the Federal Treasury. Many people in this area have contributed. We are grateful. But this is a National Center.

It would detract from the whole conception of the Kennedy Center as a memorial to change its site so that it can become a downtown commercial attraction. The quiet serenity of the river site is most appropriate

to the Center. It is a handsome site and the natural beauty of the setting will be further enhanced by landscaping. Opponents say the access roads will be complicated, gaping holes which will cut up the site. This, too, is a problem which can be solved by seeing to it that appropriate landscaping and quality highway design are used. . .

In sum, Mr. President, an adequate case for postponing this project has not been made. And practically speaking, it is too late in the day to start all over again even if the case of the opponents were better than it is. We should do what we can to speed up the completion of this major memorial to a great man, not halt it. We should do what we can to solve any problems typical of any urban project of this magnitude—provide a subway stop, work out bus routes and adequate service, make certain that the highway engineers do not destroy what the planners, architects and landscapers will create—which they do all too often in the District, as elsewhere—make the Center as beautiful, successful, and enduring a contribution to our national life as we can. This Center had John F. Kennedy's personal support. None of us ever dreamed it would turn out to be his memorial. But such it has become and it is our obligation to bring it to a successful conclusion—as he asked Roger Stevens to do when he put him in charge of this project, and as he told the Trustees on more than one occasion he wanted done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, construction of the Center moved ahead and on September 30, 1968, the massive steel framework was "topped out."

Regrettably, the Kennedy Center did not prove immune from the escalating costs that prevailed throughout the economy. Thus, in the spring of 1969, Representative KENNETH GRAY introduced H.R. 11249, providing for an increased matching Federal grant and an increased borrowing authority from the U.S. Treasury. The House passed this legislation on July 8, 1969. Subsequently, the Senate Committee on Public Works recommended its passage and on October 3, 1969, it came before the Senate for consideration.

Two proposed amendments which would have had the effect of delaying work on the center were defeated, and on October 6, 1969, the Senate passed H.R. 11249.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 3 and October 6, 1969, and an article from the Washington Evening Star of October 7, 1969.

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

[Excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 3, 1969]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am not the chairman of the Public Works Committee, and I am not the Senator in charge of the bill. Both are unavoidably absent on business of the Senate. However, I am a member of the Committee on Public Works. I desire to make a statement concerning the action of the committee in considering and reporting the bill.

In doing so, I point out to the distinguished Senator from Maine that, as she knows, I have the highest respect for her. I cannot contradict any of the facts she has given.

I will review briefly the history of the cultural center.

The facts have been correctly stated by the Senator from Maine and by the Senator from Arizona. In 1958 President Eisenhower signed the act creating the National Cultural Center. That was to be its name. It is correct that it was to be paid for by private contributions.

The act authorized a board of trustees of 30 members to administer the funds and develop the Center.

After the untimely and tragic death of President Kennedy, resolutions were introduced in the Congress proposing that the name of the center be the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

We remember the sadness of the people of our country and the desire to create an appropriate memorial for President Kennedy. It was thought by many that the construction of the center would be an appropriate memorial, considering his interest in this city and in the arts.

I was present as the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Public Works at a joint hearing of the Senate and House Committees on Public Works. It was decided to name the center for President John F. Kennedy.

It was then agreed that the construction be financed in this manner: Congress would appropriate $15,500,000 to be matched by gifts to be received by the Board of Trustees. The total would amount to $31 million.

Congress also authorized the trustees to borrow $15,400,000. Appropriation by the Congress, gifts and loans provided $46,400,000 which it was estimated at that time, would cover the total construction of the center.

The Board of Trustees constituted the General Services Administration its agent for the construction of the building. The General Services Administration and I assume, with the agreement of the Board, secured as the architect for the center Edward Durell Stone, a very distinguished architect. Gifts were received, and work was commenced.

During this session the Board of Trustees came to the Public Works Committee and reported that the estimated cost had increased from $46,400,000 to $66,400,000. They asked Congress to authorize increased appropriations of $7,500,000, to be matched by gifts, and an additional borrowing authorization of $5 million.

If this is done, the breakdown of the $66.4 million would be as follows. $23 million appropriated by Congress, matched by $23 million in gifts, and loan authority of $20.4 million. These three categories would total $66.4 million.

We asked for an explanation of the cause of the overruns. The report indicates the answers we received from the General Services Administration and the trustees.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Kentucky in saying a few words about this matter. He has correctly stated—I will not repeat all the basic facts—that this matter did begin back in the administration of President Eisenhower. As a matter of fact, I introduced the original bill which authorized the dedication of certain lands belonging to the Government for this purpose—that is, the purpose of a Center for the Performing Arts.

At that time, as a result of a number of hearings in the Committee on Foreign Relations and elsewhere, it became quite evident that Washington was the only capital of any nation of any consequence without adequate facilities for the performing arts. When the foreign operas or ballets came to Washington, they had nothing but movie houses in which to perform, and, of course, those buildings were utterly inadequate for the purpose; and there was general interest in the establishment of a center that was adequate for the performing arts.

I do not want to leave the impression that the bill I introduced was the first one. Actually, prior to that time, under the leadership, I believe, of Mrs. Agnes Meyer, who was and still is the principal owner—she and her family—of the Washington Post and other properties, an effort was made to get the land which was at that time covered by a brewery which is near the present site; and an effort had been made to interest the Government and other people in trying to find a way to provide a reasonably adequate building for the performing arts. I have forgotten the details as to why, in any case this effort was abandoned. The thought then arose that if the Government would provide the land, which it already owned—most of it, at least—perhaps private people could put up some of the money for the building.

Between that time and the assassination of President Kennedy, something in the neighborhood of $5 to $7 million had been raised or pledged. Mr. Strong, who was a prominent citizen, had been the largest donor of those funds.

Then, President Kennedy was assassinated. Incidentally, he had taken a very special interest in this activity. He and his wife were both inclined to an interest in this type of activity. There were many other people also. I do not think they were alone. They had given it a boost and they talked about it. There were plans during that period for mounting a nationwide campaign to raise funds for this particular project.

I am reminded that in a country like Australia a somewhat similar project has been underway for 10 years. They have a beautiful opera house underway on the bay at the city of Sydney. They had a worldwide competition for design. It is near completion. They started out with an estimated cost for the opera house of $10 million. I think they have already spent $57 million and it still is not quite completed. It was financed to a great extent by a special lottery and also, I think, through private gifts. Construction has proceeded from year to year; it has been suspended from time to time; and the building is now much more expensive than it had been estimated.

I do not wish to excuse the fact that there were some overestimates in this connection. I only wish to point out that the trustees, after enactment of the legislation already discussed—and I shall not repeat it—did employ the General Services Administration, which is the agency of Government charged with supervision of all Government buildings. That is the agency which supervises the letting of contracts and so forth. They supervise these great office buildings with which we are all familiar up and down the mall. The General Services Administration, and not the General Accounting Office, was employed to be the agent. In other words, they were the agent for the trustees in seeing that contracts were properly let and supervised and the money properly spent. I do not know how much more carefully one would expect the trustees to be because that would be the normal thing to do. If they had not done that and proceeded without the General Services Administration, they would be subject to criticism. They followed the procedure the Government follows in these large projects in this city and throughout the country in connection with post offices, and Federal buildings of all kinds.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I simply wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the argument he is making in behalf of the bill.

A few months ago, it was my pleasure to visit Ottawa, where I traveled as a delegate to the parliamentary conference between the United States and Canada. The first evening of our visit we were guests of the Canadian Parliamentarians at the new Center for Cultural Arts that has been constructed in the Canadian national capital. I must say that this is a perfectly beautiful center. It has

greatly enriched the life of the city even as the Kennedy Center would add a whole new dimension to the life of the Capital.

I think we would make a grave mistake if we were not to continue the work on the Kennedy Center which is now so well advanced. I know the Senator shares those feelings and I want to express my full support for the position he has taken this afternoon in speaking up for the pending bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

* * * * *

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I was fortunate enough to hear the words of the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Arkansas and rise to support them in their encouragement of the ongoing work of the John F. Kennedy Center.

I regret as much as anyone the mistakes which have been made in the estimates in regard to the figures and the overruns. Living somewhat in the same neighborhood of the jet airplane noise, I know that that will increase expenses, as well as the other unpredictable events which have occurred.

To a great extent, I am sure we all agree that it would be a most inefficient Government if errors of this kind were not checked. But in this particular case, where we are going ahead with unknown quantities, I would think that the best procedure would be to move ahead.

I recognize that the thought to have another study made has merit, but being one of those who, in the past, have supported such proposals, I have found that when one usually supports them, and when someone is against the basic project, and in this case being for the project, I find myself opposing the amendment.

It seems to me that a city such as Washington is in real need of a center of this kind for the performing arts, one not like a retired movie theater or the DAR hall, so that we should move ahead at this time and complete the center.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would the 60-day delay, while this study is being made by the GAO and its report, delay or cause any stoppage in construction, or, otherwise handicap completion of the building?

I think that every Senator wants to see the building completed. We are certainly committed to it. The Nation is also committed to it. The real question we will want answered is: Will this amendment cause any delay, in order to get a clearer picture of what the situation is, in construction of the building?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In my judgment, without question, it would delay construction. It would increase costs. It would make a difficult financial situation that much more difficult.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, could I comment on that same subject? I attended a meeting of the trustees, on Tuesday last. This question, of course, was brought up. I believe that I can say I am authorized to speak for them——

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the distinguished Senator one of the trustees?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then he can certainly report on this question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

The GSA, as I have already stated, has already seized, as they say, the project by agreement with the trustees. The last time I heard, they have been paid some $500,000 or $600,000 for their services in overseeing the project. They are thoroughly familiar with it.

Unless a Senator has no confidence in the GSA, I do not know why it would be advantageous to bring the GAO in. They are both reputable organizations. The GSA is the special agency charged with supervision of Government buildings. They are already in there. They have estimated, I think it is fair to say, that if we stop construction of the building, meaning cancellation of existing contracts which would have to be suspended for 90 days, we could not have the employees, that is the carpenters, and so forth, lying around for 90 days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I reinforce what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has just said? The chairman of the Board of Trustees for the Kennedy Center, Roger L. Stevens, says he has only enough money to continue construction into the early part of October. If additional funds do not become available, it will be necessary to stop construction, which will be very costly.

Construction costs are going up at the rate of 10 percent a year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I point out to the Senator from Florida one or two other aspects of this matter? I have in my hand a statement showing funds available for construction of the Kennedy Center as of September 15, 1969. It shows the total amount of private funds anticipated and available for construction to be $24 million-plus. Of that amount over $2,320,000 has been given by foreign governments. Furniture from Denmark, $155,000. Doors from Germany, $250,000. Marble from Italy, $1,132,000. Curtain from Japan, $140,000. Chandeliers from Norway, $180,000. Chandeliers from Ireland, $35,000. Chandeliers from Sweden, $120,000.

After all, $66 million is a large amount, but how much of that is a grant of Federal funds? $23 million. The appropriated funds are $23 million. It is not an unseemly sum for a country as large as this, when we consider there is absolutely nothing in this city that is usable for the purposes for which this Center is being constructed. It is the only country, as I have said, with a capital city that does not have some form of center for the performing arts. One of the most famous is in Moscow. They are also found in Paris and London and Italy.

[Excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 6, 1969]

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I was appointed to serve as a representative of the Senate on the Board of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts—upon the recommendation of my late colleague, Everett McKinley Dirksen—to succeed former Senator Leverett Saltonstall. I endorse the previous statement of the Senator from Arkansas. In view of the investment that has already been made, I do not feel we can abandon this cultural center. It represents too great a commitment by the Government, and by thousands of private donors to the arts, to the development of artistic talent in our Nation.

The Center represents a needed investment in the performing arts in this country. Let us not forget that this is a bipartisan enterprise, begun by President Eisenhower, developed under President Johnson, and hopefully to be completed during the administration of President Nixon.

President Nixon has, in fact, requested the $7.5 million in his fiscal 1970 budget recommendations to Congress. Mrs. Nixon serves with Mrs. Dwight Eisenhower and Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis as the honorary chairmen of the Center. All three ladies support the legislation we are considering today.

The effort to secure these additional funds, then, is a truly bipartisan one. The benefit they will have will accrue to everyone, regardless of political views. The Center will serve as a showcase of the performing arts, a place where talent from every State can be presented, where we can demonstrate to citizens and visitors from abroad the finest in American art and culture.

For these reasons, I strongly support H.R. 11249 to provide the necessary $7.5 million, and commend the House in its passage and the Senate Committee on Public Works for unanimously approving this expenditure. For these reasons also, I oppose the pending amendment to this bill.

* * * * *

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I must say at the outset that I am one of the newer members of the Trustees of the Kennedy Center, appointed only this year. I had, years ago, made a small contribution to that Center, never dreaming that I would ever be a member of the Board of Trustees. It was a very small contribution, though it was considerable to me at the time; and I welcomed this honor of serving on the Board, and have endeavored to familiarize myself with the problems facing the Center. I am in agreement with the intent and language of H.R. 11249.

It has been a matter of some embarrassment, Mr. President, for some years, in visiting other countries of the world, to have to acknowledge that I came from the only great nation I knew of that had no national center for the performing arts.

I think the American people owe it to themselves to build a center for the performing arts. It is long overdue. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas mentioned that beautiful opera house in Vienna. We saw this wonderful edifice at the Inter-Parliamentary Meeting in April of this year. It was restored, as the Senator stated, with American money after its partial destruction in World War II.

This great Nation can no longer afford to deny building a center for the performing arts, that is worthy of a great people.

The distinguished Senator from Montana, the majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD) read parts of an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star published yesterday, October 5. The editorial analyzes this controversy on both sides. I shall repeat only one sentence:

"The practical effect of that move"—

That is, to block the authorization pending an investigation by the General Accounting Office—

"would be to bring work on the center to a complete halt probably within the next few days and add materially to the total cost of completion."

* * * * *

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one last thing, the question of the Government's percentage of the cost of the building.

This is a Government building. It belongs to the Government. It is built on Government land. Normally, in most civilized countries which are interested in the fine arts, they build all their buildings and they pay all the cost—the great theaters in Paris or in Rome. I am sure that in Moscow they did not take up a public contribution to build the Bolshoi. It is a public building, belonging to the Government, just as this Capitol is. It is on Government land, and it belongs to the Government.

I think it is quite unusual for the private sector to contribute as much as they have. They all are taxpayers, in addition to making contributions. Rather than be criticized about it or have something funny raised about it or have it said that they should pay more, I think they should be congratulated.

Personally, I do not wish to apologize for anything about this building. Its history is well known. It should have been built years ago.

This is the only country in the world that devotes nearly all its funds to military affairs and almost nothing to fine arts or anything having to do with nonmilitary improvement of the quality of life. That is one of the reasons why there is such a revolt going on in this country among the young people—not because of this particular building, but because they sense that the direction of this great country is in the wrong direction; that we are becoming a country dominated

by the military, and with very little interest in what is generally called the humanities or the fine arts.

* * * * *

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at the outset, I wish to state emphatically that the Senator now speaking, although he disagrees with the amendment offered by his distinguished colleague from Maine, would in no wise impugn nor even imply that that amendment to the pending bill is offered other than in good conscience. I would not attempt to think in terms of the offering of an amendment by any Member of this body except that it be offered in good conscience and in the belief that the amendment offered would be justified. My opposition to the amendment will be stated simply upon what I believe to be a more favorable solution that can be effected.

On October 3, the Senate addressed itself to this subject matter, at which time several Members debated it. Since that time, it has been of considerable concern to me, and I have tried to assess the problem to provide a solution.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I have requested the Comptroller General to conduct a thorough study of the construction costs of the Kennedy Center and the anticipated costs of completion.

At this point in my remarks, I wish to read the letter I have sent to Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats:

"It is requested that the General Accounting Office make a study of the past costs and the estimated future costs of completing the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. This study should be submitted to the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, by December 3rd, 1969.

"In preparing your study, please answer those questions which were asked on the Floor of the Senate on October 3rd, 1969" (contained in the Congressional Record, volume 115, part 21, pages 28374–28384.)

Mr. President, I have signed the letter as chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

This request, which I have made in an effort to arrive at a solution would fulfill the basic substance of the amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine. I think it could be done in this way without imposing the burden of interrupting construction on this vital project, a project on which the Senate has committed itself.

I point out, Mr. President, that the General Services Administration has estimated that if the project construction program were interrupted it would add approximately $1 million per month—not per year but $1 million per month—to the already mounting costs of the construction of the Center. Since the Committee on Appropriations probably will not act on the additional funds authorized by H.R. 11249 until December of this year at the earliest, by which time the General Accounting Office will have completed the information and have complied with my request for this study, the commitment of these funds could be fully protected by the Committee on Appropriations in light of the General Accounting Office findings.

I think it is important during the interim that construction of the Kennedy Center go forward and that it proceed under the additional funds provided by the increased authority to borrow as authorized in H.R. 11249.

Mr. President, I, therefore, oppose the proposed amendment. I think that it is unnecessary. I think it would add significantly to the cost of completing the Kennedy Center; and it is my feeling that the effort that I am making in the way I have explained it may recommend itself to Members of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment for two principal reasons. First, it is clear that the adoption of the amendment would add to the cost. We are talking about increased costs already. It is clear that cancellation of contracts and subcontracts, and the renewal of them on the present market, would cost more money.

The second reason I oppose the cancellation, is that we have assurances of the commission that upon this basis, if it is voted, this is the last time they will ask the Federal Government for money.

I wish to read this sentence from the report:

However, the committee wants it clearly understood that the center must be completed within the proposed cost of $66.4 million and if, by any chance, this figure has been underestimated and the additional funds required must be raised by the Board of Trustees through private subscription.

Mr. President, in order that it may appear who is on the Board of Trustees I ask unanimous consent that the list of members of the Board be printed in the RECORD as it appears on page 8 of the committee hearings.

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

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Roger L. Stevens, Chairman.

Richard Adler, Floyd O. Akers, James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education, Robert O. Anderson, Ralph E. Becker, K. LeMoyne Billings, Edgar M. Bronfman, Mrs. George R. Brown, Robert W. Dowling, Ralph W. Ellison, Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abe Fortas, Rep. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen.

Senator J. William Fullbright, Mrs. George A. Garrett, Leonard H. Goldenson, Mrs. Rebeckah Harkness, George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director of the National Park Service, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Thomas H. Kuchel, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, Erich Leinsdorf Sol Myron Linowitz, Mrs. Michael J. Mansfield, Harry C. McPherson, Jr., George Meany, Robert I. Millonzi.

L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, Senator Charles H. Percy, S. Dillion Ripley II, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, John Richardson, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Richard Rogers, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Mrs. Jouett Shouse, Mrs. Stephen E. Smith.

William H. Thomas, Chairman of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, Representative Frank H. Thompson, Jr., Jack J. Valenti, William Walton, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, Walter E. Washington, Mayor-Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Lew R. Wasserman, Edwin L. Weisl, Sr., Representative James C. Wright, Jr., Senator Ralph W. Yarborough.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators will note some of the most wealthy and best known philanthropists in the Nation are contained within the Board.

I am told by the committee that the chairman of the Board is the one who has given the assurance that if this bill is passed they will assure the raising of additional funds, if any are required, to build this building.

I call attention to the fact also that on this board of trustees the names of 4 of our able senatorial colleagues appear, in addition to the former Senator from California, Mr. Kuchel, who recently retired from this body. In addition, the names of several Members of the House of Representatives appear. I call attention to the fact that Mrs. Mansfield, the wife of our distinguished majority leader is also a member of the board.

I cannot believe that the chairman of such a Board would give an assurance of that kind to this committee unless he knew that we could depend upon it.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to repeat what I said the other day. We must recognize what we have done before. This has been an action of the Senate, this has been an action of the Congress. This building was named for our former colleague, a former President of the United States. If we should fail to go through with this matter and forget the fact that eight or nine other nations have given substantial gifts for this center, I think we would be doing something to cause our Government and ourselves to be held up to ridicule. Certainly, as far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he feels it would reflect hurtfully on the pride of this Nation and the Senate.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 7, 1969]

CONGRESS OKs "URGENT" JFK CENTER FUNDS

(By William Grigg)

An "urgent" authorization of $12.5 million in additional construction funds for the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center for the Performing Arts cleared Congress last night on a Senate vote of 62–3.

Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, R-Maine, attempted to amend the authorization so that the funds could not be appropriated until the General Accounting Office made a 60-day study of the "overrun" on construction—an amendment deliberately patterned after those that liberal Democrats sought to add to the military authorization bill.

She argued that while the GAO was not equipped to make military judgments, it indeed was equipped to study the construction of the center here, which is now estimated to require $20 million more than the 1966 estimate of $46.4 million. But Mrs. Smith won only 19 votes for her amendment.

Arguing successfully against the amendment were Sens. J. W. Fulbright, D-Ark., and Charles H. Percy, R-Ill., both trustees of the center. They said the money was so urgently needed that if it did not become available quickly, contracts would be broken and construction interrupted. They said this would cost $2 million.

After her first amendment failed, Mrs. Smith tried another that would have held up only part of the funds, but this, too, failed.

However, there still will be a GAO study, though it will not require the holding up of any funds.

In arguing against Mrs. Smith's amendment Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., chairman of the Public Works Committee, announced he had just asked for a study by the GAO himself. He said it would be completed by Dec. 3.

The results thus may be available before Congress actually appropriates the $7.5 million additional federal grant authorized by last night's bill. The balance of the $12.5 million will become available from the Treasury as soon as President Nixon signs the authorization bill.

The bill brings the total in federal grants authorized to $23 million and the borrowing authorization to $20.4 million. Other funds are being raised privately for the center's construction.

Sen. Harry F. Byrd, D-Va., and Sen. Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz., supported Mrs. Smith's amendments but did not vote against the final bill.

The three voting against the entire bill were Sens. James B. Allen, D-Ala.; Henry Bellmon, R-Okla., and John J. Williams, R-Del.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., stayed off the Senate floor during the debate but appeared in time to vote against the Smith amendments and for the final bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, work on the Center continued at a steady pace, and on May 27 of this year the doors were opened for a preview benefit. I am pleased to be able to report that this preview resulted in raising $240,000 for the

Center's Education Fund, a major portion of which will be used to provide discount tickets for low-income groups. As I have frequently emphasized, I believe it is of the utmost importance that we provide a wide variety of cultural presentations at the Center and make them available to as many Americans as possible. The Education Fund, which will make tickets available at reduced rates to students, the elderly, military personnel, and others, will help achieve this goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by Richard L. Coe in the Washington Post of May 23, reviewing the history of the Kennedy Center concerning the results of the benefit included in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 23, 1971]

THE LEAN YEARS

(By Richard L. Coe)

On Thursday evening, Washington gets a preview of a dream's realization, the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The dream began 24 years ago and the reality will come alive with the first performances in September.

Picture Washington in the winter of 1947. It had no stage for opera or ballet performance. The Actors Equity and the Dramatists Guild had declared that their members would not appear after Aug. 1, 1948, in the city's sole legitimate theater, the National, because of the theater's policy of racial discrimination. Lisner Auditorium's awkward stage, when available between large George Washington University classes, could not fly scenery and had no dressing rooms.

Dancers of the Sadlers Wells, including Margot Fonteyn and Moira Shearer, had taken spills on Constitution Hall's inadequate stage. President Truman, who headed the audience, apologized to the British dancers.

Arena Stage didn't exist, nor did the Washington Theater Club. Ford's Theater was a warehouse. The Shubert Theater, now a parking lot, was then the Gayety Burlesque. The Washington Auditorium, an earlier dream that failed, served as a government office. The Capitol Theater's stage would occasionally attempt serving large companies, but it was gone with the '40's.

That was when someone began calling Washington "The Capital of the Western World." Millions of Americans had done a lot of wartime travel and many realized their capital's failings. It had no opera house, a makeshift concert hall and no theatrical future.

It did have concerned citizens. Four of them, through this newspaper, called a citizens' meeting to discuss their city's performing arts future in the auditorium of the Smithsonian's Museum of Natural History. The late Melvin D. Hildreth, impressario Patrick Hayes, Catholic University's Father Gilbert V. Hartke and this reporter called themselves a committee to get the talk going.

That was the beginning of an idea and a dream. Now, 24 years later, the nearly completed, $68-million Kennedy Center will have its first official showing on Thursday evening.

It is a vast marble structure, 630 feet long, 300 feet wide, and 100 feet high—nearly the size of four football fields placed side by side. Under one roof, it encompasses an opera house, concert hall, theater for drama, and a film theater.

It took 12 years of negotiating with appropriate committees on both sides of Capitol Hill just to get the land. That was a compromise, for what was first sought was a plot along the Mall. Downtown locations were asked for and refused.

Finally, under legislation introduced by Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) and Rep. Frank Thompson, Jr. (D-N.J.) setting forth the Potomac River site, Republican President Eisenhower signed the bill. That is why one of the four auditoriums will be called the Eisenhower Theater.

It wasn't until September, 1962, that Mrs. John F. Kennedy unveiled the model of Edward Durell Stone's building. President Kennedy pressured businessmen for donations. After President Kennedy's assassination, in November, 1963, President Johnson persuaded Congress to create the building his predecessor had wanted as a Kennedy memorial.

President Johnson broke the ground on a chilly December morning in 1964, the Kennedy family in attendance. President Nixon was an active, letter-writing supporter of the idea during his vice presidency.

With the construction now nearly completed, it is a time both to consider the Center's perspective and to imagine what the future of the capital city would be without this building.

GALA PREVIEW BENEFIT AT KENNEDY CENTER NETS $240,000

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Nearly a quarter of a million dollars was raised by the Gala Preview which took place at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts on May 27, it was announced today by William McC. Blair, Jr., the Center's General Director. The net profit from the Gala Preview, attended by more than 3,700 ticket-buyers, is $240,000, Blair stated.

The money raised will go into the Center's Education Fund, a substantial portion of which will be used to provide discount tickets for low income groups.

Mr. Blair, in making the announcement, paid special tribute to the work of the Preview's co-chairmen, Mrs. Eugene Carusi and Mrs. Elwood R. Quesada. "Their accomplishment," said Blair, "will prove significant to many who otherwise might find it difficult to attend performances at the Center."

The Education Fund, administered by its director, Norman Fagan, is to be used in part to buy tickets at full box office prices and resell the tickets to students, the elderly, military personnel and others with low or fixed incomes. The Fund, provided by the proceeds from the Gala Preview and from the 40 to 50 Founding Artists concerts to be presented during the Center's inaugural year, will absorb the losses in re-pricing the tickets.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, although some critics have thought the cost of the Kennedy Center to be excessive, I would like to point out that the total cost of the Center—about $70 million according to the latest figures—is less than 1 day of what the war in Vietnam cost us in 1968 and 1969—budgeted and incremental costs. Approximately $23 million of the cost of the Center is in direct Government grants, $20 million in loans, while more than $27 million in private gifts and donations have been pledged to the Center. It is also interesting to compare the cost of the Kennedy Center to that of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York, which is estimated to be $160 million. I think the Kennedy Center offers comparable facilities, and it was built during a period of rapidly increasing costs throughout our economy.

Mr. President, although I have tried to cover all the major steps in the history of the Kennedy Center, particularly from the legislative standpoint, I do not pretend that this is an exhaustive history. I have not said much, for example, about the dedicated efforts of the officers of the Kennedy Center who have provided outstanding leadership. I refer particularly to Roger L. Stevens, chairman; Robert O. Anderson, Harry C. McPherson, Jr., and Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, vice chairmen; K. LeMoyne Billings, secretary; Philip J. Mullin, administrator and assistant secretary; William McC. Blair, Jr., general director; Ralph E. Becker, general counsel: Robert C. Baker, treasurer; Daniel W. Bell, treasurer-emeritus; Julius Rudel, music director; George London, artistic administrator.

We should also recognize the fine work of the "Friends of the Kennedy Center," a dedicated and energetic group of people.

In the 13 years since the enactment of the legislation providing for a National Cultural Center many individuals and groups have made important contributions. To everyone who has played a part, the opening of the Kennedy Center on September 8 will be an event that has been long awaited. The outstanding array of cultural events which have been scheduled for the first 2 weeks will provide a fitting beginning for the Center, and I am confident that in the months and years ahead we will have reason to be proud of this National Center for the Arts.

In closing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post, of June 20, listing the opening attractions at the Kennedy Center.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1971]

JFK CENTER INAUGURAL: 2-WEEK FESTIVAL OF MUSIC, DANCE

(By Alan M. Kriegsman)

The much-discussed opening attractions at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts this fall has coalesced into a two-week festival of music and dance. The festival will offer a star-studded sampling of the artistry and entertainment slated to become the year-round, steady fare at the center.

The events will include presentations by two opera companies, two symphony orchestras, two ballet companies, and a range of individual concert and pop artists.

The red-letter day is Wednesday, September 8, 1971. That evening, a major new composition by Leonard Bernstein will launch both the center as a whole and the 2,300-seat Opera House, the first of two principal center auditoriums to be opened this fall.

Bernstein has informed Kennedy Center officials that the new work is to be called "Mass." The notable composer-conductor recently described it as "a theater piece for players, singers and dancers."

The National Symphony will inaugurate the 2,700-seat Concert Hall on Thursday, Sept. 9, in a concert to be conducted by Antal Dorati. The program will include the late Igor Stravinsky's "The Rite of Spring," and works by Beethoven, Mozart and William Schuman.

Among other festival presentations to take place in the Opera House will be a perform-

ance of Alvin Ailey's ballet, "The River," choreographed to the music of Duke Ellington and performed by the American Ballet Theatre, the center's "resident" ballet troupe.

The Opera Society of Washington will stage the world premier of Alberto Ginastera's "Beatrix Cenci." The Kennedy Center itself will present Handel's rarely performed opera, "Ariodante," with Julius Rudel conducting and Beverly Sills, Totiana Troianos and Veronica Tyler in lead roles.

The Concert Hall will be the site of the first events in a series of Founding Artists Concerts during the initial festival weeks. The performers will donate their services for a benefit fund to provide a substantial bloc of discount tickets for low income groups, admitting the holders to all events at Kennedy Center.

The Stern-Rose-Istomin Trio, comprised of violinist Isaac Stern, cellist Leonard Rose and pianist Eugene Istomin, will be the first presentation in the Founding Artist series, in a concert on Sept. 11. On Sept. 13, The Fifth Dimension will become the first pop group to appear in the series. Among other Founding Artists will be country singer Merle Haggard, Metropolitan Opera tenor Nicolai Gedda, pianist Gina Bachauer, singer-composer Peggy Lee, and Broadway and television star Leslie Uggams.

The New York Philharmonic will be the first of many visiting orchestras to be heard in the Concert Hall during the inaugural season. On Sept. 19, Pierre Boulez will lead the Philharmonic in a program featuring pianist Andre Watts as guest artist.

An unusual event of the festival will take place in the Concert Hall on Sept. 12, when a matinee performance of "The Dawn of Glory," a concert of Moravian music, will feature the Piedmont Chamber Orchestra and the Westminster Choir.

The complete festival schedule is as follows:

Opera House: Bernstein's "Mass," Sept. 8 and 9; Ginastera's "Beatrix Cenci," Stept. 10; American Ballet Theatre's "The River, Sept. 11; "Beatrix Cenci," Sept. 12 (mat.) and 13; Handel's "Ariodante," Sept. 14; American Ballet Theatre, Sept. 15; "Ariodante," Sept. 16; Bernstein's "Mass," Sept. 17, 18 (mat. and eve.) and 19 (mat. and eve.); American Ballet Theatre, Sept. 21.

Concert Hall: National Symphony Orchestra, Sept. 9 and 10; Stern-Rose-Istomin Trio, Sept. 11; Moravian's "Dawn of Glory," Sept. 12 (mat.); The Fifth Dimension, Sept. 13; Merle Haggard, Sept. 14; Nicolai Gedda, Sept. 15; Gina Bachauer, Sept. 17; Peggy Lee, Sept. 18; New York Philharmonic, Sept. 19 (mat.).

GOLD PROHIBITED AMERICANS BUT NOT FOREIGNERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the absurdity of American fiscal policy is never more evident than in the domestic restriction on free trade in gold. American citizens are prohibited from owning gold, yet our Government is presently allowing the depletion of our gold reserves by paying in gold to foreigners on demand—gold that is presently valued at $35 per ounce for payment, yet, if one would believe the price of gold on a free market similar to the one conducted for 3 days last week by West Coast Commodity Exchange, Inc., this same gold has an approximate value of $58.50 per ounce on a free market.

What this means, then, is that our Government is allowing foreigners to deplete our gold reserve and still make a profit of about $23.50 per ounce in gold.

This situation is entirely unrealistic. American gold reserves are actually worth more money on the open market than in support of our currency.

Such activities as those recently conducted by the West Coast Commodity Exchange, Inc., actually trading in gold futures for 3 days last week before being stopped when the Treasury amended regulations must be allowed to continue. To prohibit them is discriminatory—a violation of civil rights.

I insert the following related news clippings, my bill to prohibit payment in gold to foreigners, the Treasury release and amendments by which they stopped the West Coast Commodity Exchange, Inc., from trading in gold futures, and the response of the West Coast Commodity Exchange in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1971]

FOREIGN RESERVES DROP $307 MILLION AS GOLD STOCK DIPS

(By James L. Rowe Jr.)

The nation's foreign reserve holdings continued to deteriorate in June, tumbling $307 million to their lowest level since August 1938, the Treasury reported yesterday.

The total reserve assets—which included the gold stock, convertible foreign currencies, and the nation's position in the International Monetary Fund—stood at $13.504 billion on June 30, down from a revised $13.811 billion at the end of May.

The nation's gold stock, by far the largest component of the asset position, dipped $61 million last month to $10.507 billion.

Most of the nation's asset decline was attributable to a $250 million transaction with the International Monetary Fund which reduced the country's automatic drawing rights from that agency to $1.4 billion.

In an effort to absorb some of the excess dollars which flooded European markets during the currency crisis earlier this year, the U.S. withdrew $100 million in Dutch Guilders and $150 million in Belgian Francs last month to buy back dollars from those central banks. Belgium had used $80 million of the excess dollars it picked up to buy gold from the U.S. stock in May.

The asset holdings, which hovered about the $20 billion mark in 1960, has declined by about $1.2 billion since the beginning of the year—reflecting partially the deteriorating U.S. balance of payments position. The nation ran a balance of payments deficit of $5.5 billion in the first quarter, a record, and analysis predict a second quarter deficit of between $6.5 billion and $7 billion.

Due to U.S. payments deficits over the decade and before, foreign central banks currently hold gold claims on the United States about three times the size of the nation's gold stock. Internationally, the U.S. dollar is backed by gold (currently valued at $35 an ounce), while the dollar is the major international reserve currency. The nation stands ready to exchange dollars for gold to foreign central banks at the $35 an ounce rate.

In August 1938, the nation's reserve position was $13.136 billion—mainly gold in the days before the advent of convertible currencies.

Last month the nation's holdings of convertible foreign currencies rose slightly by $4 million, while its supply of special drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund stood constant at $1.2 billion. Special drawing rights, often called paper gold, function as an international reserve unit, much the same as the dollar gold does.

H.R. 352

A bill to prohibit the redemption in gold of any obligations of the United States for, and to prohibit the sale of any gold of the United States to, any nation which is indebted to the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States may redeem in gold any obligation of the United States for any foreign government which is indebted to the United States, except where the obligation of the United States is limited to that of a bailee.

SEC. 2. No gold may be sold by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to any foreign government which is indebted to the United States.

JULY 22, 1971.

The Treasury Department today issued the following statement:

The Treasury Department today amended its gold regulations, effective immediately, to reaffirm and clarify the long-standing gold policy of the United States that speculation in gold in any form is prohibited.

These amendments explicitly prohibit the trading of gold in any form on commodity exchanges and the acquisition of American or foreign gold coins of any description for speculative purposes.

The amended regulations were issued under the authority contained in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, Executive Order Nos. 6260, 10896 and 11037, and the Trading with the Enemy Act. Under existing law, violations of these regulations may result in civil and criminal penalties.

These amendments will not limit in any way the types of transactions currently engaged in by coin collectors or licensees under present authority.

The purchase of contracts in gold futures or the enticing of others to do so constitutes a violation of the gold regulations. In accordance with normal practice, violations of the gold regulations are referred to the Department of Justice for appropriate action.

A copy of the amendments is attached.

TITLE 31—MONEY AND FINANCE: TREASURY

CHAPTER I—MONETARY OFFICES, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY—PART 54—GOLD REGULATIONS

Clarifying amendments

Under the Treasury Department's Gold Regulations, there is a general prohibition on holding or dealing in gold without a license. An exception to this prohibition is made for gold coins of recognized special value to collectors of rare and unusual coins. Such coins, if minted before 1934, may be acquired because of this recognized special value to collectors of rare and unusual coin, but not for the purpose of acquiring the gold bullion contained therein. *Farber* v. *United States*, 114 F.2d 5 (9th Cir. 1940). Thus collectors of rare and unusual gold coins and coin dealers are enabled to buy and sell these gold coins for numismatic purposes without obtaining individual licenses for specific transactions. This exception was not intended to permit nor does it permit the acquisition of gold coins for speculative rather than numismatic purposes.

In order to state explicitly the intent of the Regulation, amendments are being made under which: (1) the acquisition, holding, importation and transportation of gold coin is limited to transactions for numismatic

purposes; and (2) the trading of gold in any form on any commodity exchange within the United States is prohibited. In addition the overall intent of the Gold Regulations is made explicit by providing that trading in gold for speculative purposes is prohibited.

These amendments will not limit in any way the types of transactions currently engaged in by coin collectors or licensees under present authority.

Notice and public procedure are not required because there is involved a foreign affairs function of the United States in that these amendments are important to the proper functioning of the international monetary system. Moreover, because there are involved interpretative rules rather than substantive changes, and because of the relationship of speculative trading by Americans in gold to the proper functioning of the international monetary system, it is found that notice and public procedure are impracticable, unnecessary and contrary to the public interest. AUTHORITY: Sec. 5(b), 40 Stat. 415, as amended; secs. 3, 8, 9, 11, 48 Stat. 340, 341, 342; 12 U.S.C. 95a, 31 U.S.C. 442, 733, 734, 22b; E.O. 6260, Aug. 28, 1933, as amended by E.O. 10896, E.O. 10905, E.O. 11037, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp.; and E.O. 6359, Oct. 25, 1933; E.O. 9193, as amended, 3 CFR, 1938–1943 Comp.; E.O. 10289, 3 CFR, 1949–1953 Comp.

Subpart B of Part 54 of Title 31 of the Code of Federal Regulations is hereby amended as follows:

SEC. 54.12 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Nothing contained in the regulations in this part nor in licenses issued thereunder authorizes the acquisition, sale, holding, importation or exportation of any present or future interest, direct or indirect, in gold in any form for speculative purposes, and such actions are prohibited."

Existing SEC. 54.15 is redesignated as subsection (a) of Sec. 54.13.

Existing subsections (a) and (b) of Sec. 54.13 are redesignated as subsections (b) and (c) or Sec. 54.13, respectively.

A new Sec. 54.15 is added to Subpart B to read as follows:

"SEC. 54.15. Trading in gold on exchanges.

No interest, direct or indirect, legal or equitable, in gold in any form, for present or for future delivery, shall be acquired under a contract made on or subject to the rules of any exchange within the United States. The term "exchange" means any organization, association, or group of persons, whether incorporated or unincorporated, which constitutes, maintains or provides a market place or facilities for bringing together purchasers and sellers of gold in any form and performs with respect to gold in any form the functions commonly performed by a commodity exchange as that term is generally understood."

SECTION 54.20 (a) and (d) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Gold coin of recognized special value to collectors of rare and unusual coin may be acquired, held and transported within the United States for numismatic purposes without the necessity of holding a license therefor. Such coin may not be acquired for the purpose of acquiring the gold bullion contained therein. Such coin may be imported only as permitted by this section or sections 54.28 to 54.30, 54.34 or licenses issued thereunder, and may be exported only in accordance with the provisions of sec. 54.25.

(d) Gold coin made prior to 1934 may be imported for numismatic purposes without the necessity of obtaining a license therefor."

Effective date. These amendments shall become effective on filing with the Federal Register.

Dated: July 22, 1971.

PAUL A. VOLCKER,
Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs,
Treasury Department.

WEST COAST COMMODITY EXCHANGE, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, July 24.—The West Coast Commodity Exchange today mailed the attached letter to Secretary Connally regarding the Treasury's actions in connection with the WCCE gold coin futures contracts.

The following is a digest of its salient points:

During the past two weeks, the Treasury has conducted a press release campaign of intimidation against our Exchange which is contrary to the dignity of your Department and the policy of this Administration against jawboning.

The issue involved in the WCCE gold coin futures contract is clear cut. We relied on Sec. 54.2 of the Gold Reserve Act regulations which states, "Gold coins having a special value to collectors, *including all gold coins made prior to April 5, 1933 . . . have been exempted from such delivery requirement"* (of gold bullion).

By exempting all such gold coins, the Act has enabled U. S. citizens to buy, sell and own unlimited quantities of gold coins in wholesale quantities, contained in sealed canvas bags, since 1934 with the full knowledge and consent of the Treasury.

Five private British banking firms, formed in the 17th and 18th century and three Swiss banks meet daily in private offices to "fix" (their terminology) the prices of gold and wholesale gold coins.

The West Coast Commodity Exchange created the first world marketplace in which such prices could be established through competitive bidding in an open forum. This procedure follows the American tradition of free enterprise and enables all segments of U.S. business and finance as well as U.S. and international public traders to participate in the stabilization of such prices.

We believe that our gold futures market during three days of such open trading clearly proved the validity of our decision to provide an open market for the orderly stabilization of such prices.

In our opinion, it would also contribute to a reduction in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, the gold reserve crisis and strengthening of the dollar.

Rather than countering the Treasury barrage of press releases, we filed suit on July 16 in U.S. District Court in Los Angeles, requesting a Declaratory Judgment and Injunction against the Treasury Department. This suit will enable the Treasury and the Exchange to present evidence and documentation in an orderly manner and thereby obtain an objective interpretation of the Act, specifically with respect to Sec. 54.2 by the judicial branch of the federal government. The Treasury has not as yet filed an answer to this suit.

At 2:35 p.m., Pacific time, on July 22, we read another Treasury press release stating that the Treasury had "amended its gold regulations, effective immediately, to explicitly prohibit gold trading in any form on commodity exchanges." Based on this informal information, the Exchange nonetheless temporarily suspended trading as of the close of the market on July 22.

On July 23, we were officially handed another press release, dated July 22, by a Treasury agent, attaching a copy of "clarifying amendments" to the regulations. These clarifying amendments assiduously avoid any reference to Sec. 54.2 which contains the specific exemption on which our futures contract is based. The four pages of clarifying amendments, in our judgment, are not responsive to the matter at issue.

Indicative of the irrelevancy and unrealistic effect of these amendments is one which "prohibits the acquisition of American or foreign gold coins for speculative purposes." Any coin collector, coin dealer, bank or numismatic authority will confirm that "acquisition of American or foreign gold coins" is for speculative purposes. No Treasury regulation will change this basic fact of life.

The amendment prohibiting the acquisition of gold coins to obtain the gold bullion content is equally unrealistic. No person could afford to pay the sizeable premium on gold coins and sustain the monetary loss involved in melting them into gold bullion.

The repeated references in the clarifying amendments to gold bullion are also irrelevant since our futures contract specifications clearly state that "Pending Repeal or Amendment of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, no gold bullion can be traded and that all deliveries on futures contracts shall be made in pre-1934 gold coins approved by the Exchange.

Such irrelevancies and inconsistencies in the "clarifying amendments" promulgated on a unilateral basis by the Treasury, in our judgment, only serve to emphasize the need for a judicial determination of the issues by an independent federal court on a matter of vital concern to the Treasury, the Exchange and to all U.S. citizens.

The Exchange letter expressed shock, surprise and regret at the apparent reluctance of the Treasury to obtain a definitive decision by a qualified legal process.

The Exchange also informed the Treasury that the WCCE Board of Governors would convene next week to consider such further legal action as may be appropriate.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 28, 1971]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—BRINGING GOLD OUT OF DARKNESS

(By Sylvia Porter)

It seems possible that one day you'll be able to buy and sell futures contracts for pre-1934 gold coins just as you buy and sell commodity futures contracts for pork bellies (uncured bacon) or frozen orange juice concentrate or platinum or soybeans on any of the 12 commodities exchanges.

Gold—once the sole and for centuries the greatest of all monies—is to be treated as just another commodity.

Gold—once the monetary base for all paper currencies and the only yardstick against which the values of paper currencies were measured—is to have its value determined not in secret by powerful governments or central bankers but by amateurs and or professionals bidding openly in an open marketplace against each other.

Gold is to come out of the twilight of money and into the cold world of commodities.

Let's say you shrug off all warnings, the futures markets are open, the Treasury ends its opposition and you are eager to try your luck. What would you do?

You would buy and sell gold coin contracts as you would any other commodities contracts: through your commodities trader at the brokerage firm with which you have a commodities trading account or through a broker directly on the commodities exchange floor with whom you establish a relationship.

You would need to put down a deposit margin of about $750 for each $10,000 contract—a slim margin which would give you enormous leeway to win or lose on your commitment.

Your brokerage commission would be only $25–$35 for a complete round turn—buy and sell—transaction.

You could hold your futures contract for up to 17 months or sell it any time in the interim—or actually take delivery of bags of gold coins.

Gold is an emotional subject and gold trading, says David Callahan, president of the West Coast Commodity Exchange, will be

often dominated not by logic but by emotions. As an illustration, Callahan cites November 1970, when the Treasury finally emptied its stockpile of silver and when the well-known fact that the demand for silver in the U.S. far exceeded the supply inspired a widespread belief that the price of silver would head for $2.50 an ounce. "Instead, it promptly sank from $1.70 to $1.61," Callahan remembers. "Only emotional response can explain it."

Trading in gold also will be marked by many more pitfalls that trading in other commodities—even though gold is neither a seasonal nor a perishable product and gold mined at the time of the pharaohs has the same characteristics as the current product of South Africa. As a world commodity, its price in the open market will be crucially affected by currency revaluations, political upheavals, changes in the stockpile policies of Russia and South Africa, moves by hoarders in France, India and other lands where thouhands of tons of gold are buried in "backyard vaults."

"What's more, if you go into the gold futures market, you will immediately come up against professionals who know on an hour-to-hour basis what is happening to gold prices in markets from Zurich to Singapore, who are deeply familiar with all the forces which could possibly influence gold prices and who can outmaneuver you any time.

In fact, says Franz Pick, the gold and currency market expert, the pros usually stand by early in the day when the little guy is settling his trades and the market is moving without meaning. They wait for a trend after that and then they ride it—either way.

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1971]

GOLD PRICE RISES TO A 2-YEAR HIGH—DEMAND IN EUROPE MARKETS GROWS AFTER UNITED STATES SAYS ITS STOCK IS BELOW $10-BILLION

(By Clyde H. Farnsworth)

PARIS.—Fresh worries about the dollar intensified market activity in gold today, lifting the price to about $42 an ounce, the highest level in two years.

Demand for the metal strengthened in London, Paris and Zurich, Switzerland, as European newspapers and financial services reported that American gold stocks had fallen below $10-billion for the first time.

The United States Treasury announced yesterday that gold stocks during June dropped by $61-million to $10,507,000,000. But this includes priority claims of $548-million against American gold by the International Monetary Fund. Taking these into account, the net gold holdings were $9,979,-000,000.

Additionally, the West German central bank holds what it maintains is a prior claim on the gold stocks of $500-million—a result of a gold sale to the United States by the Bundesbank when it was short of dollars after the 1969 upward revaluation of the mark.

LONG-HELD TENET

It has been a long-held tenet of some bankers and finance officials in Europe that the United States for strategic reasons would never permit its bullion reserves to dip below $10-billion.

In spite of privately voiced denials by American authorities that any such rigid policy thinking exists, there are growing expectations in Europe that Washington may declare a gold embargo.

Some Europeans reason that this could lead to a series of events culminating in an upward revaluation in the official gold price, which has been held at $35 an ounce for nearly three decades. In private conversations many central bankers in Europe express the belief that an upward revaluation of gold is now needed to engineer a devaluation of the dollar.

One theory is that if the United States does not act, the Europeans will by revaluing upward the value of gold against their own currencies and floating their currencies against the dollar. This, it is argued could force Washington's hand.

QUESTION OF UNITY

The big question is whether sufficient unity exists among European nations to act in concert on a major monetary issue.

A gold embargo would mean the dollar would no longer be convertible into gold in transactions with foreign countries. Dollar convertibility has been one of the underpinnings of the postwar monetary systems.

Large dollar outflows, which are continuing according to a recent study by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York, have raised the issue of the dollar's health.

This comment by a European central banker is typical of the feelings here: "The dollar is overvalued in terms of what the United States is trying to do in the world."

The dollars held by foreign governments are about three times higher than American gold reserves. While the United States has managed through some political arm twisting to stop conversions by large dollar holders such as West Germany, Japan and Canada, it has not been so successful with the smaller countries such as Switzerland, the Netherlands and Belgium.

SWISS CONVERSION

Switzerland, for instance, has just converted an additional $50-million. Much of the recent decline in gold stocks has been a result of nibbling by the smaller countries.

France, which has built up its dollar balances by an estimated $1.2-billion since last April, represents another potential threat to the gold hoard. Earlier this year the French used more than $200-million of American gold to repay a debt to the International Monetary Fund.

In today's markets the gold price rose to $42.02 in Paris. After touching $47.97½ in London it fell back to $41.90 by the close. Prices in Zurich were comparable to London.

The London price was the highest since July, 1969. The Paris price was unmatched since October, 1969.

YOUNG GRADUATE SETS PROGRESSIVE GOALS FOR CLASSMATES

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, one subject that has come up repeatedly in this House is the nature and direction of today's youth. Our young people have been portrayed in many different lights. This is an understandable reflection of our concern for their well-being, for in a very real sense, they are the future of our country.

I thought my colleagues would appreciate hearing first hand the goals of young people as articulated by a young man who is just leaving high school, and who had the honor of speaking at commencement exercises at Rockland Country Day School. I am inserting these remarks in the RECORD.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS GIVEN BY LEONARD KURTZ, ROCKLAND COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL, JUNE 4, 1971

Mr. Hingle, Mr. Downs, Mr. Keil, faculty, parents, guests . . . and my friends of the Rockland Country Day School . . .

In a thousand towns . . . at tens of thouands of schools . . . on a score of days like this . . . young men and women are rising and facing each other and their parents over grandstands and speaker's platforms . . .

They look at each other and try to say something full of hope . . . they make promises . . . they are leaving childhood . . . never to return.

I've decided not to talk to teachers today . . . nor to make promises to parents and guests. I just want to talk to my friends . . . to the people who will be part of what the future will be. The only promises we make today are those we make to each other . . .

Some people say we are an apathetic bunch. If you wanted to describe our attitudes in television terms . . . you might say that we are just looking at test patterns . . .

We have not landed on the moon . . . but we have left the green earth . . . we are just circling in orbit . . . waiting . . .

And while we wait . . . the oxygen is running out.

A lot of people tell us we have to face reality . . . and we say . . . What is reality?

O.K. . . . Here is some reality . . .

Some of us have a lot of miles to go . . . some don't. Some of us are going to see the century turn . . . some are not going to see the end of their twenties . . . Some will achieve . . . some will fail . . . some of us are going to go through life casually with no strain . . . others are going to be up against it, Hard! . . . Some will have children and see another June day like this . . . Others are going to be blown away in Vietnam, or Laos, or some other footnote in a dusty history book.

How many of us end up in each of these categories depends on how well we watch out for each other. A lot of people I know have the idea that they are going to be able to hack it on their own . . . that they can tune out, stay cool . . . that they can keep a low profile and squeak through . . . unnoticed.

No way! . . . The world is too complex for that. There is always someone or something coming up behind you . . . in a blind spot . . . for every one of us who tunes out, there are two or three of the *other* guy tuning in . . .

What does taking care of each other mean?

It means caring . . . keeping your head straight . . . and deciding that *no-one* is going to slip *anything* through on us.

It means that if reality is unreal—we change it. If our time is an absurdity—we rearrange it. It means that we look to *each other* to do something about our world . . . about war and peace . . . about hunger and housing . . . about environmental decay . . . and we *do not* cop-out by blaming it all on our parents and their institutions.

We do not write-off the whole mess as something they dumped on us . . . something we should walk away from. For when we walk away we no longer can become the solution . . . we become the cause.

We can not blame the establishment any more . . . because, as of today . . . like it or not . . . we are becoming the establishment.

What is caring about each other?

It is not rushing to the barricades . . . it is something less dramatic than that . . .

Caring is learning—It can be teaching.

Caring can be raising some good kids—It can be simply loving.

Caring can be saying "No". . . Loudly!

And it can be asking "Why?". . . often.

Caring for each other can mean—running an honest business.

It can be driving a taxicab well . . .

Caring can be simple . . . like listening and understanding.

And it can be something complicated . . . like voting.

Taking care of each other means that . . . when June 4, 1996 comes around . . . there are going to be a lot of us sitting here watching our kids graduate—and if we do the job right—we are going to feel good being there. Thank you.

MINERAL KINGDOM

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, recently Art Seidenbaum, the noted Los Angeles Times columnist, traveled to the Mineral King area of California. Following that trip, he wrote the article printed below.

I agree with Mr. Seidenbaum when he deplores the fact that in order to give new profits to Walt Disney Productions, one of our most beautiful and unspoiled national parks will be defiled.

The issue at Mineral King is not that of denying the need for additional recreational facilities; instead, the significant point is that of the type and degree of any development.

I am not convinced that a glossy, plastic, rustic Disneyland will benefit anyone but the stockholders of Disney Productions. As Art Seidenbaum writes, the rock on the way in to Mineral King should read "Government go home" because it is our action here in Washington which will allow Disney to go ahead with its plans.

Earlier this year I introduced H.R. 6596 which would enlarge Sequoia National Park to include the Sequoia National Game Refuge and thus put Mineral King under stricter developmental regulations. Only through such legislation will the beauty and value of Mineral King be preserved.

I now place Art Seidenbaum's column from the Wednesday, July 21, 1971, Los Angeles Times into the RECORD:

MINERAL KINGDOM

I drove to Mineral King the other day to see what the giants have been fighting about for the last six years.

Mineral King is where Walt Disney Productions wants to build a $35 million ski resort, a Magic Mineral Kingdom, if you will. Is where the U.S. Forest Service first solicited bids for a $3 million development in 1965. Is where the Sierra Club says "stop" in the name of the land.

Mineral King is already the site of suit and countersuit between the Sierra Club and the federal government. Sierra won an injunction against construction two years ago in district court. U.S. attorneys won a second round in appeals court, challenging Sierra's right to sue.

Sierra appealed in turn and now the argument has carried all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States for probable decision next year. Meanwhile no earth has moved. A small subalpine village becomes a national test case for resort recreation vs. remote refuge.

JUST AN APPROACH

The only approach to Mineral King is through Three Rivers, a charming two-motel town east of Visalia where another mammoth, Boise Cascade, wants to build a 12,000-acre resort community. One motel already advertises the territory as near "the future home of Walt Disney's alpine village."

The town is abloom with for sale signs.

The road to Mineral King twists into Sequoia National Forest and, begins a 25-mile scenic ribbon of switchbacks, panoramas, heroic trees. The bridge over the Kaweah River looks down on coral-colored rocks, so water-smoothed they seem like flesh.

The narrow pavement turns to dirt after several miles, entering Sequoia National Park. The distinction, between national forest and national park, is important.

No national park could have a mammoth resort development such as the Disney plan. Mineral King, however, is in forest. No route to Mineral King is practical without passing through Sequoia National Park. The new road planned to Mineral King is a $40-million project, a highway that would slice a nine-mile swath of national park splendor.

25 MILES, 80 MINUTES

The present road is closed in winter and an adventure in summer. It could never handle the kind of traffic that the ski resort would generate. We covered the 25 miles at maximum safe speed, arriving 80 minutes later.

Mineral King proper is not as magnificent as the way to Mineral King. There are cabins clustered on the valley floor, trails for backpackers, two miles of slope faces showing rocks and grass. Snow still hugging mountain tops. Good but not great by High Sierra standard.

I wouldn't mind a handsome resort ornamenting the valley.

But I deplore the idea of carving a national park to provide access.

The Forest Service must have been more interested in rental fees than sequoia trees from the beginning. Give them a small valley and they'll take 25 highway miles.

There is a rock in remote Mineral King hand-painted to read, "L.A. go home." I understand. But it ought to read, "Government go home."

SAFETY MUST BE ASSURED IN KANSAS AEC PROJECT

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the U.S. House of Representatives agreed to a revised amendment to H.R. 9388, the authorization for the Atomic Energy Commission, which strengthens a prohibition against the Atomic Energy Commission acquiring land for a proposed radioactive waste repository at Lyons, Kans.

The amendment developed by Representative JOE SKUBITZ and agreed to by the Kansas congressional delegation is a considerable improvement over the amendment adopted by the U.S. Senate last week which was authored by Senator ROBERT DOLE.

The original Senate amendment offered little or no protection against the Atomic Energy Commission proceeding with development of the repository before safety was definitely determined. The amendment accepted by the House directs the President to appoint an advisory council of nine members, and specifies that three of the members shall be from Kansas.

The revised amendment also sets stringent requirements as to on-site testing and prohibits the deposit of any radioactive waste for testing purposes unless it is fully retrievable.

As another safety measure, the revised amendment provides that after the Advisory Council has reported to the Congress, we have 60 days in which to study the report and may stop it within that time period if there remain doubts about the safety of Kansas citizens or protection of our environment.

I am also pleased that the House Appropriations Committee has deferred funding for land acquisition for the proposed AEC atomic waste repository at Lyons, Kans.

The proposed establishment of an atomic waste repository at Lyons, Kans. was—and remains—a source of great concern to the Governor of Kansas, Robert Docking; members of the Kansas scientific community; the Kansas congressional delegation; and many Kansas citizens. Governor Docking and Congressman JOE SKUBITZ are to be congratulated for their efforts on behalf of Kansas citizens.

The Atomic Energy Commission requested authorization to purchase land for the site of the atomic waste repository near Lyons, Kans., and for construction design and planning. Concerned Kansans urged postponement of this action until all necessary and pending studies relative to the hazards of the project were completed. There were—and remain—many unanswered questions regarding the safety of the project.

The Kansas Geological Survey, which has acted as the spokesman for the Kansas scientific community, has raised grave doubts about the assurances of safety offered by the Atomic Energy Commission to date. Questions exist regarding the retrievability of the wastes, safe transportation of radioactive wastes to the site, the thermal problem, and others. In short, there remain too many unanswered questions for the House of Representatives to have allowed the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with site acquisition and construction planning before the safety was determined.

I believe the Atomic Energy Commission authorization, with the revised amendment, to be the best possible legislation for protection of our citizens and the environment. I hope the Senate acts promptly in approving the revised amendment.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 319

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

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

H. RES. 319

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's

in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

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

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

"—the question of releasing captured military men."

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

RHODESIAN CHROME

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker. Ibn Hazm of Cordova—994–1064—said:

The measure of prudence and resolution is to know a friend from an enemy; the height of stupidity and weakness is not to know an enemy from a friend . . . The height of evil is that you should oppress your friend. Even to estrange him is the act of a man who has no sense, for whom misfortune is predestined.

While the Nixon administration races to embrace a regime which is in close contention with the Soviet Union for the title of "despotism of the century," it at the same time advocates continued U.S. participation in the United Nations sanctions against pro-Western Rhodesia. While visits, trade agreements, and ping-pong teams are directed toward a Red China which contributes significantly to the North Vietnamese Communist war effort, a nation which has offered to aid us in our attempt to stop the Communist advance in Southeast Asia is boycotted.

Fortunately there is a growing movement in the Congress to alter one of the most detrimental aspects of our twisted embargo policy toward Rhodesia. In the House of Representatives over 50 Congressmen, including me, are cosponsoring H.R. 6589, or identical bills which would lift our self-imposed ban on the importation of strategic high grade Rhodesian chrome ore. Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, is sponsoring a similar bill—S. 1404—in the Senate.

The United Nations action against Rhodesia began after that nation declared its independence from Great Britain in 1965—shades of July 4, 1776. In 1966 the U.N. Security Council, of which the United States in a permanent member, imposed selective mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and in 1968 made the embargo comprehensive. This declaration of economic warfare was ostensibly based upon Rhodesia's stated intention not to allow universal suffrage. The fact that article 2, section 7 of the U.N. Charter specifically forbids intervention in the internal affairs of member states was conveniently avoided by the subterfuge that Rhodesia was not sovereign but still British territory. The State Department continues to advance this ludicrous argument after 5 years of real and obvious Rhodesian independence and autonomy.

Probably the most staggering ramification of our participation in this profoundly unwarranted economic boycott of Rhodesia, the condition which H.R. 6589 and similar bills are designed to correct, is the fact that by participating in this embargo the United States is becoming dependent on the Soviet Union as a source of supply for high grade chromium ore. Metallurgical grade chrome is necessary for the manufacture of stainless steel, tool steel, structural steel and high temperature alloys. It is no ordinary commodity, but goes directly to the heart of our industrial civilization. We find the list of end products utilizing high grade chromium ore in manufacture wide-ranging in the fields of aerospace, communications, defense, and many others. In short, metallurgical grade chromium ore is an absolutely essential strategic material. This is recognized by the U.S. Office of Emergency Preparedness, which has high grade chrome ore on the strategic stockpile list. Unfortunately, the United States has no domestic supply of this most necessary item.

Prior to the point when the embargo against Rhodesia went into effect, Rhodesia was the largest single source of chrome ore imported into the United States. This is natural since Rhodesia possesses nearly 70 percent of the world's known metallurgical chrome reserves. Since the embargo, this pattern has drastically shifted and today better than 60 percent of the metallurgical grade chrome imported by the United States comes from the Soviet Union. As the United States began to rely more heavily on the Soviet Union as its source for this ore, the Soviets almost tripled their price from a preembargo level of $25 per ton to the present $72 per ton.

Since the boycott of the Rhodesian source went into effect, imports of this strategic material have continually fallen short of domestic needs. Not only have industrial reserves of this commodity been exhausted, but the Office of Emergency Preparedness has sold off practically 1 million tons of our strategic stockpile. The administration now plans to sell off 30 percent more of our stockpiling to meet domestic requirements rather than lift a boycott which is effective only in placing the United States in a position of complete dependency on the Soviet Union.

Widespread support for H.R. 6589 and S. 1404 will help end a policy which is contrary to national security requirements, instrumental in losing to U.S. manufacturers, dependent on exorbitantly priced Soviet chrome ore, their share of both foreign and domestic markets, and which, in truth, has nothing whatsoever to do with contributing to international peace and security.

Orating about peace and security while accepting tyrannical demands, our policymakers are failing to accomplish that task for which they are paid by the citizens. This task ought to be first and foremost to conduct our affairs in such a manner as to strengthen the security and preserve the integrity of the United States of America.

A RESOLUTION OF THE MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, the Michigan State Board of Education adopted a resolution opposing the continuing war in Indochina. I insert this resolution into the RECORD to again point out the immediate need for this Nation and this Congress to reassess our national priorities. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Whereas, the state of education and society are bordering on a social and financial crisis, and

Whereas, any tax reform of a constitutional nature will require some period of time, and

Whereas, there are some school districts that cannot wait for constitutional change if they are to observe the constitutional demands for quality education for all their children this fall, and

Whereas, it is estimated that an inordinate amount of every federal tax dollar is spent on past, present, and future wars while not enough is spent on education and health and social needs, and

Whereas, the nature of our national priorities must begin to reflect the fundamental needs of our State and our country such as education, health, environmental and other essential social needs; therefore, we are

Resolved, That the Michigan State Board of Education go on record as opposing the war in Southeast Asia and our involvement in any future undeclared wars and demand that our elected officials take heed of our educational needs as well as all the needs of our society in order to create a climate of health and sanity for our young so that we all can make progress in assuring all children of our State of the means for equality and quality education, and

Resolved, That the Michigan State Board of Education urge the President to remove all our armed forces from Southeast Asia and their involvement in this undeclared, costly, and immoral war by a date certain, and further

Resolved, That the Michigan State Board of Education urge the Congress of these, our States, to begin immediately to institute plans for conversion to peace from war, and the immediate reordering of priorities giving top priority to the needs of education, health, environmental, and other essential social needs.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I ask unanimous consent that the text of the July 1971 issue of the 102 Monitor published by the Council on Environmental Quality appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATES BEGIN TO REQUIRE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Recognizing the need for a similar "action-forcing" procedure, California, Washington, Delaware, Montana, and Puerto Rico have recently passed statutes[1] requiring environmental impact statements on state actions analogous to the statements required on Federal actions by Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).[2] Similar bills are pending in a number of other states.[3] Most of these statutes closely parallel Section 102 of NEPA. There are, however, several substantive differences between the state and Federal requirements and it is the purpose of this article to note both the new State requirements and some of these differences.

The NEPA Section 102 impact statement is intended as a device to assure that Federal agencies investigate and give weight to any significant environmental effects caused by action which they take, to require the development of less damaging alternatives and to assure that those effects are made known to the public before the action is undertaken. The initiating agency must prepare a report on any major Federal action which will have a significant impact upon the environment. The report must contain detailed statements on 1) the environmental impact of the action, 2) any unavoidable adverse environmental effects, 3) alternatives to the proposed action, 4) the relationship between short-term uses and long-term productivity; and 5) any irreversible commitments of resource. Prior to making the report the initiating agency must solicit the comments of any federal, state, and local agency with jurisdiction by law or special expertise. Under applicable rules, copies of the agency report and all comments must be made available to the public in advance of agency decision or action.

Section 102 of NEPA requires an impact statement for a broader range of activities than is required by some of the new state statutes. California, for example, requires an impact statement only for projects which the state agency will itself carry out, thereby excluding such actions as the granting of a license or permit to a private group. (A bill now pending in California would expand the requirement and duplicate the Section 102 coverage, requiring an impact statement for "every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major governmental action."[4]) Montana provides a more complete enumeration, requiring a statement for "every recommendation or report on proposals for projects, programs, legislation and other major actions of state government." The statutes of Washington and Puerto Rico require impact statements for exactly the same types of state action as is required for Federal actions by Section 102. Delaware requires a statement only for permit applications to conduct new manufacturing uses along the coastal zone. The statements are to be prepared by the applicant as part of his permit application to the state authority controlling industrial development in this area.

Most of the statutes parallel Section 102 in requiring that the initiating agency consult with and obtain the comments of a broad range of federal, state, and local agencies. Montana, however, requires only that "any *state* agency" be consulted. (Empasis added.) Puerto Rico refers to "any agency", Washington to "any public agency", and California to "any governmental agency". Such terms apparently include all appropriate federal, state, and local agencies. It is not clear whether appropriate local and state agencies from neighboring states are included as well. Delaware makes no statutory provision for comment on environmental statements.

The California, Washington, Montana, and Puerto Rican statutes are identical with Section 102 in requiring that the reports and comments be made available to the public. Delaware instead requires a public hearing on the matters involved in the environmental statement.

---

[1] See Appendix for the text of these statutes.

[2] 42 U.S.C. § 4332.

[3] *E.g.*, Massachusetts House Bill No. 5144, § 2.

[4] California Assembly Bill No. 1056, § 21105(c).

APPENDIX

1. National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4332:

"(2) all agencies of the Federal Government shall—

"(C) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on—

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,

(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,

(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,

(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

"Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the President, the Council on Environmental Quality and to the public as provided by section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes;"

2. *Cal. Public Resources Code*, §§ 21100, 21104 (West 1970):

"§ 21100. All state agencies, boards and commissions shall include in any report on any project they propose to carry out which could have a significant effect on the environment of the state, a detailed statement by the responsible state official setting forth the following:

(a) The environmental impact of the proposed action.

(b) Any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided if the proposal is implemented.

(c) Mitigation measures proposed to minimize the impact.

(d) Alternatives to the proposed action.

(e) The relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity.

(f) Any irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

"§ 21104. Prior to the making of a detailed statement, the responsible state official shall consult with, and obtain comments from, any governmental agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved."

3. Montana Environmental Policy Act, Montana Session Laws of 1971, Ch. 238 § 4(b) (March 9, 1971):

"(b) all agencies of the state shall

"(3) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for projects, programs, legislation and other major actions of state government significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement on—

"(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,

"(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,

"(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,

"(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment, and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

"(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

"Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible state official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any state agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate state, federal, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the governor, the environmental quality council and to the public, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes."

4. Public Environmental Policy Act, Puerto Rico Session Laws of 1971, Law No. 9 § 4(2) (June 18, 1970):

"all agencies of the Government shall:

"(C) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other governmental actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on:

"(i) the environmental impact of the proposed actions,

"(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,

"(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,

"(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

"(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

"Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the Governor, the legislative bodies, the Environmental Quality Board, and to the public, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes."

5. State Environmental Policy Act of 1971,

Washington Session Laws of 1971, Ch. 109 § 3(2) (May 10, 1971):

". . . all branches of government of this state, including state agencies, municipal and public corporations, and counties shall:

* * * * *

"(c) Include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major actions significantly affecting the quality of the environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on:

"(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action;

"(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;

"(iii) alternatives to the proposed action;

"(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and

"(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented;

"(d) Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any public agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate federal, province, state, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop end enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the governor, the department of ecology, the ecological commission, and the public, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes."

6. Coastal Zone Act, Delaware House Bill No. 300 as amended. (passed June 28, 1971):

§ 7002. *Definitions*

(c) 'Environmental Impact Statement' means a detailed description as prescribed by the State Planning Office of the effect of the proposed use on the immediate and surrounding environment and natural resources such as water quality, fisheries, wildlife and the aesthetics of the region.

§ 7004. *Uses allowed by permit only.* Nonconforming uses.

(a) . . . manufacturing uses . . . are allowed in the Coastal Zone by permit only . . .

§ 7005. *Administration of this chapter.*

(a) The State Planning Office shall administer this chapter. All requests for permits for manufacturing land uses and for the expansion or extension of non-conforming uses as herein defined in the Coastal Zone shall be directed to the State Planner. Such requests must be in writing and must include . . . (3) an Environmental Impact Statement. "The State Planner shall hold a public hearing and may request further information of the applicant."

NEW SOURCE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

It is now possible to order the draft and final impact statements prepared by any federal agency from a single source: the National Technical Information Service of the Department of Commerce. Each statement will be assigned an order number that will appear in the 102 Monitor (at the end of the summary of each statement) and also in the NTIS semi-monthly Announcement Series No. 68, "Environmental Pollution and Control." (An annual subscription costs $5.00 and can be ordered from the NTIS, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22151.)

Final statements will be available in microfiche as well as paper copy. A paper copy of any statement can be obtained by writing NTIS at the above address and enclosing $3.00 and the order number. A microfiche costs $0.95. (Paper copies of documents that are over 300 pages are $6.00. These rare instances will be noted in the 102 Monitor.)

NTIS is also offering a special "package" in which the subscriber receives all statements in microfiche for $0.35 per statement.

Statements will still be available for public scrutiny in the document rooms of the various agencies. Some agencies may still wish to provide copies of the statements directly to the public.

Yet another possible source of statements is from the Environmental Law Institute, 1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Envelopes bearing orders should be marked "Document Service." The Institute charges $0.10 per page. The number of pages is indicated at the end of each summary in the Monitor. Please enclose the correct amount of money with your order. It is not necessary to be a subscriber to the Environmental Law Reporter, available from the Institute for $50.00 per year, to take advantage of this service. Give the date and title when ordering statements.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS RECEIVED BY THE COUNCIL FROM JUNE 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1971

Note: at the head of the listing of statements received from each agency is the name of an individual who can answer questions regarding those statements.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Contact: For Non-Regulatory Matters: Joseph J. DiNunno, Director, Office of Environmental Affairs, Washington, D.C. 29545 (202) 973–5391.

For Regulatory Matters: Christopher L. Henderson, Assistant Director for Regulation, Washington, D.C. 20545 (202) 973–7531.

Title, Description, and Date of Transmittal

Draft: Fort St. Vrain Nuclear Generating Station, *Colorado.* Application by Public Service Company of Colorado for an operating license. Station located on a 2,238-acre tract in the South Platte River Valley and will be an AEC Power Reactor Demonstration Program Plant. Docket No. 50–267. Statement—30 pages; Applicant's Environmental Report—115 pages.

Final: Radioactive Waste Repository, Lyons, *Kansas.* Involves construction of a demonstration repository for solid radioactive wastes in underground bedded salt formations. Will utilize a 200 acre non-producing salt mine for alpha wastes; an adjacent 800 acre section of salt bed for high level waste; and surface facilities will be constructed for receipt and handling of waste packages. (Explosive or inflammable materials will not be accepted for storage.) Discusses thermal impact, radiological and physiological effects, geophysical effects, transportation of wastes, etc. Repository is expected to be in operation for at least 25 years. Purpose: to isolate these types of radioactive wastes from man's biosphere. Comments on draft were received from Senator Dole and Governor Docking of Kansas; and Depts. of HEW, Interior and Transportation of EPA. PB–199 663–F. 245 Pages. June 4.

Proposed issuance of an operating license to the Vermont Yankee Power Corporation for the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, *Vermont.* The Station utilizes single cycle, forced circulation boiling water reactor, and is designed to operate at a power level of 1593 thermal megawatts, corresponding to an output of 540 electrical mg. Comments made by various State of N.H., Vermont and Mass.; Departments of HUD, Defense, Agriculture, HEW, Interior. Docket No. 50271. PB–199 753–F. 232 pages. June 7.

Cannikin underground nuclear test, Amchita Island, *Alaska.* Nuclear testing of less than 5 megatons will take place about 6,000 feet underground in the fall. Estimated magnitude on the Richter scale of about 7.0. Comments on draft statement were received from State of Hawaii and Depts. of Commerce, Defense, HEW, Interior, State and Transportation. PB–200 231–F. 119 pages. June 23.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Contact: W. Brinton Whitehall, Secretary, P.O. Box 360, Trenton, New Jersey 08603 (609) 883–9500.

American Dredging Company has decided to *discontinue* the proposed dike and fill project on the Delaware River at Bridgeport, New Jersey. (Draft statement sent 4/14; listed on page 14 in the *Monitor,* Vol. 1, No. 4.) June 25.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Contact: Dr. T. C. Byerly, Office of the Secretary, Washington, D.C. 20250 (202) 338–7803.

Agricultural Research Service

Draft: Pilot Boll Weevil eradication experiment: *Mississippi Area.* Trial eradication program will be undertaken this year and will consist of a series of population suppression techniques (cultural, insecticides, defoliants, sterile male release, etc.) integrated into a season-long control effort. Involves 4,000 acres of cotton. 32 pages. PB–200 200–D. June 21.

Emergency Program for Venezuelan Equine Encephalomyelitis (VEE), *Lower Rio Grande* Area. Involves using 3 oz. per acre of aerial spray malathion on an area comprising 1,200,000 acres at the mouth of the Rio Grande and 400,000 acres in Northern Mexico. It is hoped that spraying will be sufficient although as many as 5 may be necessary. Purpose: to ensure protection to horses and related animals from this fatal virus disease transmitted, primarily by mosquitoes. 9 pages. June 28.

Forest Service

Draft: Proposal to designate the Glacier Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, *Wyoming.* Involves classification of between 168,785 and 190,620 acres of wilderness, much of which is presently classified as a Primitive Area and declassification of 1,012 to 7,518 acres. Public Hearings will be held on the future management of the area. PB–199 462–D. 5 pages. May 25.

Final: Legislation: S. 1407 and H.R. 6957. Proposals to establish Sawtooth National Recreation Area, *Idaho.* Purpose: to assure preservation and protection of Sawtooth, White Cloud, and Boulder Mountains and adjacent lands. No comments attached. 29 pages. June 14.

Elk Mountain Road, Santa Fe National Forest, San Miguel County, *New Mexico:* project consists of new construction of 26.5 miles of paved road and paving of 7.5 miles of existing road. A scenic 2-lane road from Gallinas Canyon to Pecos Canyon. Comments made by various County and State of New Mexico agencies; various Members of Congress; Departments of Interior and Transportation. 87 pages. June 25.

Rural Electrification Administration

Draft: Loan application from the Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., of Benson, *Arizona* for financing part of the 16 miles of 230 kv transmission line between the Apache generating station near Cochise, Arizona, and a substation to be located near Benson. Purpose of transmission line: to provide service in a fast-growing area. PB–199 739–D 14 pages. June 2.

Cardinal Generating Station, Jefferson County, *Ohio.* Application for loans totaling $16,575,000 from member systems of Buckeye Power, Inc., for construction of an additional generating unit at the station. This unit will utilize a supercritical boiler-steam turbine-condenser cycle. Will produce approximately 615,000 kv of electricity. PB–199 923–D 271 pages. June 7.

Soil conservation service

Draft: Blue Eye Creek Watershed Project, *Alabama.* Involves conservation land treatment of about 4,000 acres, supplemental con-

struction of 2 dams, channel work on 9.2 of stream, etc. Purpose: to reduce flooding water damage, sediment damage, etc. About 9.2 miles of low-value stream fishery will be destroyed and approximately 94 acres of bottomland woodland will be required for completion of channel work. PB–199 875–D 11 pages. June 4.

Final: Mud Gulch flood prevention project, Sangre de Cristo RC&D project, *Colorado*. Involves construction of a flood retention dam near Canon City, etc. Approximately 20 acres of rangeland will be disturbed to construct the dam and about 30 acres of rangeland will be subject to temporary flooding. Purpose: to protect businesses, homes, a highway, and agricultural land from flooding. Comments were made by various State of Colorado agencies and Dept. of Agriculture (FHA) PB–199 654F. 12 pages. May 21.

Short Bayou Drainage District Project Measure, Southeast Delta RC&D Project, *Mississippi*. Involves work on 8.2 miles of existing channels and initiation of an accelerated land treatment program. Purpose: to reduce flooding & improve agricultural water management and also control surface water runoff erosion. No draft statement received. Comments made by various Mississippi State agencies and Army Corps of Engineers. PB–199 656–F 15 pages. May 21.

White Water Creek Hydrologic Unit Project measure, Cherokee Hills RC&D project, *Oklahoma*. Involves constructing 3 dams, land treatment measures, technical assistance to farmers, mosquito control, etc. Purpose: to reduce floodwater and sediment damages, reduce soil loss from erosion, etc. No draft received. Comments made by various State of Oklahoma agencies; Depts. of Interior and Army Corps of Engineers. PB–199 653–F. 11 pages. May 21.

Almont Flood Control Project Measure, Lewis and Clark 1805 RC&D Project, *North* Dakota. Consists of constructing about 2.3 miles of dikes, .2 mile of field diversions, and .2 mile of channel. Purpose: flood protection. No draft statement received. Comments made by various State of North Dakota agencies; Depts. of Agriculture, Army Corps of Engineers and Interior. PB–199. 655–F. 25 pages. May 21.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Contact: Dr. Sydney T. Galler, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Affairs, Washington, D.C. 20230 (202) 967–4335.

Economic Development Administration

Draft: Financial grant assistance for development of an industrial park, Swinomish Indian Reservation, Skagit County, *Washington*. Involves two phases: (1) dredging and filling operations, changing land use, etc.; and (2) occupying the site with industrial facilities and monitoring/controlling waste discharges. Purpose: to provide long term employment for members of the Swinomish Tribal community and residents of Skagit County. PB–199 871–D. 35 pages. June 7.

Final: Financial assistance to Rogers Brothers Company for the construction of a frozen French fried potato plant: Benton (Near Kennewick), *Washington*. Of primary concern, is disposal of liquid potato wastes and possible resultant odors. Favors method of spray-irrigation on 60 acres. Comments by Department of Commerce (Off. of Economic Affairs and NOAA). PB–179 662–F. May 24.

Financial grant assistance for construction of a trunk line sewer: Tulare, *California*. Involves 7 miles of trunk sewer to serve southern area of Tulare. Purpose: to provide link between sewage treatment facilities and industries locating in the area. Comments by Department of Commerce (NOAA). PB–199 456–F. 8 pages. May 24.

Hillsdale Foundry Company, Inc.: Hillsdale, *Michigan*. Request for financial assistance for development of a new facility on a site in a less populated area. Purpose: to help overcome air pollution problems by installing new air control equipment. Comments by various State of Michigan agencies and Department of HUD. PB–199 455–F. 14 pages. May 24.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—DEPARTMENT OF ARMY

Corps of Engineers

Contact: Francis X. Kelly, Assistant for Conservation Liaison, Public Affairs Office, Office, Chief of Engineers, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20314 (202 693–6329.

Draft: Chief Joseph Dam Additional Units, Columbia River: *Washington*. Construction of 11 additional units to increase the hydraulic capacity and peak power producing capacity of Dam. 500 acres of land would be inundated. Purpose: power generation. PB–199 458–D 10 pages. May 20.

Jacksonville Harbor Navigation Project: *Florida* Section 2. Project consists of enlarging the channel in the St. Johns River, Blount Island to municipal terminals portion. 107 acres submarginal marsh destroyed. Purpose: navigation improvement. PB–199 457–D. 13 pages. May 24.

Fort Myers Beach Channel Project, *Florida*, (navigation project). Dredging a 2,000 foot channel extension (11 ft. x 125 ft.) with a turning basin at the easterly end of the existing channel (adjacent to Matanzas Pass). Dredged material will be pumped across Estero Island and placed along the beach. Purpose: to facilitate shrimp boats and barge traffic to and from terminal facilities. PB–199 611–D 5 pages. May 28.

Oak Orchard Harbor (small boat harbor project), Lake Ontario, *New York*. Consists of dredging an entrance channel which will be protected by constructing jetties and a detached breakwater. Dredging spoils will be disposed of in a confined upland area. Purpose: construct small boat harbor. PB–199 636–D 6 pages. May 28.

Presque Isle Peninsula cooperative beach erosion control project, Lake Erie at Erie, *Pennsylvania*. Consists of constructing a reef along a 1200 foot section of beach, which will be about 200 feet wide. Purpose: protect public bathing beaches. PB–199 637–D 7 pages. June 1.

Kaunakakai Harbor maintenance dredging project, Molokai, Hawaii. Involves restoring navigation depth to 23 feet within project limits. Dredged material will either be deposited at Molokai Ranchland or if acceptable to EPA, at sea in depths of about 100 fathoms. Purpose: to insure continued barge transportation through harbor. PB–199 613–D 7 pages. June 1.

Myers Chuck Harbor project, Myers Chuck, *Alaska*. Construction of a 700-foot rubble-mound breakwater with an elevation of 22 feet at mean lower low water in the water-gap south of Myers Chuck. Purpose: to provide a calm harbor for refuge, cargo transfer and storage; to prevent danger to harbor facilities, etc. 900 square yards of calm habitat will be destroyed and debris may accumulate due to potential decrease in tidal circulation. PB–199 638–D 12 pages. June 1.

Bethel Small-boat harbor, Bethel, *Alaska*. (Navigation project). Consists of dredging a 6,000 foot channel in Brown's Slough. Initial width 40 feet, eventually stabilizing at a width of 20 feet. Dredged materials, made up of both frozen and unfrozen spoils, will be deposited on low marshy areas adjacent to the channel. Purpose: to provide an all-tide water access to the Alaska State Housing Authority relocation project. Will disturb the northern pike and whitefish nursery habitat. PB–199 620–D 11 pages. June 1.

Stockton, *California*. Levee Restoration Project. Involves placement of rock revetment at 6 selected erosion sites from Stockton to Venice Island, *California*. Purpose: to repair presently eroded levees, to maintain levee integrity, and to reduce future damage from wave action against levee. PB–199 873–D. 21 pages. June 7.

Grand Lagoon navigation project, *Florida*. Consists of dredging a channel (8 ft x 100 ft) from Panam City Ship Channel to a point near the bridge over Grand Lagoon. From this point 2 branch channels with a connecting channel at the West Terminals will be constructed. Dredged material will be deposited along Gulf Beach, forming large berms. Purpose: to accommodate a large number of recreational vessels. PB–199 874–D. 6 pages. June 7.

Navigation Project, Okeechobee Waterway, vicinity of Ft. Myers, *Florida*. Involves enlarging the 10-foot deep Okeechobee Waterway. Purpose: to improve navigation conditions for commercial use from the Gulf to Lake Okeechobee. PB–199 872–D. 7 pages. June 7.

Jacksonville Harbor navigation project, *Florida* (Section 1). Consists of enlarging the channel in the St. John's River from the Atlantic Ocean to Blount Island. Length of project: 11 miles. Spoils from dredging will be used as fill. Purpose: to improve transportation conditions for the commercial cargo industry. PB–199 880–D. 9 pages, June 7.

Panama City Harbor navigation project, *Florida*. Involves increasing depths in the existing federal project channel from the Gulf of Mexico across Lands End Peninsula into St. Andrew Bay and for new channels into Bay Harbor and Dyers Point. Purpose: to meet navigation (present and future) needs for larger ships and also to improve tidal flushing. St. Andrew Bay spoils from dredging will be placed along the Gulf beach. Also included is the report of Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. PB–200. 199–D. 23 pages. June 8.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Project. Involves extension of the Waterway from Carrabelle to St. Mark's River, *Florida*. Would change 45-mile "outside" waterway to a 42-mile direct waterway. Purpose: to provide more direct and less hazardous route for barge traffic. PB–199 887–D 5 pages. June 10.

Aquatic Plant Control Program, Hudson and Mohawk Rivers, *New York*. Project provides for control and progressive eradication of waterchestnut in and from the waters within the two rivers by spraying with 2,4–D. Purpose: improve recreation facilities and eliminate possible health hazards. PB–200 003–D. 6 pages. June 10.

Hempstead Harbor navigation project, *New York*. Construction of a channel 13 feet deep and 2.1 miles long terminating at a turning basin 9 feet deep. Construction continues on a 6 ft. deep channel .2 mile long. Purpose: provide safe passage of recreational boats, sand tows and tank barges. Channelization will be by hydraulic dredge methods with material confined by retaining dikes. PB–199 879–D 8 pages. June 11.

East Chester Creek Navigation Project: *New York*. Involves construction of channel by providing depths of 10 feet and varying widths a total distance of about 5 miles. Purpose: navigation improvement. PB–200 004–D. 7 pages. June 11.

Great Lakes connecting channels project, St. Marys River, *Michigan*. A three-phase project to widen 6 bend areas in the river. Statement deals with 1st phase which involves dredging and blasting 3 bends in the Middle Neebish Channel area. Fish kills and nutrient releases may occur during blasting and dredging. Spoils disposal will form an island covering about 6 acres of river bottom. Purpose: to enable larger vessels to navigate Great Lakes. PB–199 855–D 16 pages. June 11.

Collection and Removal of drift, New York Harbor, *New York* and *New Jersey* (navigation project). Discusses various new methods for controlling and/or handling disposition of debris from deteriorated structures,

derelict vessels, floatable dumped materials along shores of the Harbor and tributaries. Purpose: to reduce floating material in navigable waters, enhance the value of shore property, reduce future costs for removal of drift, etc. PB–200 2055–D. 21 pages. June 11.

Lewis & Clark connecting channel navigation project: Clatsop County, *Oregon*. Consists of navigation channel 10 feet deep from existing channel in Youngs Bay to mouth of Lewis & Clark River (4.5 miles in length). Purpose: navigation improvement. PB–199 881–D 11 pages. June 11.

Entrance—Channel Improvement Project, Summamish River, King County, *Washington*. Involves dredging an entrance channel (8 ft. deep, 100 ft. wide) into the Sammamish River. Two acres of marshland will be destroyed. Purpose: to provide safe passage for recreational craft between river and Lake Washington. PB–199 888–D 8 pages. June 11.

Brownsville small boat basin project, *Washington* (on Puget Sound). Involves constructing a 1,530 foot breakwater, entrance channel, access channel and turning basin. Purpose: to provide a protected moorage for 334 recreational boats. PB–199 882–D 10 pages. June 11.

West Kentucky Tributaries (Obion Creek) *Kentucky*. Project consists of clearing, realignment, and enlargement of about 31 miles of Obion Creek channel from its junction with the Mississippi River near Hickman, Kentucky. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources agree that project will be damaging to fish and wildlife. Purpose: flood control. 9 pages. (Revised draft —1st draft sent 1/14/71.) PB–200 024–D. June 16.

Baldwin and Hannon Sloughs, *Alabama*. River Basin. Project consists of clearing and snagging 1.3 miles of Baldwin Slough and straightening and enlarging 2.5 miles of Hannon Slough channel. Purpose: provide flood protection for 1,022 acres of Montgomery. PB–200 023–D. 7 pages. June 17.

Training Dike and breakwater, Everett Harbor, *Washington*. Purpose: provide protection from wave action for various industries and the boat basin. Involves raising the 4,100 feet of the dike to an elevation of 18 feet above mean low water (MLW) and extending it 1,500 feet southwesterly. 6 pages. June 18.

St. Francis Basin, Flood Protection Project: *Missouri* and *Arkansas*. Construction of a detention reservoir, channel enlargement and realignment, leveed floodway, pumping stations, control structures and improvement of tributary ditches. Project has been in operation since 1930—is 41% completed. Purpose: provide additional flood protection in St. Francis Basin. 22 pages. June 18.

Flood control project in Sugar Creek: Brewster, *Ohio*. Modification and construction of levees and installation of pumping station at Brewster. Also snagging and clearing in Sugar Creek and minor tributaries adjacent to and downstream of Brewster to improve flow characteristics. Purpose: provide additional flood protection to Brewster. 7 pages. June 18.

Central and Southern *Florida* Flood Control Project. Consists of flood control protection, recreation, preservation of fish and wildlife, and navigation structures. Includes system of canals, levees, pumping plants, locks, bridge, and highway relocations. Sites are Kissimmee River Basin, Lake Okeechobee, upper St. Johns River Basin, and Everglades National Park. Purpose: provide flood protection and recreation in central and southern Florida. 127 pages. June 21.

Copan Lake/Little Caney River Flood Control Project: Washington County, *Oklahoma*. Construction of a dam and levee. Purpose: contribute to water quality control, water supply, fish and wildlife, and recreation lake facilities. 4,850 acres will be inundated. 32 pages. June 21.

Flood Control Project, Saw Mill River and tributaries, Hudson River Basin, Yonkers, *New York*. Consists of clearing and grubbing, channel excavation, concrete flume and concrete walls and bridge replacements. Purpose: to provide an efficient channel through which to pass flood flows safely. 8 pages. June 22.

Tranters Creek, Tar River Basin Flood Control Project: Martin, Beaufort, and Pitt Counties, *North Carolina*. Consists of clearing and snagging and channel excavation. Also includes wildlife areas for seasonal detention of water fowl. Purpose: flood protection. 12 pages. June 22.

Flood Control Project on Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien: Crawford County, *Wisconsin*. Program involves total evacuation, flood proofing, and land-use control measures. 157 buildings will be relocated to higher ground, 48 buildings purchased and removed. Purpose: flood protection and recreation. 22 pages. June 22.

Flood control project, Painted Creek, South of Chillicothe, *Ohio*. Project consists of snagging and clearing, removal of trash and logs, bar removal and bank shaping. Work begins at U.S. Route 23 Bridge, extends 2.7 miles. Purpose: flood protection. 5 pages. June 23.

Crude oil and natural gas production in navigable waters along the *Texas* coast. Discusses administrative actions of the Corps relative to issuance or denial of permits for erection of structures and construction of ancillary facilities associated with exploration for and production of cured petroleum and natural gas. Purpose: oil production. 58 pages. June 28.

Final: Navigation Project Taskinas Creek: James City County, *Virginia*. Plan provides for construction of a channel 6 ft. deep, 80 ft. wide, and 1 mile long. Purpose: improve small craft navigation. No draft statement received. Comments made by various State of Virginia agencies and Dept. of Interior. 15 pages. May 28.

Commercial Boat Harbor Navigation Project: Fort Madison, *Iowa*. Mississippi River project consists of dredging an access channel with maneuvering area for barge traffic (1.5 miles in length). Purpose: provide commercial navigation channel and maneuvering area. No draft statement received. Comments made by City of Fort Madison, Iowa; State of Iowa and Illinois; Dept. of Interior and EPA. PB–199 450–F 26 pages. May 28.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Navigation Project, Fort Isabel Side Channels, *Texas*. Deepening of channel and removal of submerged bars. Purpose: improve navigation. Comments made by various State of Texas agencies; Depts. of Agriculture, Interior and EPA. PB–199 443–F 25 pages. May 28.

Bristol Marina Navigation Project: Delaware River, Bucks County, *Pennsylvania*. Involves construction of entrance channel (100 ft. wide, 310 ft. long), access channel (100 ft. wide, and 1,100 ft. long), and two sheet pile breakwaters. Purpose: to provide berthing and service facilities and replace blighted conditions of old historic site. No draft statement received. Comments made by various State of Delaware and Pennsylvania agencies; Depts. of Hud, Interior and Transportation and DRBC. PB–199 452–F 48 pages. May 28.

Great South Bay & Patchogue River Navigation Project, *New York*. Project calls for deepening of channel by two feet (200 ft. wide, 10 ft. deep). Purpose: to accommodate existing and future petroleum commerce and eliminate siltation. No draft statement received. Comments made by State of New York; Depts. of Agriculture, Commerce, HUD, and Transportation and AEC and EPA. PB–199 451–F. 21 pages. May 28.

Delaware Coast Protection Project, Beach Erosion Project: *Delaware*. Improvement involves placement of sand to provide a berm over 24.5 miles of beach, construction of a dune, planting of dune grass, and placing of sand fences on top of the dunes, from Cape Henlopen to Maryland state line at Fenwick Island. Purpose: beach erosion control and hurricane protection. No draft statement received. Comments made by State of Delaware; Depts. of Commerce, HEW, Interior and Transportation. PB–199 454–F. 20 pages. June 1.

Flood Control Project, Caesar Creek Lake: *Ohio*. Dam site located 3 miles above mouth of Caesar Creek. Involves inundation of 2,830 acres of land, 2 Indian Mounds, 90% of community of New Burlington and portions of scenic river valley. Purpose: flood control and water supply. No draft statement received. Comments made by State of Ohio, Depts. of Agriculture, Interior and EPA. PB–199 446–F. 31 pages, June 1.

Bayou Coden, *Alabama*, Navigation Project. Involves construction of an 8 ft. by 60 ft. channel for 3,000 ft., an 8 ft. by 100 ft. channel for 2.3 miles across Portersville Bay, a turning basin, etc. Purpose: improve navigation facilities for fishing industry. Comments made by various State of Alabama agencies; Depts. of Agriculture, Commerce, HEW, HUD, Interior, and Transportation and EPA. PB–199 453–F. 29 pages. June 1.

Tioga-Hammond Lake Project, *Pennsylvania*. Construction of 2 dams and reservoirs. One dam on the Tioga River, one on Crooked Creek. Purpose: flood control and recreation 7,144 acres are required Comments made by States of New York and Pennsylvania; Depts of Agriculture and Interior and EPA PB–200 226–F. 64 pages. June 2.

Beach Erosion Project, Waikiki Beach, (Kuhio Beach Sector), Oahu, Hawaii. Involves improvement of approximately 1500 ft. of Waikiki Beach by placement of sand along beach, construction of additional groin, rehabilitation of existing groin, and construction of a promenade along project. Purpose: to improve recreational and environmental quality of the beach. Comments made by State of Hawaii; Depts. of Interior and Transportation and EPA. PB–199 892–F. 30 pages. June 11.

Gulf intracostal Waterway to Offatts Bayou Galveston, *Texas*. Navigation Project plan provides for construction of a 12 ft. by 125 ft. shallow draft channel from Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Offatts Bayou. Total distance 2.2 miles. Purpose: improve navigation. Comments made by State of Texas; Depts. of Commerce, Interior, and Transportation and EPA. PB–199 972–F. 31 pages. June 16.

Lapwai Creek, Culdesac, *Idaho*. Stream channel shaping and construction of a levee. A rock quarry would be created in the process. Purpose: flood protection. Comments made by State of Idaho, Depts. of Agriculture, Interior and EPA. PB–200 224–F. 16 pages. June 17.

Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, *New Jersey*. (New York Harbor Area), navigation project. Widening 35-foot channel and entrance to Port Elizabeth and Port Newark branch channels, building two maneuvering areas, deepening and widening Newark Bay Channel, building turning basin at junction of Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, etc. Purpose: navigation improvement. No draft statement received. Comments made by various State of New Jersey agencies. PB–199 973–F. 29 pages. June 17.

Santa Rosa Washington Flood Control Project (Tat Mamolikot Dam and Lake St. Clair) Papago Indian Reservation, Pinal County, *Arizona*. Involves construction of an earth-fill dam, 2 small dikes, spillway, ungated flood control outlet, etc. Purpose: flood control, water for irrigation, fishing. Approximately, 450 acres are needed for this project. No draft statement received. Comments made

by State of Arizona; Depts. of Agriculture, HEW, and Interior. PB-200 225-F. 33 pages. June 17.

Tahquitz Creek. Whitewater River, *California* (Navigation Project). Involves 2 stages: (1) construction of a 400-acre foot capacity debris basin and (2) construction of a concrete-lined and stone revetted channel along the Creek. Due to controversy over the channel portion of the project, this second step will be delayed while further studies are made. The debris basin will be constructed as a separate increment. Purpose: flood control and debris protector. The Aqua Caliente Band of Mission Indians have been opposed to whole project because of concern that ground water will be affected. No draft statement received. Comments made by various State of California agencies; Depts. of Agriculture, HEW, HUD, and Interior, and EPA. PB-200 227-F. 35 pages. June 21.

Sandy Lick Creek, Flood Protection Project, Du Bois, *Pennsylvania*. Involves widening, deepening and some realignment of about 25,035 feet of existing channel, constructing earth-fill dikes, etc. Will have drainage area of 86 square miles at the downstream end of the project. Purpose: to provide high degree of hydraulic efficiency and reduce flood damage. No draft statement received. Comments made by State of Pennsylvania; Depts. of Agriculture and Interior. 13 pages. June 28.

DEPARTMENT OF NAVY

Contact: Charles Ill, Room 4C713, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20350.

Draft: Project Sanguine: Northern *Wisconsin*. The intention of the project is to devise means by which to communicate with submerged submarines by use of magnetic fields, Extremely Low Frequency Communication System (ELF). The statement includes factual data obtained from research and engineering experiments conducted as part of the Project Sanguine Environmental Compatibility Assurance Program in order to determine the environmental impact of ELF. Research is not expected to be completed for several years. PB-199 732-D. 504 pages. May 14.

Proposed Navy F-14 Fighter Aircraft. Operational capability planned for mid-1970's. Discusses aircraft's turbofan engine and its effect on the atmosphere, sound level, etc. June 10.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Contact: Dr. Raymond Moore, 15-15 Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852, (303) 443-1808.

Draft: Indian Health Service Hospital: Tuba City, *Arizona*. Involves constructing a 125 bed hospital adjacent to the existing hospital. Will provide increased outpatient clinics and adjunct services. Purpose: to provide a comprehensive coordinated health program for about 16,000 Navajo and Hopi Indians. 24 pages. June 14.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Contact: Charles Orlebeke, Deputy Under Secretary, Washington, D.C. 20410 (202) 382-2914.

Draft: Auraria Urban Renewal Project: Denver, *Colorado*. Involves clearing approximately 173 acres near the central business district and developing a Higher Education Center. Extensive park and recreation spaces will be part of the Center. Purpose: to eliminate environmental deficiencies in area, such as noise, dirt and visual pollution. Project No. Colorado No. 24. PB-199 876-D. 10 pages. June 14.

HUD Handbook I, Comprehensive Planning Assistance Leading to a Grant. This handbook establishes policies, guidelines and requirements which govern grants under the Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program. It contains requirements for environmental planning and for the first time imposes a formal environmental assessment requirement on the comprehensive planning process. 4 pages (Statement); 64 (Handbook). June 29.

Statement on HUD's "Minimum Design Standards for Community Sewerage Systems". (Copy of Handbook with standards attached.) Purpose: to provide minimum criteria for nation-wide use of developers, builders, etc. in developing privately-owned central sewerage systems. 6 pages (Statement); 41 pages (Handbook). June 29.

Statement on HUD's "Minimum Design Standards for Community Water Supply Systems". (Copy of Handbook with standards attached.) Purpose: to provide minimum criteria for nation-wide use of developers, builders, etc. in developing privately owned central water supply systems. 4 pages (statement); 74 pages (Handbook). June 29.

Cedar-Riverside, proposed new community, Minneapolis, *Minnesota*. Proposed action is an offer of commitment to guarantee up to $24 million of obligations to finance the cost of land acquisition and development. The proposal will set a precedent with respect to its intention to tie new community assistance to an urban renewal plan and to provide new approaches to environmental quality. 58 pages. June 29.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Contact: Office of Information, Public Queries, 18th and C Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240 (202) 343-3172.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Draft: San Marcos National Fish Hatchery: Hays County, *Texas*. Facilities will be located on 126 acres of land, formerly part of the Southwest Texas State University. Will consist of 52 ponds, associated drains and supply lines, a water treatment and recirculation system, etc. Purpose: to serve as a national fish hatchery and as a development center for new fish rearing techniques. PB-199 463-D. 7 pages. May 28

Bureau of Reclamation

Draft: Navajo-McCullough Transmission Line, Navajo Project, *Arizona*. (Revised draft—1st draft sent 1/13/71.) Construction of a 500 kv transmission line to serve as a link between the Navajo Generating Station near Page and the McCullough Switching Station near Boulder City. Will require about 1,000 acres of land used for forage production. PB-200 186-D. 27 pages. June 22.

Office of Saline Water

Draft: Sea Water Distillation Module Project: Orange County, *California*. Involves construction and operation of a sea water distillation module of VTE/MSF design of approximately 3 mgd capacity. Part of development program to convert saline water at lower cost and produce larger quantities of it. . . . production. Discusses emissions from burning natural gas in the boilers, noise produced by operating plant, presence of copper and nickel in the waste streams, etc. PB-199 850-D. 104 pages. June 9.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Contact: Martin Convisser, Director, Office of Special Projects, 400 7th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 (202)426-4537.

He will refer you to the correct regional office from which the statement originated.

For the readers convenience we have listed the numerous statements from DOT by State in alphabetical order.

Federal Aviation Administration

Draft: Indian Valley Airport, Crescent Mills, *California*. Involves right-of-way acquisition, runway embankment and site drainage, site fencing, and power line clearance. 24 pages. June 28.

Stapleton International Airport project, Denver, *Colorado*. Involves runway improvement, installation of a MIRL lighting system, installation of blast protection, reconstruction of portions of the high-speed turnoffs, etc. Purpose: to provide a new runway for aircraft including Boeing 727's, to prevent erosion and dusting conditions from jumbo type aircraft, etc. PB-199 604-D. 11 pages. June 2.

Boundary County Airport project, Bonners Ferry, *Idaho*. Land acquisition, runway extension, taxiway and apron rehabilitation, etc. PB-199 844-D. 11 pages. June 11.

Airport project at Pittsfield, *Illinois*. Involves acquisition of land for a proposed airport. Future development will involve construction of paved runway, etc. Purpose: to replace an existing "restricted landing area." PB-199 730-D. 63 pages. June 7.

Baer Field airport project, Fort Wayne, *Indiana*: acquisition of land, extension of runway, etc. PB-199 870-D. 13 pages. June 11.

Arthur N. Neu Airport, Carrol, *Iowa*. Involves land acquisition, extension of runway, construction of asphalt overlay and connecting taxiway and apron, etc. 15 pages. June 28.

McPherson City County Airport project, McPherson, *Kansas*. Consists of the final phase of paving the runway and taxiway and extending the north end of the runway, etc. PB-199 603-D. 13 pages. June 2.

Taylor County Airport project, Campbellsville, *Kentucky*. Consists of extending and reconstructing the existing runway and also acquiring land for clear zone. Purpose: to accommodate an increasing number of single and double engine aircraft. PB-199 883-D. 29 pages. June 14.

Mott Municipal Airport project, Mott, *North Dakota*. Involves construction of a runway extension, taxiway, runway edge lighting, etc. Purpose: to improve facility for single engine aircraft. PB-199 743-D. 14 pages. June 8.

Airport project at Fort Yates, *North Dakota*. The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe requests assistance for constructing a new airport facility. Purpose: to complement and complete objectives of building an industrial park-airport facility. (The area is presently economically depressed). PB-199 885-D. 32 pages. June 11.

Airport project at Shamokin, *Pennsylvania*. Involves acquisition of land, construction of runway, stub taxiways, apron, turnaround, etc. To be built on site of present Elysburg-Shamokin airport. 36 pages. June 25.

Grant County Airport, Petersburg, *West Virginia:* land acquisition, grading, draining, etc. PB-199 878-D. 15 pages. June 8.

Final: Dothan-Houston County Airport, Dothan, *Alabama*. Construction of runway extension, supporting taxiways, lighting system. Purpose: to permit full load usage of DC9-31 planes. C141 to land in dry weather and T-1A planes to land in all weather. Comments made by State of Alabama Department of Interior and Environmental Protection Agency. 34 pages. June 21.

Savannah Municipal Airport, Savannah, *Georgia*. Project involves acquisition of 1,500 acres for a new runway. Comments made by various State of Georgia agencies. 45 pages. June 21.

Rexburg-Madison County Airport project, Rexburg, *Idaho*. Involves land acquisition for clear zones, airport development, runway extension (on land between sewage lagoons), etc. Comments made by various State of Idaho agencies. PB-199 657-F. 23 pages. June 2.

Capital Airport project, Springfield, *Illinois*: runway extension and pavement reinforcement. Purpose: accommodation of larger aircraft. Comments made by various State of Illinois agencies. PB-200 230-F. 15 pages. June 17.

Ryan Airport, Baton Rouge, *Louisiana*. Involves runway extension, overlay and parallel and connecting taxiway. Comments made by various State of Louisiana agencies. PB-199 894-F. 47 pages.

Mankato Municipal Airport project, Mankato, *Minnesota*. Involves construction of

cross-runways, taxiways, lighting, etc. Comments made by various State of Minnesota agencies. PB–199 969–F. 15 pages. June 9.

Albert Lea Municipal Airport project: Albert Lea, *Minnesota*. Involves extension of existing N/S runway, construction of a new NE/SW runway and taxiways, lighting and installation of Visual Approach Slope Indicators, etc. Purpose: to accommodate corporate turbo-jet planes. Reports no adverse comments received. 9 pages. June 17.

Tecumseh Municipal Airport: Tecumseh, *Nebraska*. Involves acquisition of land for a limited airport, including clear zones, NNW/SSE runway, etc. Comments by various State of Nebraska agencies and Department of Interior. PB–199 896–F. 21 pages. June 7.

Wahoo Municipal Airport: Wahoo, *Nebraska*. Involves acquisition of land in fee simple title, paving NE/SW runway, turnaround and taxiway, etc. Comments received from various State of Nebraska agencies and Department of Interior. PB–199 895–F. 23 pages. June 7.

Carson Airport: Carson City, *Nevada*. Land acquisition, runway, taxiway and lighting extensions, apron improvements, and miscellaneous items, including VASI. Comments by Departments of Agriculture, Army Corps of Engineers, Commerce and Interior. PB–198 671–F. 25 pages. June 28.

Goldsboro-Wayne Municipal Airport: Goldsboro, *North Carolina*. Involves reimbursement for land acquired, apron expansion, taxiway construction and installation of VASI. Comments by various State of North Carolina agencies. PB–199 750–F. 12 pages. June 7.

Henryetta Municipal Airport: Henryetta, *Oklahoma*. Involves reconstruction, extension and relocation of highway, construction of taxi turnarounds, and installation of VASI. Comments by various State of Oklahoma agencies and Department of Interior. PB–199 897–F. 17 pages. June 7.

Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton Airport project: Allentown, *Pennsylvania*. Involves extension of runways, expansion of taxiways, aprons, etc. Purpose: to enable larger commercial airplanes to use airport. Comments made by Departments of Commerce. Army Corps of Engineers and Environmental Protection Agency. 25 pages. June 21.

Pierre Municipal Airport: Pierre, *South Dakota*. Construction of runway and taxiway extensions, land acquisition, easements and grading for instrument landing system, etc. Comments made by various State of South Dakota agencies and Department of Interior. PB–199 890–F. 17 pages. June 7.

Maury County Regional Airport: Mt. Pleasant, *Tennessee*. Involves acquistion of land, extension of runway, parking apron, etc. Comments made by various State of Tennessee agencies. PB–199 893–F. 13 pages. June 7.

Harlingen Industrial Airpark project: Harlingen, *Texas*. Involves extension of runway and taxiway, acquisition of land for future expansion and clear zones in order to avoid having to relocate people in the future. Comments by various State of Texas agencies. PB–199 891–F. 23 pages. June 7.

Wayne Wonderland Airport: Loa, *Utah*. Includes runway extension and marking, land acquisition and boundary fencing extension. Comments made by Departments of Agriculture, Commerce and Interior; Agencies—AEC, EPA, FPC. PB–199 970–F. 20 pages. June 9.

Salt Lake City International Airport: Salt Lake, *Utah*. Involves land acquisition, runway and taxiway extension, lighting installation, etc. Comments made by Departments of HEW, Agriculture, Interior and HUD; Agencies—FPC and EPA. PB–200 228–F. 24 pages. June 17.

Federal Highway Administration

Draft: FAS Route 12: construction of a 2-lane facility on new location from point just south of Grove Oak, *Alabama* to a point 2.7 miles north of Geraldine, *Alabama* (5.3 miles). Federal Aid Secondary Project S–2010(101); State Project 1635–J. PB–199 602–D. 7 pages. May 24.

FAS Route 16: replacement of wooden bridge over Copperas Creek in Talladega National Forest, *Alabama* with a paved facility. Purpose: to accommodate wood and timber haulers. Project S–0416(102). PB–199 581–D. 6 pages. June 1.

FAS Route 09: Chilton County, *Alabama*. Paving and widening route from Alabama Highway 183 near the Chilton-Perry County line to a point on the Chilton-Bibb County line (2.8 miles). Project lies within Talladega National Forest. Project S–1109(101). PB–199 576–D. 7 pages. June 2.

Alabama 55: Covington County, *Alabama*. Upgrading of 7.8 miles of highway from point near north limits of Red City to new location, then to existing highway at Covington-Cunecuh County line. Project S–2001 (103). PB–199 628–D. 8 pages. June 3.

US–84: Houston County, *Alabama*. Widening road from 2 to 4 lanes from 1 mile east of the Dothan Circle to point near Gordon. Partially on new location. Will displace 69 residences and 18 businesses. Project F–170 (7). 8 pages. June 18.

Alaska Project S–0653(1): Fairbanks, *Alaska*. Construction of a new roadway connecting Badger Road with Chena Hot Springs Road. PB–199 595–D. 62 pages. May 28.

Richardson Highway: upgrading and realigning highway where it crosses the Chugach Mountains, *Alaska*. A 4(f) determination is attached since project requires realignment through the proposed Keystone Canyon State Park. Projects: F–071–1(2), F–071–1(8), F–071–1(1B) and F–071–1(19). 20 pages. May 28.

Copper River Highway: *Alaska*. Extension of highway within the Chugach Mountains from the confluence of Copper and Tasnuna Rivers across Marshall Pass to Richardson Highway (36 miles). A 4(f) determination is attached as route would bisect proposed Keystone Canyon State Park. Projects S–0851 (32) and S–0851(33). PB–199 727–D. 11 pages. June 8.

Alaska Project S–0389(4): improvement from intersection of Benson Avenue and Rezanoff Drive in northeast direction through Kodiak, *Alaska* to Mill Bay area. Project corridor utilizes Rezanoff Drive and other roadways. Project S–0389(4). 11 pages. June 11.

Petersburg Thru Route: replacement of gravel street with a 2-lane paved facility beginning at the Petersburg Ferry Terminal and extending in a northeast direction through Petersburg, *Alaska* to the tip of Mitkof Island, then proceeding southeast to a point adjacent to the Sandy Recreation Area (3.3 miles). Project S–0937(10). 10 pages. June 21.

Homer Bypass: construction of a 2-lane bypass around the City from the northwest side to the Homer Spit, *Alaska*. Project F–021–1(14). 9 pages. June 24.

I–19 (Nogales-Tucson State Highway): Santa Cruz and Pima Counties, *Arizona*. Construction of 4 sections of highway (Tubac, Amado, Canoa Ranch, Canoa Ranch-Continental). Runs from a point just north of Carmen on US–89 northerly to a point just south of Green Valley (20 miles). Federal Aid Highway project numbers are, respectively: I–19–1(29), I–1901(32), I–19–1(41), I–19–1 (57). PB–199 616–D. 20 pages. June 2.

I–40 (Hualapai Mountain Park): Mohave County, *Arizona*. Construction of a 4-lane secondary highway to serve as a primary means of access between isolated districts of both north and south Kingman and the central business district. Projects US–356(4) (Kingman City limits to US–66); US–356(2) (US–66 to Detroit Avenue); US–356(*) (Detroit Avenue to I–40 T.I.). 19 pages. June 18.

State Highway 59: Benton County, *Arkansas*. Widening and straightening highway from Illinois River Bridge to Siloam Springs. Project S–SU–444(4). PB–199 630–D. 4 pages. June 2.

Batesville TOPICS: Independence County, *Arkansas*. Construction of an overpass across the Missouri Pacific Railroad and Polk Bayou to connect Broad Street with Bayou Street. Length of project about 1,500 feet. Project T–8020(3). 7 pages. June 17.

Manzanita Avenue Bridge: Chico, Butte County, *California*. Reconstruction of bridge on a new alignment over Big Chico Creek in Bidwell Park and reconstruction of approaches. 4(f) report is attached since project is located in Bidwell Park. TOPICS project T–3014. PB–199 640–D. 6 pages. May 27.

State Highway 138: San Bernardino County, *California*. Upgrading, realigning and widening highway from I–15 to Summit Valley (3.8 miles). Will become 60 foot all-paved, limited access facility. Project 08–SBD–138–R15.2/R19.0. 9 pages. June 4.

State Highway 101: Mendocino County, *California*. Widening highway from 2 to 4 lanes on new location between Sonoma County line and Hopland Overhead (8.9 miles). Project 01–Men–101 0.0–8–9 (F–001). 18 pages. June 8.

SR–49: Nevada County, *California*. Construction of a 2-lane controlled access highway on new location from 5.6 miles south of North San Juan to Tyler-Foote Crossing Road (1.9 miles). Project 03–NEV–49 24.6–26.5. PB–199 839–D. 10 pages. June 8.

State Highway 84 (Willow Expressway): San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, *California*. Construction of a 4–lane divided controlled access highway between Santa Cruz Avenue, Palo Alto and the Dumbarton Bridge (6.4 miles). Sensitive areas disrupted by or within the influence of this project are: Stanford Golf Course, El Palo Alto (an ancient redwood tree), El Camino Park, Hopkins Park, San Franscisquito Creek, Willow Oaks Park and Bay Lands. Attached is a report on 4(f) involvement. Project FAP–66, 04–SM, SC1–84. 68 pages. June 15.

State Highway 1: Santa Barbara County, *California*. Freeway construction on new location beginning 2 miles north of the Santa Ynez River and ending at the junction with Route 135. Will require heavy earth work in order to traverse rugged terrain. Project FAP–29, 05–SB–1–23.4/R30.1. 17 pages. June 23.

I–291: Rocky Hill, Wethersfield, Newington, New Britain and Farmington, *Connecticut*. Construction of a belt route around Hartford beginning at the interchange with I–81, extending westerly along the Rocky Hill-Wethersfield boundary into Newington, then northerly along Newington-New Britain boundary to the interchange with I–84 in Farmington. 4(f) documentation attached as route requires undeveloped land from Churchill Park and 7.3 acres of land declared as open space in Newington. Project I–291–4(8)31 and I–IG–291–4(13)34. 62 pages. June 4.

Connecticut 68: widening and reconstruction of roadway on new location between I–91 and North Branford Road (1.4 miles). Wallingford, *Connecticut*. 8 pages. June 10.

Route 289: Lebanon and Windham, *Connecticut*. Widening and realigning highway from just south of the Lebanon-Windham Town line north to Hayden Street (.7 mile). State project 163–92. 6 pages. June 28.

Dover Bypass (Route 13): construction of a bypass beginning at existing Route 13 north of Woodside, Delaware curving northerly to the west of Dover. Also construction of a connecting spur from Frederica to Woodside. Length of 2 projects approximately 19.8 miles. Kent County, *Delaware*. Projects F–89 (23), F–106(12), and F–116(14). PB–199 587–D. 9 pages. June 1.

Delaware Route 2 (Kirkwood Highway): improvement of intersection with Cleveland Avenue and replacement of bridge over the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. New Castle County, Delaware. PB–199 580–4. 5 pages. June 1.

Dover East-West Connector: Dover, *Delaware*. Construction from the west Dover industrial area across the St. Jones River and US–13 to the commercial and governmental complexes along the North-South Connector, US–113. Discusses 4 proposed alternatives. Purpose: to remove traffic from downtown area. 9 pages. June 24.

SR 826 (Sunny Isles Causeway): North Miami Beach, *Florida*. Two stage construction project. First stage involves construction of 8-lane facility with frontage road from SR–5 to point west of the Intracoastal Waterway, also construction of a new 4-lane bridge just north of the existing bridge for westbound traffic. Second stage provides for replacing existing bridge with a new structure. Project F–043–1( ). PB–199 859–D. 8 pages. June 9.

Georgia Project F–010–1(9) and Spur: Troup County, *Georgia*. Replacement of bridge over the Chattahoochee River and improvement of approaches. Purpose: provide better facility between West Point, *Georgia* and Lanett, *Alabama*. 14 pages. June 18.

Kailua-Kawaihae Road (Keahole-Hapuna Section): Hawaii, *Hawaii*. Construction of a 2-lane segment with ultimate development to a 6-lane divided facility along the northwest coastline connecting with the existing roadway at the Keahole Airport and the Hapuna State Park (23 miles). PB–199 734–D. 17 pages. June 8.

I H–3: Oahu, *Hawaii*. Construction of a 6-lane controlled access facility from the Halawa Interchange on the leeward side of Oahu and the Halekou Interchange on the windward side (9.4 miles). 26 pages. June 16.

FAP Route 56 (Kauai Belt Road): Kauai, *Hawaii*. Expansion of route from 2- to 4-lanes beginning at the south end of Kapaa at the Waikaea Bridge and ending at the north end of Kapaa (.95 mile). Includes widening of Moikeha Bridge. June 18.

US–95 (Idaho Forest Highway Route 1): Boundary County, *Idaho*. Reconstruction and partial relocation of highway from junction with SR–1 in Copland to the US-Canadian Boundary near Eastport. 25 pages. June 25.

F.A. Route 25 (East Peoria Bypass): Tazewell County, *Illinois*. Construction of 6 miles of highway to bypass city of East Peoria. 14 pages. PB–199 662–D. June 4.

F.A. Route 25: Richland County, *Illinois*. Reconstruction, widening and relocation of highway from the north corporate limits of Olney to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad (1.5 miles). 4(f) documentation attached as route requires small amount of land from the Olney City Park and Fairgrounds. Project F–274. 16 pages. June 8.

US–24 (F.A. Route 172): Tazewell and Woodford Counties, *Illinois*. Construction of a bypass around Washington and Eureka beginning west of Washington to a point east of Eureka (13 miles). 15 pages. June 8.

F.A. Route 17: Shelby County, *Illinois*. Reconstruction and widening (4-lanes) from Washington Street in Shelbyville easterly to the Moultrie County line near Windsor (14.5 miles). Will displace 25 residences and a business. Also will require 180 acres of agricultural land; 8 acres of this land comes under Section 4(f). Project F–58( ). 12 pages. June 18.

US–50: Martin and Lawrence Counties, *Indiana*. Upgrading route from Loogootee to SR–60 in the vicinity of Bryantsville (22 miles). Crosses through a portion of Hoosier National Forest. 12 pages. June 2.

Federal Aid Secondary Route 644: Bartholomew County, *Indiana*. Involves replacing bridge over the East Fork of White River and the appurtenant approach work. 4(f) determination attached as structure will require .49 acre permanent land use from the Azalia Public Fishing Site. Project S–834(2). 17 pages. June 11.

I–129: Woodbury County, *Iowa*. Construction of a new crossing of the Missouri River south of Sioux City, Iowa (1 mile). Project I–129–6. 9 pages, June 22.

US–63: Davis County, *Iowa*. Construction of a 2-lane facility partially on new location from point on the Missouri State line northerly to its junction with Iowa 2 (10.9 miles). Project F–63–1. 7 pages. June 24.

US–59: Douglas County, *Kansas*. Upgrading and widening highway from Lawrence to the Kansas-Oklahoma line. Projects (SF) 59–23 F–067–2(23) and (SF) 59–23 U–067–2 (25). PB–199 626–D. 13 pages. June 7.

US–169 and K–279 (Osawatomie Bypass): Miami County, *Kansas*. Relocation of US–169 from its junction with K–7 to a point near the intersection of Marais Des Cynges River and First Street. Involves construction of 13 bridges. Length of project about 7 miles. Projects 169–61 F–081–1(22) and 279–61 K–100–1(1). PB–199 729–D. 7 pages. June 8.

US–50: Reno County, *Kansas*. Upgrading and widening road from the Reno-Stafford County line to a point 1.5 miles north of Sylvia (about 4.8 miles). Discusses 2 location studies. Location A would require land from the city park and Sylvia Grade School. Project 50–78 RF 050–4(36). 22 pages. June 22.

Kentucky 14 and Kentucky 16: Boone County, *Kentucky*. Upgrading and widening from western terminus of I–75 in Walton extending eastward along existing roadway and then continuing southeastward to a tie-in with US–25. Project S749. PB–199 629–D. 5 pages. June 3.

Kentucky 15 (Hazard Bypass): Perry County, *Kentucky*. Construction on new location of a 4-lane facility around Hazard (2.24 miles). PB–199 736–D. 9 pages. June 8.

Lexington-Versailles Road: widening .3 mile of road between intersection with Mason-Headly Rd. and Oxford City East junction. Fayette County, *Kentucky*. Project T 3003(1). 7 pages. June 25.

Kentucky 90 (Burkesville-Monticello-Burnside Road): Wayne County, *Kentucky*. Construction generally on new alignment of a 2-lane highway beginning 5.3 miles southwest of Monticello and then bearing off to the east for a distance of 100 ft. before merging with KY–90 near west city limits of Monticello. Requires 95 acres of land and will displace 18 residences, etc. Project S10(9). PB–199 573–D. 9 pages. May 28.

Lafitte-Larose Highway: Jefferson and Lafourche Parishes, *Louisiana*. Twenty-eight miles of new highway between Lafitte and Larose. Highway is designed as a 4-lane divided facility, but initial construction will consist of 2-lanes. About 1,018 acres will be required of which 636 acres is fresh and salt water marshland, 252 acres is swampland and 130 acres is presently residential or potentially residential. State project 700–06–82. PB–199 591–D. 9 pages. May 28.

I–220 (Shreveport Bypass): Cado and Bossier Parishes, *Louisiana*. Construction on new location of a 4-lane divided highway from I–20 and Buncombe Rd. to I–20 on the north side of Barksdale Air Force Base (17.6 miles). A 4(f) determination is attached as route includes construction of a bridge over Cross Lake, Shreveport's water supply reservoir. Federal Aid Project I–220–1(37)13. 11 pages. June 14.

I–83: Baltimore, *Maryland*. Construction of a 6-lane, controlled access highway passing through the neighborhoods of Highlandtown, Canton and Fells Point. A 4(f) report on Fells Point is included since this section is considered to be an historic area. Project I–83–1(44). PB–199 608–D. 12 pages. June 2.

Maryland Route 197: Prince Georges County, *Maryland*. Relocation of route from 1.7 miles of SR–450 to proposed County relocation of Jericho Park Road (1.3 miles). 14 pages. June 7.

Maryland Route 414 and I–495: Prince Georges County, *Maryland*. Construction of a series of interchange ramps to connect the two highway systems. 11 residences and 6 businesses will be dislocated. Federal Aid Project I–495–2(179)38. PB–199 735–D. 5 pages. June 7.

Maryland Route 2: Baltimore, *Maryland*. Replacement of Hanover Street Bridge over the Patapsco River and upgrading approaches. Project U 903–1(300). PB–199 726–D. 4 pages. June 8.

Route 52: Worcester, *Massachusetts*. (Statement deals with a portion of highway project.) Construction of a limited access expressway from Gold Star Boulevard to just north of Shore Drive. This segment will result in the loss of about 10.6 acres of Indian Lake's surface area. Several alternatives are being considered. (Another statement will be written dealing with highway project to Route 140 interchange in West Boylston.) 160 pages. June 18.

I–94 Business Loop: replacement of bridge structure over the St. Joseph River between Benton Harbor and St. Joseph, *Michigan*. Purpose: to accommodate traffic and to enable boats of all sizes to pass under bridge without causing traffic delays. 4(f) document attached since project will require .4 acre of river front park owned by Benton Harbor. PB–199 601–D. 21 pages. May 27.

Trunk Highway 55: Minneapolis, *Minnesota*. Upgrading to freeway standards from T.H. 5 at Fort Snelling to T.H. 35W and T.H. 94 (5.9 miles). A 4(f) determination is attached as relocation of highway would go through Minnehaha Park and Longfellow Gardens. Project F 022–1. PB–199 575–D. 30 pages. June 1.

SR–25: Winston County, *Mississippi*. Relocation of highway from a point north of Louisville continuing in a northeast direction for 5.5 miles. Project SP–056–1 (A). PB–199 627–D. 4 pages. June 4.

Route 61: Lincoln County, *Missouri*. Addition of 2 lanes making a 4-lane facility from a point just south of the Pike-Lincoln County line to a point north of Route E (6.5 miles). Project F–61–4(17). PB–199 586–D. 5 pages. June 1.

Route 71: Andrew County, *Missouri*. Construction of a full access facility on new location from its junction with Route 59 to the intersections of I–29 and I–229 (5.6 miles). Project F–FG–71–7(1). PB–199 866–D. 5 pages. June 10.

Route 13 (Crane Bypass): Stone County, *Missouri*. Construction on new location, passing along the west edge of Crane (3 miles). Project F–FG–13–1(2). PB–199 858–D. 4 pages. June 14.

Route 3: Randolph County, *Missouri*. Reconstruction, partially on new location, from 4.4 miles south of Macon County to US–24 in Randolph County (12.4 miles). Project S–627(6). 6 pages. June 16.

I–453: Clay and Platte Counties, *Missouri*. Construction of a 4- to 6-lane facility to serve as a circumferential route for Kansas City (15.6 miles). Project I–435–1(81) and I–435–1(83). 5 pages. June 21.

Route 54: Callaway County, *Missouri*. Addition of one lane to form a dual highway between Fulton and Jefferson City. Project F–FG–54–3( ). June 25.

Midland Boulevard: St. Louis County, *Missouri*. Extension of roadway westwardly to Dorsett Road, with the construction of an interchange and grade separation at Lindbergh Boulevard (SR–66 TR). Project T–4189(24). 5 pages. June 28.

I–90 (Drexel East & West): 5.3 miles of highway construction (4-lane limited access) in the St. Regis River Canyon near Drexel, *Montana*. 150 acres of right-of-way through Canyon will be required. Project I–90–1(12) 22. 13 pages. June 1.

Highway 89: Teton and Cascade Counties, *Montana*. Reconstruction and widening beginning at Freezeout Lake, about 4 miles northwest of Fairfield to point southeast of Fairfield (9.6 miles). Project F–65(7). 14 pages. June 15.

Ryegate-East: Golden Valley County, *Montana*. Proposed project will begin at a point just east of Ryegate and proceed west to point on US–12. Discusses alternative routes

for project. The length of each is about 12 miles. Project F–268(7). 11 pages. June 23.

I–90: Big Timber, *Montana*. Construction of a 4-lane divided highway between Big Timber and Greycliff (10.5 miles). 4(f) determination attached as route would go through Fireman's Island which is used as a picnic area. Project I 90–7(18) 364. 50 pages. June 22.

I–15 (The Teton River North & South Project): 7.1 miles of 4-lane interstate highway construction between Great Falls, *Montana* and the international boundary at Sweetgrass, *Montana*. Project I 15–6(2)305. 12 pages. May 24.

Highway 2: Flathead County, *Montana*. Widening to 4-lane facility between Hungry Horse and West Glacier (10.9 miles). Purpose: to improve access to Glacier National Park. Some forest land will be cleared and some parkland will be required for highway expansion. Project F 257(16). 15 pages. May 28.

North 72nd Street: Omaha, *Nebraska*. Rebuilding road from a 2- to 4-lane facility between Ames Avenue and a point 400 ft. north of Redick Ave. (1.4 miles). A 4(f) report is attached since route goes through the Benson Golf Course. Project SU–147(13). PB–199 635–D. 39 pages. June 3.

Hastings-Grand Island Freeway: Hall, Adams, Hamilton and Merrick Counties, *Nebraska*. (A relocation study for segments of US–281 & US–30) Construction of a controlled access 4-lane divided (64 ft. median) highway between cities of Hastings and Grand Island. Length of project 31 miles. Right-of-way acquisition will vary from a minimum of 800 acres (Study Route 7) to a maximum of 1210 acres. (Study Route 1). Project F–215(12). 34 pages. June 14.

US–77 and US6 (Cornhusker Highway): Lincoln, *Nebraska*. Involves widening 2.1 mile segment of US–77 at the intersection of 56th Street and Cornhusker Highway in Lincoln, Nebraska, north to interchange with I–80. Widening 1.6 mile segment of US–6 from end of 4-lane divided section at 52nd Street to intersection at 70th Street. Projects F–155(6) and F–312(23). 12 pages. June 25.

New Hampshire Route 26: Colebrook, *New Hampshire*. Reconstruction on new location of highway from intersection with US–3 for a distance of 1.7 miles. Project S–201(1), P–7860. PB–199 861–D. 7 pages. June 8.

Route 130: Burlington County, *New Jersey*. Replacement of narrow lift bridge with a 6-lane high level bridge on new alignment across Rancocas Creek, upgrading approaches and constructing an interchange. Twenty-two residence and 8 commercial establishments will be displaced. 7 pages. June 15.

New Mexico 104: reconstruction and upgrading of highway from San Miguel and Quay County lines, *New Mexico* to Tucumcari (5.7 miles). Project S–1420. PB–199 610–D. 6 pages. June 3.

FAS 1418: San Miguel County, *New Mexico*. Replacement of dirt road with surfaced road from 6 miles west of US–85 to 1 mile west of US–85 (about 5 miles). Project S–1418(1). PB–199 860–D. 11 pages. June 9.

SR–95: construction of 2-lane facility to replace dirt road from intersection with US–84 westerly for 4 miles. *New Mexico*. Near proposed Heron Dam Site, a Bureau of Reclamation project. Project S–1523(3). PB–199 865–D. 4 pages. June 9.

US–62/180: Hobbs, *New Mexico*. Widening highway from 2- to 4-lanes from junction with SR–483 to the west Hobbs city limits (11.1 miles). Project F–022–2(5) and F–022–2(11). PB–199 857–D. 4 pages. June 14.

SR–3: upgrading route (2-lanes) between Mora, *New Mexico* and Las Vegas, *New Mexico* (9.8 miles). Projects S–1426(15) and S–1426(16). 9 pages. June 18.

SR–3: upgrading route beginning 1.7 miles north of Mora, *New Mexico* and continuing north for 4.7 miles. Project S–1426(17). 12 pages. June 24.

SR–22: Westchester County, *New York*. Widening route from 4- to 6-lanes between Katonah and Croton Falls (6.1 miles). Project PIN 8061.00. PB–199 582–D. 22 pages. May 26.

SR–5 (Great Western Gateway Bridge): Schenectady County, *New York*. Involves replacement of bridge over the Mohawk River and Barge Canal between Scotia and Schenectady. Also involves construction work on approaches. 4(f) determination attached since land from Collins Park and the "Sanders' Mansion is required. Project PIN 1383.00. PB–199 642–D. 39 pages. May 27.

SR–27 (Westmoreland Street): Oneida County, *New York*. Construction, mostly on same alignment, of 2–12 ft. wide travel lanes from point near Judd Road proceeding easterly to point just inside Whitesboro Village limits (2 miles). Project PIN 2082.00. PB–199 600–D. 15 pages. May 28.

SR–8 (Miller Road): Oneida County, *New York*. Relocation of highway between Utica and Poland, *New York*. Project PIN 2016.10. PB–199 631–D. 16 pages. May 28.

Route 9: widening road from 2- to 6-lanes between I–84 and SR–52 in Fishkill, Dutchess County, *New York* (1.4 miles). Project PIN 8381.00. 13 pages. June 4.

I–88 (The Susquehanna Expressway): construction of segment of expressway between Binghamton, *New York* and the eastern boundary of Oneonta, *New York*. (Some parts of this segment not covered in statement.) Project PIN 9357.00, .07 & .18. PB–199 740–D. 21 pages. June 7.

US–11 (SH–5283 & SH–8476): St. Lawrence County, *New York*. Reconstruction of highway from Gouverneur-DeKalb junction through Town of Richville to Redrock Crossing (6.7 miles). Discusses 3 alternate routes within Richville. Project PIN 7043.01. PB–199 862–D. 13 pages. June 9.

Canandaigua Southwest Connector: Ontario County, *New York*. Construction of a southwest arterial highway from west city line to South Main Street. 4(f) determination required as route will take small part of Red Jacket Park. PIN 4113.00. PB–199 853–D. 8 pages. June 11.

SH–258 (Piru Bridge): construction of a new bridge over Little Ausable River and improvement of approaches. Piru, Clinton County, *New York*. Project PIN 7130.04. 12 pages. June 14.

Route 253 (SH–1499A): Monroe County, *New York*. Replacement of Browns Bridge with a new bridge and highway approaches to span the Genesee River. Will connect Wheatland and Henrietta, *New York*. Project PIN 4124.00. 10 pages. June 14.

US–11: Antwerp County Line-Jefferson County, *New York*. Reconstruction of a 3.9 mile segment from Antwerp Village Line to the Jefferson-St. Lawrence County Line generally on existing alignment (2 lanes). Project PIN 7057.00. 11 pages. June 14.

SR–28: Oneida County, *New York*. Reconstruction, primarily on same alignment, of route beginning at interchange in Alder Creek and terminating at the Hamlet of Woodgate. Will require 3 acres of land from Oneida County reforestation lands and 4 acres from state conservation lands. Project PIN 2289.00. 21 pages. June 14.

Freeman-Elkland (County Road 85): Steuben County, *New York*. Upgrading road in Tuscarora, *New York* (1 mile). Project PIN 6243.01. 14 pages. June 15.

SR–12: reconstruction and resurfacing 3 segments of route in Jefferson County, *New York*. Project PIN 7197.00. 17 pages. June 18.

Doansburg Road (County Road 65): Putnam County, *New York*. Replacement of bridge over East Branch of the Croton River. Project PIN 8554.01. 5 pages. June 21.

SR–3: widening and resurfacing from point just west of Watertown and Hounsfield Town line, *New York* to I–81 (1.6 miles), Jefferson County, *New York*. Project PIN 7015.04. 7 pages. June 21.

LaSalle Arterial, Erie-Highland Arterial and Rainbow Boulevard: Niagara Falls, *New York*. Involves these three highway facilities in the initial segment of an arterial highway system for downtown Niagara Falls. Purpose: provide a direct connection between the highway systems in this country and Canada. Project PIN 5041.02. 18 pages. June 22.

Irondequoit-Wayne County Line Expressway: Monroe County, *New York*. Construction of final section of expressway on new location from Five Mile Rd. to County Line Rd. in Webster (5.3 miles). Project PIN 4107.00. 11 pages. June 23.

I–85: construction of a truck weigh station at the Lowell City limits. Gaston County, *North Carolina*. State project 8.16365 and F.A. Project I–85–1(23)31. PB–199 598–D. 9 pages. May 27.

North Carolina 213: Madison County, *North Carolina*. Reconstruction and relocation beginning at the existing interchange at the US–25–70 Marshall Bypass to Mars Hill (7.2 miles). State project 6.801571. PB–199 579–D. 14 pages. May 28.

US–25–70: Buncombe-Madison Counties, *North Carolina*. Construction of 4-lane freeway on new location from Marshall to Weaverville to coincide with existing US–19 and 23 (8.8 miles). State Project 6.801760. PB–199 618–D. 23 pages. May 28.

US–64: Nash County, *North Carolina*. Relocation of highway, straightening and widening (4-lanes), from intersection with NC–231 to the Nashville Bypass (11 miles). Will serve as a bypass of Spring Hope and Momeyer. Federal Air Freeway project US–64. PB–199 583–D. 25 pages. May 28.

Owen Drive Freeway: Cumberland County, *North Carolina*. Construction of freeway from Owen Drive, south of Raeford Road, on new location to Reilly Road. Highway will connect Fayetteville and Fort Bragg. Project 6.801786. PB–199 625–D. 27 pages. June 4.

US–220: Montgomery County, *North Carolina*. Construction of Candor-Biscoe-Star Bypass (14.3 miles). Project 6.801737. PB–199 864–D. 13 pages. June 10.

SR–2480 (Sugar Creek Road): involves widening road to 5-lanes from I–85 interchange to Derita, North Carolina and improving intersection with Derita Rd. and Mineral Springs Rd. Mecklenburg County, *North Carolina*. Project 6.801826. 10 pages. June 16.

US–75 (Kings Mountain Bypass): Gaston and Cleveland Counties, *North Carolina*. Relocation and upgrading from 1 mile west of Bethware School to the interchange of I–85 east of Kings Mountain (7.3 miles). Will displace 120 families and 3 businesses. State project 6.801783. 16 pages. June 21.

Secondary Road 1211: Graham County, *North Carolina*. Replacement of existing roadway with a 2-lane highway from US–129 in Robbinsville to intersection with NC–28 (about 9 miles). Project 6.801738. 15 pages. June 22.

SR–41: Clark County, *Ohio*. Widening route in the towns of German and Springfield and in the city of Springfield to allow for increased traffic as a result of relocation of State Route No. USR 68 and the opening of a shopping center. Project CLA–SR 41–19.28 (S–US–103(6)). PB–199 572–D. 17 pages. May 13.

Athens Country Road C–23: Athens, *Ohio*. Construction of a 2-lane road beginning at the intersection of US–33 and town road T–251 to a point in the alignment of SR–682 at town roads T–404 and T–242 (3.5 miles). Project S–1611(1), ATH–CR–23. PB–199 571–D. 7 pages. May 18.

SR–772: Ross County, *Ohio*. Reconstruction of route generally on new alignment from 1.3 miles southwest of Chillicothe to Paint Street at its crossing with the B&O Railroad in Chillicothe (1.5 miles). Involves constructing a new bridge over Paint Creek. 33.5 acres of land will be required. Project S–SU–1257(4); ROS–772–14.18. PB–199 588–D. 6 pages. May 18.

SR–571: Darke County, *Ohio*. Upgrading and realigning highway between Union City and Greenville. Project DARKE–SR 571–0.00. PB–199 607–D. 21 pages. June 1.

SR–93: relocation of route beginning 2 miles north of Baltic, *Ohio*, and terminating 1 mile north of Sugarcreek, Ohio (6 miles). Project HOL/TUS–93–1.70/1.08 (S–969[11]). 6 pages. June 14.

SR–76: relocation of route from Penn Central Railroad, south of the village of Holmesville, to the intersection of Main St. and Vermillion St. (¾ mile). *Ohio*. Purpose: to remove 2 right-angle turns. Project HOL–SR–76–13.95. 7 pages. June 14.

SR–43 (Market Avenue): widening 2- and 3-lane facility to 4 lanes from 30th St. N.W. to 55th St. (2 miles). Canton, *Ohio*. Project U–459(13). 10 pages. June 15.

I–71 (Northeast Expressway): Cincinnati, *Ohio*. Construction of 8-lane freeway, necessary interchanges, ramps, etc., beginning north of Melish Ave. to point just east of Victory Parkway (0.9 mile). Will complete construction project for I–71. 4(f) approval given (5/5) for land required from Walnut Hills Playfield and Victory Park. Project I–71–1(31)04. 14 pages. June 15.

US–68: Champaign County, *Ohio*. Construction of 4-lane highway from north of the Clark-Champaign County line north to Urbana (13 miles). Project also involves relocating SR–55 (2.1 miles), etc. Project F–1108(3) and F–U–1108(4); State project CHP–US 68–0.19 and 6.42. 15 pages. June 17.

SR–123 and SR–63: Proposed project relates to improvements in Lebanon, *Ohio*. The purpose is to alleviate traffic congestion on Main Street. Project WAR–63/123–6.37/15.13/17/58 (Unprogrammed). 6 pages. June 28.

SR–41: Adams County, *Ohio*. Relocation of 1.8 mile portion of highway from near Ohio Brush Creek on new alignment to just north of County Road No. 134.m Jacksonville. Project S–1378(3); ADA–41–22.40. 5 pages. June 28.

SH–33: Delaware County, *Oklahoma*. Construction on new location (4–lane right of way) of a 2–lane highway from .5 mile north of the junction of US–59, SH–33 and SH–10 extending easterly to the Arkansas State Line (approximately 13 miles). Project F–398; PB–199 597–D; 10 pages. May 27.

SH–3: Coal County, *Oklahoma*. 6 miles of construction on a new alignment from point just west of Centrahoma to a point northwesterly in an undeveloped area. Project F–236; PB–199 593–D; 9 pages. May 27.

US–62: Cherokee County, *Oklahoma*. Construction on a new alignment of a 4–lane highway beginning at the east urban limits of Tahloquah and extending just east of the junction of SH–10 (1.6 miles). Project F–508; PB–199 594–D; 7 pages. May 27.

SH–51: Payne County, *Oklahoma*. Addition of 2-lanes to existing highway beginning at Western Avenue in Stillwater continuing westerly 5.5 miles. Project F–176; PB–199 590–D; 5 pages. May 28.

US–183: Custer County, *Oklahoma*. Reconstruction (widening, resurfacing, etc.) beginning at the Washita River Bridge north of Clinton and extending northerly through Arapaho to point just north of SH–33 (approximately 8 miles). Project F–332; PB–199 585–D; 8 pages. May 28.

US–62: Lawton, *Oklahoma*. Consists of developing an interchange at the intersection of two planned expressways, the Rogers Lane Expressway and the Pioneer Expressway. Project U–232; PB–199 592–D; 7 pages. May 28.

SH–99: Osage County, *Oklahoma*. Relocation of highway at the Junction of SH–11 south of Pawhuska, and extending northerly 9.6 miles to the present SH–99 and SH–60 Junction. Project F–335; PB–199 619–D; 8 pages. May 28.

US–183: Tillman County, *Oklahoma*. Relocation of highway separation and necessary connecting roadway beginning four miles north of Manitou extending northerly 1.5 miles, crossing St. Louis and San Francisco Railway. Project F–268; PB–199 578–D; 7 pages. June 1.

US–270. LeFlore County, *Oklahoma*. Construction generally along same alignment. Beginning at the Junction of US 270–US 271 west of Wister and extending east 6.0 miles to Wister. Project F–82; PB–199 574–D; 6 pages. June 1.

Federal Aid Secondary Route 6018: Stillwater, *Oklahoma*. Upgrading road to 4-lanes from the intersection of US 177 and 12th St., west on 12th St. to Western Rd., north on Western Rd. to McGeorge Ave., east on McGeorge Ave. to US 177, and from the intersection of Washington St. and McGeorge Ave., north on Washington St. to US 177. Project SU–6018(100)c. 14 pages. June 2.

FAS–4504: McCurtain County, *Oklahoma*. Construction of a 2-lane road on a new alignment beginning east of Wright City and terminating 10 miles north west of Broken Bow (3.7 miles). (Industrial Access Road) Project S–CS–4529; 6 pages. June 11.

US–60: Osage County, *Oklahoma*. Construction of 20.4 miles of 4-lane highway from Pawhuska, northeast to point near US–60 and SH–123 Junction. Statement makes no mention of fact that route will go through Pawhuska Indian Village Reserve. Project F–152 and F–252; 11 pages. June 18.

SH–144: Pushmatsha County, *Oklahoma*. Relocation and widening highway beginning north of Dunbar. Project S–622; 8 pages. June 18.

US–169: Tulsa and Rogers Counties, *Oklahoma*. Initial 2-lane construction generally on a new alignment from Collinsville to a point north of Talala (16.9 miles). Right-of-way wide enough for an ultimate 4-lane facility. Project F–267; 11 pages. June 18.

US–62: Grady County, *Oklahoma*. Consists of providing an adequate Primary State Highway from Washita River east of Chickasha to point 3 miles northeast of Tabler (7.6 miles). Project F–202; 8 pages. June 21.

Oregon Forest Highway (Klamath Lake-West Side Highway); Klamath County, *Oregon*. Construction of 2.9 miles highway through US National Forest. Project 48–1(4); 24 pages; PB–199 623–D. June 4.

US–99W: Pacific Highway West, Portland, *Oregon*. Closing portion of Harbor Drive by rerouting traffic on Front Avenue and other city streets and freeways. Purpose: to create open space for river front development. (Federal-Aid Primary Route 9). 24 pages. June 22.

Legislative Route 1022 (Sections 8 and 9): Somerset County, *Pennsylvania*. Replacement of portion of traffic Route 219, from intersection of LR 1 and LR 85143 to the intersection of LR 55036 and Township RD. 616. (Total distance, 8 miles). Roadway will be linked between I–80, traffic Route 22, and I–76. Will expose coal seams. PB–199 623–D; 27 pages. June 4.

I–95: (Delaware Expressway)—Delaware and Philadelphia Counties, *Pennsylvania*. Relocation and upgrading of highway segments LR 795–B, LR 67054–11, and LR 762–3, near the Philadelphia International Airport (3.6 miles). Route will cross Tinicum Marsh. PB–199 731–D; 27 pages. June 8.

Legislative Route 40124, Section 2: Luzerne County, *Pennsylvania*. Upgrading road 2-lanes between the intersection with US–309 and Caverton Road in Truckville and the intersection of 8th St. and Caverton Road in Kingston. Strip of land from Francis Slocum State Park is required for right-of-way. 4(f) report attached. Project 8–40124–04–002–043. 21 pages. June 15.

Legislative Route 10041 (Section A01): Butler County, *Pennsylvania*. Relocation of .34 mile out of highway, including new bridge over Little Connoquenessing Creek. Route runs from just east of bridge over I–79, north. 7 pages. June 16.

PR–23: (F.D. Roosevelt Avenue)—San Juan, *Puerto Rico*. Extension of road as depressed roadway crossing to the intersection with Barbosa Ave. Project U–23–1(3); PB–199 867–D; 10 pages. June 10.

Woonsocket Industrial Highway: *Rhode Island*. Proposed construction would run from Route 146 beteen I–295 and Woonsocket Northeasterly to Mendon Rd. (SR 22). Discusses 4 location alternatives. Project SU–0325(2); PB–199 868–D; 20 pages. June 9.

Downtown Loop Freeway: Greenville, *South Carolina*. Construction of a multi-lane divided highway from I–385 to Pendleton Street, including interchanges. A 4(f) determination is attached since Meadowbrook Ball Park belonging to the city will be required. PB–199 641–D; 21 pages. May 28.

US–1: Richland County, *South Carolina*. Upgrading to 4-lane highway from I–20 easterly to point near SR–1274 (4.3) miles. Project F–035–2; PB–199 621–D; 12 pages. June 3.

State Routes 32 and 35 (Newport By-pass): Cocke County, *Tennessee*. Upgrading to a 4-lane arterial route around Newport beginning at junction with I–40 continuing northeastward to SR–35 (approximately 5 miles). Alternate routes discussed. Alternate B could effect the Richland Park area. Project F–035–2( ); PB–199 589–D; 9 pages. May 25.

State Route 29: Hamilton County, *Tennessee*. Construction of four-lane divided highway 3 miles south of Thrashfield Road to point near Hodgetown (14.75 miles). FA Project F–029–1, State Project 33036–0212–04. PB–199 577–D; 17 pages. May 28.

SR–68: Meigs, McMinn Counties, *Tennessee*. Realignment and widening from Boggs Crossroads continuing in an easterly direction to 1 mile west of I–75, (8.2 miles). Project F–077–2(2); 7 pages; PB–199 606–D. June 2.

Secondary Route 2373: Sullivan County. *Tennessee*. Replacement of bridge and improvement of approaches over the South Fork Holston River between Caylors and Silver Grove. Project S–2373(10); 5 pages. June 7.

SR–29, US–27: Morgan County, *Tennessee*. Improvement and reconstruction of route from the intersection with SR–62 southeast of Wartburg to point about 1 mile north of Emory River on a new alignment (3.7 miles). Federal-Aid Project F–031–1( ), State Project 65001–5227–04; 8 pages. June 17.

SR 29: Morgan County, *Tennessee*. Construction of a new bridge and improvement of approaches over the Southern Railway south of Sunbright. Project F–031–1( ). 6 pages. June 17.

SR–61: Anderson-Roane Counties, *Tennessee*. Extension of 4-lane highway from existing route southwest of Oliver Springs to existing route southeast of Oliver Springs (1.7 miles). Purpose: bypass Oliver Springs. Project F–079–1( ); 28 pages. June 23.

I–27: Randall County, *Texas*. Construction of a 4-lane controlled access facility from the Swisher County line to 13 miles south of Amarillo. Will require 955 acres of land. PB–199 584–D; 12 pages. June 1.

US–69: Angelina County, *Texas*. Widening highway from 2 to 4-lanes beginning at the Cherokee County Line to SH 7 (4 miles). Relocating southbound highway 125 feet west of existing roadway. Project F–353; 21 pages; PB–199 863–D. June 11.

US–287 and SH–19: Houston County, *Texas*. Construction party on new location of a 4-lane facility from .5 miles south of the city limits of Grapeland north to the Anderson County Line. Three miles will be on new location and the remaining 3.1 miles will be constructed along existing route using present highway for south bound traffic. Project F–485(—); 22 pages. June 14.

SH Loop 288: Denton County, *Texas*. Construction of 4-lane facility from I–35, north of Denton, east and south to present Loop 288 at SH 24 east of Denton (6.3 miles). Also construction from IH 35E, south of Denton,

west to I–35H southwest of Denton (4.2 miles). Project S–2316; 7 pages. June 16.

US Highway 287: Wilbarger County, *Texas*. Upgrading from 2 to 4-lanes of 10.6 miles of highway beginning at the Wilbarger-Hardeman County Line continuing southeast to Pease River. Project F–501 and F–451; 8 pages. June 18.

Loop Highway 143: Construction of 2 13-foot lanes beginning at SH–15 proceeding north along a country road then continuing west to US–83 (1.7 miles). Perryton, *Texas*. 16 pages. June 21.

Interstate Highway 35E: Dallas and Denton Counties, *Texas*. Addition of one lane in each direction to 4-lane freeway between Dallas and Denton. Project I 35E–6. 5 pages. June 21.

IH–35: San Antonio, *Texas*. Widening from 4- to 6-lanes between Durango Boulevard South and Nogalitos Street (1.6 miles). Project I–35–2; 16 pages. June 26.

Forest Hill Avenue: Richmond, *Virginia*. Widening of the bridge and approaches over the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad (.2 miles). Project T–5502(6); PB–199 634–D; 6 pages. May 26.

Routes 7 and 716: Fairfax County, *Virginia*. Project consists of upgrading Route 7 to 6 lanes from the west corporate limits of Alexandria to point just past Bailey's Crossroads (about 1.4 miles). Also involves upgrading to 6-lanes route 716 from west corporate limits of Alexandria northeasterly to Carlyn Springs Road (about 0.5 mile). Project F–070–1 and S–734, respectively. 8 pages. June 18.

US–220 (Southwest Freeway): Roanoke, *Virginia*. Construction of 4-lane freeway from point just south of Franklin Road to point just south of Route 419 (2.6 miles). Federal Project F–03–1 ( ). 7 pages. June 24.

US–58 and 220: Henry County, *Virginia*. Construction of partial circumferential bypass of Martinsville, Colesville, Fieldale, Fontaine and Chatmos. It appears to be about 14 to 15 miles in length. Will displace 60 families and 7 businesses. Federal projects F–03–3 ( ) and F–024–1 ( ); 5 pages. June 24.

SR–525: (Swantown Road), Island County, *Washington*. Construction of a channelized intersection at junction of Swantown Road, Fort Nupert Road and SR–525 near Oak Harbor. Project S–0211; PB–199 599–D; 6 pages. May 25.

SR–127 and SR–195 (Colfax Bypass): Whitman County, *Washington*. Involves 3 projects to provide a bypass around Colfax and relative traffic on above routes. Projects F–037–1 ( ), F–037–1 ( ) and F–037–2 ( ); PB–199 596–D; 10 pages. May 26.

SR–12: Walla Walla County, *Washington*. Widening highway from Walla to Waitsburg along existing route, except for bypassing Dixie to the west (16 miles). Project F–018–5; PB–199 260–D; 4 pages. May 24.

SR–26: Adams County, *Washington*. Relocation and upgrading of highway from Washtucna to Hooper (10.5 miles). Project S–0292, L–3347; PB–199 605–D; 10 pages. June 1.

SR–27: (Campus Loop Road), Construction of an ultimate 4-lane facility around Pullman, *Washington*. (Area known as Palouse Country.) Project F–044–1, and L–3874; PB–199 612–D; 3 pages. June 1.

SR–2: Chelan County, *Washington*. Replacement of interchange at the (Wenatchee Ave.) west approach to the Columbia River Bridge with a new loop ramp. Stevens St. will also be built from the bridge to its intersection with Mission St. A 4(f) report is attached since route goes through City Park. Project F–028–1; PB–199 609–D; 11 pages. June 3.

I–5: Vancouver, *Washington*. Expansion of Vancouver freeway from 4 to 6 lanes between Columbia River Bridge and Burnt Bridge Creek. 150 families will be dislocated. A 4(f) Determination is attached as route skirts George C. Marshall and Leverich Parks, taking about ½ acre from each. Project I–05–1; PB–199 728–D; 19 pages June 8.

SR–24: Reconstruction or route between Sagehill Road to the junction with State Route 26 (5.6 miles) Primarily follows alignment of a former country road. Othello, Adams County, *Washington*. 8 pages. June 15.

US–12: Dane County, *Wisconsin*. Rebuilding to freeway standards a portion of the South Madison Belt Line between Fish Hatchery Rd. and I–90 (6 miles). Includes relocation between Raywood Rd. and Highway 51. Project F 04–2, ID 1206–0–00; PB–199 617–D; 12 pages. June 3.

USH–51: Freeway construction beginning at the Lincoln County Line and extending northerly to the junction with existing USH–51 a little over a mile north of Merrill, *Wisconsin* (6.5 miles). Purpose: bypass of Merrill, FAP Route 5–4–1; ID 1173–2–00; 11 pages. June 11.

US–51: Freeway construction on a new alignment from the north terminus of the Wausau Belt Line to an interchange with existing highway 51 near the north limits of the city of Merrill. Marathon and Lincoln Counties, *Wisconsin*. FAP Route F–3(4) and ID 1175–1–00; 15 pages. June 11.

State Trunk Highway 59 to County Trunk Highway "Y" Road (south bypass): Waukesha County, *Wisconsin*. FAS Route 1462 (County Trunk Highway "A"): Construction of an ultimate 4-lane bypass of the city of Waukesha. Runs from State Trunk Highway "59" to County Trunk Highway "Y". Project S 1462( ) and ID 273–3–00; 14 pages. June 21.

Kendall-Elroy Road (State Trunk Highway 71): Monroe and Juneau Counties, *Wisconsin*. Reconstruction and widening of road beginning in Kendall and ending at the intersection with highways 80 and 82 in Elroy (approximately 6 miles). Will require 82 acres of agricultural land and 6.1 acres of Wisconsin's Bikeway property. A 4(f) Determination is attached. Project S–313 ( ); 21 pages. June 23.

Chippewa River Bridge and Approaches: Sawyer County, *Wisconsin*. Replacement of "Ketcha Bridge" and upgrading and relocation of approaches. Project 8950–1–00 and S–1417(2); 7 pages. June 24.

Final: Project F–300: Washington-Clarke Counties, *Alabama*. Highway to parallel US 43 for a total of 6.26 miles beginning 0.4 miles south of Leroz School. The road will be 4-lanes to replace existing 2-lane facility. Dual bridges "Under Construction" will cross the Tombigbee River 125' downstream of present bridge. 150 acres of wooded, swamp and pasture lands will be used for new right-of-way. 9 residences and 6 businesses will be replaced. Comments made by EPA, DOI, FHWA, Commerce, and Army: COE, and various Alabama departments. PB–199 752–F; 34 pages. June 7.

US–43 and US–72: Construction of a bridge over the Southern Railway in Sheffield, *Alabama*. Length of project is .34 miles. Purpose: To alleviate delays due to rail traffic. Comments made by Commerce, EPA, DOI, FHWA, TVA, and the Army: COE, and various Alabama departments. Project F–FG–196(16); 36 pages. June 24.

US–84: Relocation from Andalusia to River Falls, *Alabama*. Right-of-way along existing route is narrow—widening would cause extensive damage to adjacent property owners. Comments made by DOI, AEC, FAA, ARMY, EPA, FHWA, and Commerce, and various Alabama departments. Project S–1729–A, and F–339; 34 pages, June 28.

SH–64: Construction of 3.9 miles of highway in the Mule Shoe Bend Section in Coconino County, *Arizona* (within Navajo Reservation). Purpose: To provide a new alignment replacing sub-standard section. Project FLH–033–1(1); PB–199 661–F; 22 pages. Comments by DOI, USDA, FAA, FHWA. June 2.

I–40 (Ashfork-Flagstaff Highway): Coconino County, *Arizona*. Construction work on Supai Section in Kaibab National Forest between Pine Springs and Williams. Involves relocation and paving, grading and drains, building game fences, setting up water collecting system. Purpose: To remove a water producing well for median area, etc. Comments made by various State of Arizona agencies and Department of Interior and Agriculture. PB–199 659–F. 17 pages. June 4.

I–40 (Kingman-Ashfork Highway): Yavapai County, *Arizona*. Construction of 3 segments of highway; Mohave County Line-East Section, Juniper Mountain Section, and Juniper Mountain-Chino Section. Project I–40–2(53), (56), and (59), respectively. PB–199 989–F; 19 pages. June 7.

Bagdad-Hillside Highway: Yavapai County, *Arizona*. Upgrading of highway from city limits of Bagdad, southeast for about 4.1 miles to junction at SR 97. Comments made by the Department of the Interior and an Arizona department. Project S–370–501; 19 pages; PB–199 748–F. June 7.

SR–88: Maricopa, *Arizona*. Upgrading of Pinto Creek Section of Apache Creek Highway from 12 miles east of Roosevelt Dam for a distance of 4.5 miles in a southeasterly direction. Comments made by the Department of Agriculture (Forest Service), and an Arizona department. Project EDA–S–214(8), reported on Draft Statement as Project S–214(8); PB–199 746–F; 18 pages. June 7.

Arizona State Highway Route 60: Navajo County, *Arizona*. F–053–2(9) Clay Springs, and F–053–2(10) Pinedale-Payson Show Low Highway. State Route 200 from Payson, Arizona to US Rt. 60. Two sections comprising a total distance of 10.87 miles. Projects are on land administered by Sitgreaves National Forest. Considerable wildlife habitats will be disrupted or lost. Comments made by USDA, and DOI and an Arizona department. PB–199 747–F; 14 pages. June 7.

US–80. Cochise County, *Arizona*. Relocation of Highway 50 feet north and parallel to existing highway between Cochise Jr. College and Douglas. Project F–016–1(17), F–016–1–(18), F–016–1(19); PB–199 749–F; 11 pages. June 7.

Dewey 1–17 Highway, State Highway Route 169: Yavapai County *Arizona*. A proposed highway from Dewey on State Route 69 to connect with Interstate 17. Will follow general alignment of present County road to Yarbar School and then under new alignment through Precore National Forest. Total length 14.8 miles. Comments made by USDA, and DOI, and an Arizona department. Project S–447–504 and S–447–503; PB–199 745–F; 17 pages. June 7.

Gila Bend-Buckeye Highway (US 80 to Junction 1—10 Section): Maricopa County, *Arizona*. Upgrading of highway from point 2 miles west of Buckeye for a distance of 4.3 miles to Oglesby Road traffic interchange of I–10. Will be connecting segment of I–10 and I–8. Comments made by the Department of Interior. Project F–FG–023–1(2) and F–023–1(3); PB–199 744–F; 15 pages. June 7.

US–666/180: Springerville-Clifton Highway (Nutriosa-Alpine Section). Corridor relocation and widening, etc. of 2½ miles of highway, Nutriosa, *Arizona*. Will require about 60 acres of a scenic meadow. Comments made by USDA, and DOI, as well as various state departments. Project FAP–05–1–2; 20 pages. June 17.

US–89: (Wickenburg-Prescott Highway)—Proposed corridor relocation and improvement between Congress and Yarnell, *Arizona*. Length of project 4.5 miles. Comments made by FHWA, and DOI, and various Arizona departments. Project F–025–1(9), Unit 1, and F–025–1(10) Unit 2; 25 pages. June 24.

US–666/180: Proposed corridor relocation and improvement of 8.21 miles (Nutrioso-Alpine Section) in Apache County, *Arizona*. Road will be widened 12 feet, etc. Arizona Project F–051–2(9), Unit 1 and (12), Unit 2. Comments made by State of Arizona and

Depts. of HUD, Interior and Agriculture. 15 pages. June 24.

Interstate Route 10 (San Bernardino Freeway): Los Angeles El Monte, California. Project consists of addition of 2-lane express busway on freeway between Mission Road near Santa Ana Freeway, in Los Angeles and Santa Anita Avenue in city of El Monte, (Total distance is 11 miles). Proposed program consists of preferential curb lanes for buses, one bus station with parking facilities and two without parking along the busway. Joint project of California Department of Public Works, Division of Highways and Southern California Rapid Transit District. 4(f) Determination attached as action would require land from Ramona Gardens West-Pocket Park, Fletcher Park, and Pioneer Park. Comments made by DOI, and EPA, and a numerous California departments and agencies. Project FAI-10; 111 pages. June 23.

Glasgow-Edmonton Road: Barren County, *Kentucky*. Realignment of 2.4 miles between new section in Glasgow to KY-80-US-68. Comments made by various State of Kentucky agencies; Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Transportation (FAA); Agencies—EPA & TVA. Project F-543(4). 26 pages. June 2.

Harland-Cumberland-Whitesburg Road: *Kentucky*. Involves 8 miles of highway construction on new location. Comments made by various State of Kentucky agencies; Department of Interior and EPA. AP 48-85L. 46 pages. June 28.

Northern Parkway: Baltimore, *Maryland*. Bellona Ave. to the Alameda. Requires 1.1 acres from Chinquapin Park. Will be replaced with 1.9 acres in immediate vicinity. Comments made by Metropolitan Transit Authority, Baltimore. Project US-1022(19). PB-199 968-F. 6 pages. June 9.

College-Beattie Street Connector project in Greenville, *South Carolina*. Length of project: 2700 feet. Comments made by various State of South Carolina agencies and Department of HUD. PB-199 660-F. 20 pages. June 4.

US-12: Brown and Day Counties, *South Dakota*. Construction of highway beginning at Bath Corner continuing through Groton to Andover (20 miles). Comments made by Department of Interior and EPA. Project F 004-5 & F 944-6. PB-199 971-F. 16 pages. June 8.

SH-63: Ziebach and Haakon Counties, *South Dakota*. Construction of new bridge across Cheyenne River and realignment of approaches for safety reasons. Comments made by Departments of HUD and Interior. Project S-1262 and S-1263. 11 pages. June 24.

SH-40: Mellette County, *South Dakota*. Construction runs from 1.5 miles west of Cedar Butte then runs easterly along existing SH-40 (8 miles). New grade, flattened horizontal and vertical curves, etc. Comments made by Departments of Agriculture, HUD, Commerce, Interior and EPA. Project S-1351 (5). 17 pages. June 24.

SH-40: Rapid City, *South Dakota* to Farmingdale, *South Dakota*. Rebuilding, flattening curves, widening, raising, etc. to accommodate higher traffic volume. Comments made by Departments of HUD and Interior. Project S-1041. 11 pages. June 24.

Tennessee Secondary Route 6371: Rutherford County, *Tennessee*. Construction begins at SR-1 (US-41) northwest of Murfreesboro and extends to SR-10 (US-231) (Project S-6371(2)). Project section S-6371(2) begins at Sulphur Springs Rd. and goes to SR-10. Total length: 2.5 miles. PB-199 751-F. 5 pages. June 7.

Secondary Route 2624: Roane County, *Tennessee*. Construction of 1.22 miles of highway from 1 mile east of Post Oak to SR-61. Project 73-068-32-03. 6 pages. June 24.

Secondary Route 434: Hamilton County, *Tennessee*. Improving and straightening 1.2 miles from FAS 4427 at Ooltewah-Ringgold Rd. to Collegedale. Project S-4343(4). 5 pages. June 24.

FHWA 4(f) Statements: The following are not 102 statements. They are explanations of the Secretary of Transportation's approval of projects to be implemented under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act. 49, U.S.C. Section 1653 (f).

SR-41 & 180: Fresno, *California*. Highway construction requires use of .26 acre of Romain Playground. 3 pages. June 16.

Frazier Mountain Park Road: Kern County, *California*. Highway construction requires use of 6.25 acres and severing 2.71 acres of Frazier Mountain Park. 3 pages. June 16.

US-85 (South Santa Fe Drive): Denver, *Colorado*. Highway construction will require 2 acres of Overland Park North and 1.8 acres of Overland Park Golf Course. 3 pages. June 14.

SR-14: Sussex County, *Delaware*. Highway construction requires .2 acres of Primehood National Wildlife Refuge. 4 pages. June 21.

I-75: Roscommon County, *Michigan*. Highway construction requires use of 570 acres of State-owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources. 4 pages. June 9.

I-195: Monmouth County, *New Jersey*. Highway construction requires land from Allaire State Park. 5 pages. June 9.

I-80: Warren County, *New Jersey*. Highway construction requires use of 33 acres of Columbia Lake recreation area. 6 pages. June 23.

US-2: Highway project requires use of 9 acres of land from a golf course owned by the city of Lakota. *North Dakota*. June 28.

I-476: Delaware County, *Pennsylvania*. Highway construction requires use of land from Smedley Park. 6 pages. June 8.

Route 48: Allegheny County, *Pennsylvania*. Upgrading of 2.7 mile segment from 2 to 4 lanes. 3 pages. June 10.

SR—4 (Noconnah Greenbelt): Shelby County, *Tennessee*. Highway construction requires 0.12 acres of land near Noconnah Creek. 5 pages. May 19.

SH-288: Brazoria County, *Texas*. Highway construction requires land from Thumb Park. 3 pages. June 9.

SR-30: Poultney, *Vermont*. Highway construction requires .23 acre from Lake St. Catherine Park. 4 pages. June 9.

U.S. COAST GUARD

Contact: William R. Riedel, DOT Coordinator, Water Resources, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20591 (202) 426-2274.

Draft: Construction of fixed high level bridge over Broad Thorofare on the *New Jersey* Intracoastal Waterway 100 ft. to the north of the existing bridge (SR-152). PB-199 741-D. 6 pages. June 7.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Contact: Charles Fabrikant, Director of Impact Statements Office, 1629 K St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20460 (202) 254-7471.

Final: Construction grant for a wastewater treatment project, Muskegon County, *Michigan*. Project includes intercepting sewers pumping stations, spray irrigation facilities, etc. Will provide 43.36 million gallons per day of sewage treatment capacity. Purpose: to eliminate the discharge of municipal and major industrial wastes into dune-impounded Muskegon, Mona and White Lake by bringing wastes inland for tretament. 56 pages. June 25.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Contact: Frederick H. Warren, Commission's Advisor on Environmental Quality, 441 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20426 (202 386-6084.

Applicant's drafts: (These are not official FPC drafts. They will be followed by staff-prepared draft statements. The FPC requests that any person desiring to be heard, to present evidence, to be advised of all hearings and proceedings, with reference to these statements, and to receive notice of proposed subsequent draft statements, file with the FPC on or before 60 days from the publication of this document in the Federal Register.)

Application by Seattle, Washington, for an amendment to its license for Skagit River Project No. 553. Provides for the final stage of construction of Ross Dam, involving an increase in the structural height from 540 ft. to 661 ft. and the reservoir elevation from 1602.5 ft. to 1725 ft. Will result in Ross Lake's surface area being extended by 3,600 acres within the U.S. section (the Ross Lake National Recreation Area). Wildlife habitat will be reduced and trout spawning areas inundated. Purpose: to provide additional electrical power supply to Seattle. PB-199 736-D 36 pages. May 20.

Department of Water Resources (*California*) application for California Aqueduct Project No. 2 426. Involves an aqueduct from the southern extremity of the delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley into Southern California, dividing into the West Branch, which terminates in Castaic Lake, and the East Branch, which terminates in Lake Perris. A coastal branch will extend 100 miles westerly to San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties. The total distance at completion will be about 450 miles. 282 miles are now completed. Purpose: to control flooding, to supply water and hydroelectric power, to develop recreation, and to enhance fish and wildlife. PB-199 854-D 182 pages. June 10.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company's application for license for Construction Project—Electron Project No. 2495, Puyallup River, Pierce County, *Washington*. Involves: timber diversion dam, other installations, and a concrete powerhouse with four generating units (capacity 25,500 KW). Purpose: to provide power to meet Company and area requirements. 66 year operation of the project has had minimal impact on recreational and environmental values, except for fishery resources. PB-199 886-D 36 pages. May 21.

Northern Natural Gas Company's application for license to construct a 285-mile, 30-inch diameter natural gas transmission line from Sandstone, *Minnesota*, to near Emerson, *Manitoba*. Together with a 45-mile, 96-inch diameter transmission line extending from Havre, Montana, North & East to the International Border. Also involves building compressor stations. Transmission lines will traverse several state forests, wildlife refuges, game preserves, etc., PB-199 852-D. 14 pages. May 21.

Draft: FPC staff briefs and environmental statement in the reopened proceeding on the Blue Ridge Project No. 2317, *North Carolina* and *Virginia*. Applicant is the Appalachian Power Company. Purpose: electric power generation. 249 pages. June 2.

Joint application by Pacific Northwest Power Company and Washington Public Power Supply System for major license for the High Mountain Sheep Project, a hydroelectric plant on the Snake River between the States of *Washington, Oregon,* and *Idaho*. Consists of 3 large dams and 2 smaller ones. Purpose: electric power generation. Project Nos. 2243 and 2273. 43 pages. PB-200 002-D.

Application by Portland General Electric Company for Pelton Project No. 2030—*Oregon*. Involves building a fish hatchery and related facilities adjacent to the powerhouse of Round Butte Development. Purpose: to provide for maintaining the numbers of anadromous fish in the Deschutes River. PB-199 877-D. 5 pages. June 9.

Application for major license by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Hat Creek Nos. 1 & 2 (hydroelectric project). In the region of Cassel, Burney and Fall River Mills on

Hat Creek, Shasta County, *California*. Hat Creek No. 1 Reservoir has 13-acre surface, 231 ft. long, 12 ft. high concrete buttress dam. No. 2 Reservoir has 89-acre surface with 43 ft. long, 29 ft. high concrete gravity dam. Purpose: electric power generation. 21 pages. PB–200 198–D. June 18.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Contact: Rod Kreger, Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration—AD, Washington, D.C. 20405 (202) 343–6077.

Alternate Contact: Aaron Woloshin, Director, Office of Environmental Affairs, General Services Administration—ADF, (202) 343–4161.

Draft: Transfer of 12.36 acres of Los Alamitos Naval Air Station, Orange County, *California* to the Office of Education, HEW. Purpose: to enable the Office of Education to consolidate the Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory by constructing a building on this land. PB–199 459–D. 7 pages. May 26.

Disposal of the 119.11 acre tract of land comprising the former Castle Valley Job Corps Conservation Center: Price, *Utah*. Proposed sale of this land to Carbon County. The County plans to establish a light industry type industrial park on this land. PB–199 737–D. 10 pages.

Disposal of the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant, Dallas (Grand Prairie), *Texas*. Involves 314.8 acres and 11 buildings. Proposes to sell this plant by negotiated contract to LTV Aerospace Corp., present lessee, for continued use as an aircraft manufacturing facility. Bid should reflect the cost of necessary corrective measures to alleviate such problems as air and water pollution. 10 pages. June 16.

Disposal of the Niagara Falls Army Chemicals Plant: Niagara Falls, *New York*. Plant consists of 37 buildings and 5.7 acres and will be sold by competitive bidding. 8 pages. June 29.

Final: Negotiated sale of the former Sweetwater, *Texas*, Air Force Station and family housing annex. The release of the interest of the U.S. in 16.38 acres leased from the city of Sweetwater is also involved. Purpose: to enable Sweetwater to provide a campus for the Texas State Technical Institute for the operation of a training school. Comments by the Dept. of HEW. PB–199 447–F. 7 pages. May 28.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Contact: Ralph E. Cushman, Special Assistant, Office of Administration, Washington, D.C. 20546, (202) 962–8107.

Draft: Applications Technology Satellite Program. Consists of launching the 6th and 7th satellite in the series (1973 & 1975). Experiments are to be carried out in the disciplines of communications, navigation, meteorology, data collection, geodesy, etc. PB–199 460–D. 10 pages. May 28.

NEW ENGLAND RIVER BASINS COMMISSION

Contact: David Harrison, New England River Basins Commission, 55 Court Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02108 (617) 223–6244.

Draft: Connecticut River Basin Plan—*Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts,* and *Connecticut*. Involves water quality wastewater treatment, etc., power, outdoor recreation, preservation of sites, anadromous fisheries restoration, resident fish and wildlife, water supply, navigation, upstream water and related land resource potential, flood control and large multiple purpose reservoirs. Purpose: National Efficiency: to get greatest economic benefits from investment in water resource restoration and development in terms of the whole country; Regional Efficiency: to produce the greatest return in social and economic benefits in terms of the Connecticut River Basin; Environmental Quality: to improve the quality of the environment through water resource investment. PB–199 738–D. 103 pages. June 3.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Contact: Dr. Francis Gartrell, Director of Environmental Research and Development, (615) 755–2002.

Draft: Tellico Project, *Tennessee*. Major project is construction of a dam and the creation of a 16,500 acre reservoir on Little Tennessee River near Fort Loudon Dam. Also involves construction of saddle dams on the left rim of the reservoir, a 1,000 ft. canal on the right bank of the reservoir, rebuilding of 77 miles of roads, 3 miles of railroads and 13 bridges. 275 families will be dislocated. Purpose: industrial development. PB–200 025–D. 24 pages. June 18.

Mills River Dam and Reservoir, Henderson County, *North Carolina*. Involves construction of a dam. Will be the first unit of a multipurpose water control system for the Upper French Broad River Basin. Reservoir will inundate 660 acres of pasture and woodland. Purpose: reduce flooding. 21 pages. June 29.

U.S. WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Contact: W. Don Maughan, U.S. Water Resources Council, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037 (202) 254–6408.

Draft: Pearl River Basin Comprehensive Study: Mississippi and Louisiana. A 10–15 year program that would include 3 multiple-purpose reservoirs, floodwater retarding structures, and 1,202 miles of channel development in 30 upstream watersheds. Also to be constructed is a pleasure boatway. Other features are expansion of existing recreation areas, flood plain management, water quality improvement, etc. PB–199 742–D. 8 pages. June 3.

SUMMARY OF 102 STATEMENTS FILED WITH THE CEQ THROUGH JUNE 30, 1971—BY AGENCY

Agency	Draft 102's for action on which no final 102's have yet been received	Final 102's on legislation and actions	Total actions on which final or draft 102 statements for Federal actions have been received
Atomic Energy Commission	27	20	47
Appalachian Regional Commission	1	0	1
Delaware River Basin Commission	3	0	3
Department of Agriculture	31	69	100
Department of Commerce	1	5	6
Department of Defense	3	2	5
Air Force	1	0	1
Army	3	1	4
Army Corps of Engineers	112	193	305
Navy	7	0	7
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1	0	1
Department of Housing and Urban Development	8	1	9
Department of Interior	42	20	62
Department of Transportation [1]	640	107	747
Department of Treasury	2	1	3
Environmental Protection Agency	1	6	7
Federal Power Commission	11	4	15
General Services Administration	18	2	20
International Boundary and Water Commission—United States and Mexico	2	1	3
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	21	0	21
National Science Foundation	2	0	2
New England River Basins Commission	1	0	1
Office of Science and Technology	0	1	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	8	0	8
U.S. Water Resources Council	1	0	1
Total	947	433	1,380

[1] Separate 4 (f) statements not incorporated in 102 statements received from DOT are not included.

SUMMARY OF 102 STATEMENTS FILED WITH THE CEQ THROUGH JUNE 30, 1971—BY PROJECT TYPE

	Draft statements for actions on which no final statements have yet been filed	Final statements on legislation and actions	Total actions on which final or draft statements for Federal actions have been received
AEC nuclear development	7	5	12
Aircraft, ships, and vehicles	2	1	3
Airports	25	72	97
Buildings	2	3	5
Bridge permits	18	2	20
Defense systems	2	0	2
Forestry	1	3	4
Housing urban problems, new communities	7	0	7
International boundary	3	1	3
Land acquisition, disposal	16	5	21
Mass transit	3	0	3
Mining	4	1	5
Military installations	6	1	7
Natural gas and oil:			
Drilling and exploration	4	1	5
Transportation, pipeline	2	2	4
Parks, wildlife refuges, recreation facilities	6	6	12
Pesticides, herbicides	5	9	14
Power:			
Hydroelectric	15	1	16
Nuclear	23	14	37
Other	10	1	11
Transmission	5	4	9
Railroads	2	0	2
Roads	530	26	556
Plus roads through parks	62	5	67
Space programs	7	0	7
Waste disposal:			
Detoxification of toxic substances	3	0	3
Munition disposal	1	2	3
Ocean dumping	0	0	0
Radioactive waste disposal	1	1	2

SUMMARY OF 102 STATEMENTS FILED WITH THE CEQ THROUGH JUNE 30, 1971—BY PROJECT TYPE—Continued

	Draft statements for actions on which no final statements have yet been filed	Final statements on legislation and actions	Total actions on which final or draft statements for Federal actions have been received
Recycling	0	0	0
Sewage facilities	1	2	3
Solid wates	1	0	1
Water:			
Beach erosion, hurricane protection	2	18	20
Irrigation	12	7	19
Navigation	31	75	106
Municipal and industrial supply	4	0	4
Permit (Refuse Act, dredge and fill)	3	0	3
Watershed protection and flood control	88	158	246
Weather modification	7	1	8
Research and development	16	0	16
Miscellaneous	11	6	17
Total	947	433	1,380

RETRAINING OF CERTAIN PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, we know of the troubled times that exist for certain professional people, particularly those from the space age industries. Efforts are being made to use the skills of these technical people in many other areas. This will require retraining in many instances. The PMC Colleges, outside Philadelphia, in Chester, Pa., have developed a special program that should interest Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news release relating to a development by the PMC Colleges be printed in the RECORD.

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

RETRAINING OF CERTAIN PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE

A deferred tuition program to retrain unemployed engineers, scientists, teachers and other professionals for new or broader careers was unveiled today (Wednesday, July 14) by PMC Colleges, Chester, Pa.

Dr. Arthur T. Murphy, vice president and dean of the college, said the innovative program to be known as Program Crossroad, begins this fall and is designed to allow unemployed professionals to return to college for graduate and undergraduate "refresher" courses and as "a means of updating knowledge, acquiring new skills to expand opportunities for employment or preparing for an entirely new career."

Under Program Crossroad, unemployed professionals could defer tuition costs until six months after they are working full time in their new profession. No interest charges will be made and applicants will have a maximum of 2½ years from registration to first payment.

The Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security reports that 2000 engineers, scientists and other professional workers in the eight-county area are currently drawing unemployment compensation, and estimates that about 9000 professionals have received lay-off notices. The American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics estimates that about 10,000 engineers and scientists have been laid off in this area and an estimated 100,000 are unemployed or underemployed throughout the nation.

PMC Colleges is a small co-educational college in suburban Philadelphia, with students from 35 states and 24 foreign countries.

Under Program Crossroad, unemployed professionals or persons not working full-time at their profession, may take courses in either the day or evening schools.

Courses available at the graduate level would be in engineering and economics and management. Courses at the undergraduate level would be in liberal arts, social and physical sciences, teacher education, nursing, economics and management, and engineering.

Applications will be available from the college's admission's office. Applicants should state their educational objective and include a resume of their education and work experience in their initial letter.

Murphy said the unemployed professionals should have a bachelor's degree from an accredited college. Also eligible, he said, would be unemployed professionals who have had at least 60 hours of college credit and have been out of college for five years or more.

"Some engineers," Murphy explained to a news conference, "have experience and training in narrow areas of specialization. With additional education, they could move into problem-oriented areas like urban engineering, environmental engineering and systems engineering."

"Or," the former engineering school dean added, "they might combine their expertise with other disciplines like physiology to become bio-engineers working on artificial kidney or heart machines or various diagnostic and post operative equipment. Also, they could return to college for studies in economics and management in order to run their own business, or to develop training to teach science in secondary schools."

"Similarly," Murphy explained, "an unemployed chemist might take biology courses to become a bio-chemist, or a physicist to become a bio-physicist. Unemployed teachers might take foreign language studies to prepare for a new career with a multi-national corporation or to work in community or social welfare programs for persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban descent."

PENTAGON PAPERS CONFERENCE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my colloquy with the gentlemen from New York (Mr. Dow and Mr. RYAN) on their "congressional inquiry into the Pentagon Papers," the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow) denied ever having seen the controversial memorandum or agenda for the July 7 meeting of the conference organizers. That agenda, which was quoted in part in the July 25 Evans-Novak column in the Washington Post, and to which I referred in my remarks on Monday, suggests that an attempt be made to shift the blame for the war to the Nixon administration, to undermine the administration's peace efforts, and to force acceptance of the Vietcong peace proposal through a democratically sponsored congressional action.

Yesterday, I accepted the word of the gentleman from New York that he had not seen the controversial agenda, even though he is one of the principal organizers of this week's conference. I am willing to concede that the politically motivated memorandums may only reflect the "overactive imaginations of young staffers," as some members of the group indicated to Evans and Novak, and are not representative of the intentions of those Congressmen sponsoring this conference. Perhaps there is a lesson in this which should not be lost on the conference organizers themselves during their inquiry: memorandums from lower echelon officials are not necessarily an accurate indication of the policy intentions of their superiors. Perhaps we should all reread the Pentagon Papers with this in mind rather than accepting them as the most authoritative historical record of our Vietnam involvement.

SOUTH VIETNAMESE ELECTIONS?

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that has been constant in the history of this country, it has been the democratic tradition. The people decide who will govern them by voting in periodic elections—elections that are free and fair. The United States has encouraged other countries to adopt that democratic tradition. Occasionally, that policy and that tradition are put to a test. There will be such a test in October in South Vietnam.

We are waiting and watching to be sure those elections are nothing less than free and fair. After all, one of the alleged hallmarks of this country's troubled policy in Vietnam has been to guarantee that the people of South Vietnam have the right to choose their public officials and, indirectly, their form of government—through the ballot box—without fear of intimidation or recrimination. Mr. Speaker, there are signs that the people's right is being compromised, or at least threatened.

There are indications that at least one of the announced candidates for the

Presidency of South Vietnam may not be allowed to place his name on the ballot. This candidate is not some obscure provincial official. He is the country's Vice President. And if his name does not appear on the ballot, it may very well be due to the work—or the acquiescence—of another candidate for the Presidency, who happens to be the incumbent.

We will not know the outcome of that election for several months. But it should become clear in a matter of weeks how the democratic tradition is faring in South Vietnam. I would hope that my countrymen pay more than passing attention to what develops.

Earlier this week, there were items in two Chicago newspapers that may shed some light on the health of democracy in South Vietnam. One, a dispatch from Saigon in the Daily News, carried the headline: "Ky Facing Squeeze-Out in Viet Vote." The article itself explained how that was happening. The second item, an editorial in the Sun Times, was called "The 'I Will' Spirit in Saigon." It raises some questions about this country's attitude to the South Vietnamese elections.

The texts of both items follow:

KY FACING SQUEEZE-OUT IN VIET VOTE

(By Keyes Beech)

SAIGON.—Barring a last-minute breakthrough, it appears that Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky will be squeezed out of South Vietnam's October presidential election.

If this happens, the field will be reduced to two contenders—President Nguyen Van Thieu and retired Gen. Duong Van (Big) Minh. And the scene may be set for an attempted coup.

Thieu and Ky are bitter enemies.

U.S. embassy sources Tuesday confirmed charges from the Ky camp that Thieu apparently is determined to eliminate the 41-year-old vice president from the race by making it difficult or impossible for him to qualify.

"Yes, the embassy admits it," said a Ky spokesman. "The question is what they are going to do about it."

All candidates have from July 29 to Aug. 4 to qualify by submitting the signed endorsements of at least 40 national assemblymen or 100 provincial councillors. Thieu and Minh have more than enough assembly signatures to qualify.

But Ky, lacking support in the assembly, was forced to seek the support of provincial councillors. His supporters said he had at least 140 signatures but was unable to get them certified by Thieu-controlled province chiefs and mayors.

"Something very strange has happened," a Ky spokesman said. "All the province chiefs and mayors who must certify the signatures are mysteriously absent when we try to get our signatures certified."

Ky has written Prime Minister Tran Thien Khiem asking when the officials will be on duty to certify his signatures. But it seems unlikely Ky will get much help from this quarter. Khiem, in addition to being Thieu's prime minister, is also his alternate vice presidential running mate.

Ky's plight underlined the American dilemma in the South Vietnamese elections. On instructions from Washington, the U.S. Mission here has adopted a hands-off attitude, although most if not all senior American officials think Thieu is the best man.

But the United States is morally committed to see that the elections are at least reasonably fair. And Thieu has already demonstrated that he will not hesitate to use the vast U.S.-financed government apparatus at his disposal to get the mandate he so passionately desires.

Both political underdogs, Ky and Minh, have joined forces in an effort to put Thieu on the defensive and force the U.S. to "neutralize" the election machine that Thieu has put together out of the government apparatus.

In this respect the 55-year-old Minh, leader of the 1963 coup that overthrew the Diem regime, has been consistently inconsistent.

In one breath he has demanded that the United States stay out of the elections, going so far on one occasion as to demand the resignation of Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. In the next breath he has demanded that the United States intervene to make sure the elections are fair.

If Ky is forced out of the presidential race, the consequences could be explosive. Ky has hinted that if he is denied the electoral process he may resort to an armed coup against Thieu.

This may be more than an idle threat. Recent soundings have shown a marked shift in the armed forces away from Thieu and toward Ky. Many army officers are still bitter over the way Thieu handled the ill-starred Laos invasion.

Both Thieu and Minh squared away for the campaign over the weekend by formally announcing their candidacies and naming their vice presidential running mates.

THE "I WILL" SPIRIT IN SAIGON

Gen. Duong Van (Big) Minh, leader of the military coup which in 1963 ousted (by assassination) South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem, has announced his candidacy for election to his country's presidency in the Oct. 3 election. We await with interest flavored with more than a pinch of cynicism the reaction of President Nguyen Van Thieu, who is seeking re-election.

Thieu, through mixed threats and bribery, railroaded through the National Assembly a bill requiring a ridiculously broad base of support for opposition candidates; the aim is to stifle attempts by Minh and Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky to oppose him.

One wonders why Thieu, who is generally conceded to be in about as much electoral trouble as was Mayor Daley last spring, has to resort to this obvious strong-arming. It is especially to be wondered at when the President of the United States keeps blatting about "self-determination."

Publicly, the United States has adopted a hands-off policy toward the election campaign. Indeed, it is reliably reported that American Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker has privately warned his client in the Presidential Palace that a one-candidate ticket would further alienate the support of the American public.

"Self-determination," as we have always defined it, does not really mean the right of a strong man to impose his will on the people. Unfortunately, in practice over the past generation, the United States has seldom paid attention to self-determination when the governments are sufficiently anti-Communist. Spain, Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, South Korea and Taiwan are cases in point.

"This isn't Scarsdale," former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge once said of South Vietnamese politics. Perhaps it isn't the politics of an affluent suburb, but that doesn't mean that Washington has to condone river-ward election practices, either.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

WOMEN SUFFER MOST FROM UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, my sister Congresswoman GRIFFITHS, read to you an article describing the plight of women in Detroit who evince a higher unemployment rate than men, and who face tremendous difficulty in finding jobs. This dilemma is not limited to Detroit. All over the country, the unemployment level of women tends to be at least 3 points higher than that for men. The assumption that women work only for extra money or to relieve boredom is unjustified for the 15,055,000 women who are heads of households and the sole source of support for their families. For those women who do have working husbands, many women work to raise their families above the level of poverty. And even for those women whose husbands do earn a substantial amount, it makes no sense to decide that the husband's work is automatically more important, and that he is entitled to be retained rather than an equally or more competent woman.

My office has received scores of letters from all over the Nation informing me of desperate situations, and complaining of inattention or lack of solicitude from their own representatives in Washington. This is a serious charge. I hope that my colleagues in Congress are not so hypocritical as to speak out with concern on employment, while ignoring the very persons that are hardest hit. I hope that my colleagues in Congress realize that they represent unemployed women as well as unemployed men, employed women as well as employed men. And I hope that my colleagues will join me in doing everything within our powers to alleviate this desperation.

I include a letter which I recently received from a woman from West Virginia which is typical of the nationwide pleas that my office has received:

JULY 15, 1971.

MRS. BELLA ABZUG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ABZUG: If this letter reaches you directly, I would like to say honestly it is a plea for help. I am a woman of forty-two, with a college degree in office management and public relations which I worked at for fifteen years, I have reared a daughter, a lovely young woman, put her through college and now she is a teacher and married. Unfortunately I must support myself, I do not qualify for unemployment, I cannot receive welfare which I ask for as a last degrading resort because I was told I was able to work, how do they think I could ask for welfare if I could find work. I am told I am too old when an office job comes up and they hire younger

girls, I can assure anyone Mrs. Abzug I am quite capable of managing a business. I am so sick and tired of begging for work which is stupid and degrading for two months I applied for two waitress jobs at $1.15 per hr. and could have kept them both had I been more recipient to the men who owned the places, why can't we be allowed to work without this, I have seen so much of it it sickens me.

I have written both my congressman and senator and have received only a Civil Service form in return mail for who knows what. Mrs. Abzug, no help. Unless one has been in my situation one cannot perceive of what you have to take to keep a job. I could probably come to Washington and support myself very well, I know no one and I have no money to hold me until I should acquire something I am suited for. Mrs. Abzug, I am highly capable woman and would be an asset to any business, something must be wrong with a state of the union which will allow some of the discriminations to go on towards women in my situation. Mrs. Abzug I would like very much to belong to the organization at which you spoke to just recently in Washington. I am not sure (League of Women Voters)? If dues are involved perhaps I can get same.

Mrs. Abzug, there must be many women in my position and age group who are hit with the same frustrations every day, as for me I am fed up with it and would like to do something about it. I would appreciate any help you can give me. Thank you for reading my letter, and your time.

Most sincerely,

DOROTHY ALGER.

P.S.—If you wish to use this letter as an example please do so.

WHAT A NATIONAL POWER GRID MEANS TO NEW YORK: CHEAPER, RELIABLE POWER, CLEANER AIR, AND NO NEW PLANTS IN THE CITY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has the opportunity to meet squarely a number of major domestic challenges and few are more serious, in my opinion, than the urgent need to provide this Nation with a new means of assuring inexpensive, reliable electrical power consistent with the protection of our environment.

On July 21, I introduced legislation that will go a long way toward meeting that goal. This bill, H.R. 9970, authorizes the establishment of a national power grid. It is cosponsored in the House by my good friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN) and the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK). The chief Senate sponsor is Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana, a recognized expert in the utility field and a leading consumer advocate.

On introducing this new legislation, I addressed myself to the national power issues it attempts to resolve. Today, I would like to discuss briefly the effect our bill would have on New York's power crisis—the worst power crisis faced by any region or metropolitan area in the Nation.

In no other part of the country is there as dramatic a confrontation between the needs for electric reliability and environmental protection. All too often, advocates of one side or the other have treated the two as mutually exclusive. The utilities in general, and Consolidated Edison Co. in particular, have insisted that all that is needed to achieve reliable power is permission for them to construct new plants wherever and whenever they wish. Some conservationists—by no means a majority—have insisted on the other hand that virtually no power plant construction is acceptable.

All this illustrates is the futility of attempting to resolve the related power and environmental crisis through construction of new plants. In urban areas such as New York, powerplants represent an unwarranted use of valuable land and whether they be fossil-fuel or nuclear facilities, they also represent an inexcusable threat to environmental health and safety.

CON EDISON'S ASTORIA PLANT

This is well dramatized by the controversy over Con Edison's proposal to expand its Astoria plant. Here is an instance in which a utility is attempting to capitalize on New York's power crisis to achieve its own ends. The Astoria expansion, pressed with great urgency by Con Edison last summer, could not help in the present crisis, for the company does not propose to have any part of the plant on the line before 1974. In fact, Con Edison's 10-year plan as submitted to the Federal Power Commission, indicated that the plant would not be fully operative until 1975. Moreover, according to the company's own plan, it will have installed by 1974, exclusive of power purchases, reserve capacity of some 36 percent over its peak needs. Without the first part of the Astoria expansion, it will still have a comfortable reserve—more, in fact, than that recommended by the FPC.

In view of this, and in view of existing alternate sources of power for the city—such as purchase power from the Power Authority of the State of New York, which the city administration only belatedly and under pressure is seeking—I have maintained that the city should not be stampeded into approving the Astoria plant—a facility which will have no effect on the current crisis and will not be essential by the time Con Edison proposes to put it into service. I have called upon the city administration to stand by the memorandum of understanding into which it entered with Con Edison just 5 years ago, to the effect that the utility would not seek to add any new fossil-fuel plants in the city.

Councilman Manton's bill before the New York City Council enforces that agreement by barring construction of fossil-fuel generating plants in the city. It deserves passage, for it recognizes that many areas of New York City—such as the area of Queens, in which the Con Edison plant is located—are constantly threatened by poisonous air which has been and continues to be the direct cause of illness and even death.

GRID BILL MEANS RELIABLE POWER

How would my national power grid bill resolve New York's power crisis and at the same time protect environmental concerns such as air quality?

In the first place, New York's power crisis—indeed, the power problem of the entire Northeast region—does not stem from a national power shortage. It stems from our inability to move power around the Nation to the areas where it is needed most. And that inability is the direct result of the private utility industry's unwillingness to interconnect power sources and the weakness of utility regulation by the FPC and the State regulatory agencies.

With power transmission technology what it is today, it is senseless to talk about solving the power crisis only through construction of new plants. A far better answer is to interconnect all our major power systems to create a spinning reserve available to take care of any emergency, regardless of where it may be.

For example, if Con Edison's facilities should be strained because of an unusually hot summer day, surplus power from the west coast which is 3 hours behind New York time and would not have reached its peak load, could be pumped in.

GRID MEANS CLEAN POWER

The national power grid would give us not only electric reliability, but a healthier source of power, as well. Overuse of fossil-fuel plants, such as Con Edison's existing Astoria facility, is a major cause of the air pollution plaguing our cities today. At times of atmospheric inversion, the pollutants from these plants become trapped in the air above us and become a direct threat to life and health. A national grid would enable us to close down these plants temporarily during an inversion, since we could import "clean" power from other areas.

Finally, our national grid bill would authorize the kind of comprehensive power planning that has been totally lacking in this Nation. It would enable us to increase our power capability on a planned, rational basis, without the atmosphere of crisis and panic which all too often prejudices deliberations at the local, State and even Federal levels. It would provide the right kind of land use planning without necessitating the jurisdictional overlaps and unnecessary delays which piecemeal power planning have caused.

I am convinced that this legislation offers the best all-around solution to New York's immediate power crisis, as well as the most feasible means of assuring our country reliable inexpensive power so vitally needed for our economic and social well-being.

THE F–111: TURKEY OR TIGER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces Journal for July 19, 1971, carried an article on the F–111

written by a George Weiss. I think the article speaks for itself and I commend it to the skeptics in this body who may still feel that the F–111 program was a bad one:

THE F–111: THE SWING-WING MAY SURPRISE YOU YET

(By George Weiss)

If the United States finds itself in a serious shooting war next year . . . or a decade from now . . . one of the first aircraft to be committed to battle will be "Little Orphan Annie," unloved by her relatives in Congress, eventually deserted for the international banking business by her illegitimate father, denied by her Navy foster brothers, but who finally found a home with friends of the family, the Air Force.

People have now taken to calling "Annie" by her given name, F–111, but some neighborhood critics still prefer her pre-natal name, TFX. Almost everyone remembers her nickname "Controversial." Perhaps they know her best by that name.

But the orphan, say the friends of the family, turned out to be a lady despite all the whispers behind her back and charges to her face that she would never amount to anything. Those who know her best, who fly with her and care for her ills, say they love her. She has won the approval of those who count the most—the men who will go with her into combat and trusting in her to see them home again.

She still has problems and faults and she will have more. No one ever denies it. And since she is famous there are those who will pounce on her, without thinking, slashing at her old reputation. But, say the airmen, it hurts those who honestly believe she is to be a faithful companion through the years.

In many ways she didn't have a chance. Here are some of the reasons.

The Air Force wanted a long range fighter-bomber with primary emphasis on high speed, low altitude, nuclear and conventional bombing capability. The Navy needed a carrier based interceptor to climb to high altitudes, medium range, for fleet defense. Somehow the services were expected to adjust their needs and the resulting aircraft would be everything to everyone. It didn't happen.

The Navy finally saw an opportunity to pull out and the Air Force stuck with the problem going through several model designations, doggedly improving the aircraft.

If the Air Force erred in its approach to the situation it was in not having changed the type designation from tactical fighter to tactical bomber.

When the F–111 was little more than a gleam in the Air Force's eye, TAC discarded the aircraft designations of day-fighter and fighter-bomber, combining them into an all inclusive term—tactical fighter. All future TAC aircraft were expected to bomb and fight air-to-air with more or less equal agility. But the bomb load to be hung on the F–111 was equal to or greater than that of either B–66 or B–57 tactical bombers. The F–111 today is a tactical bomber with many of the characteristics of a fighter.

From the very outset it was obvious the F–111 would never become an air superiority fighter in the sense of being a "dog fighter." Weight alone precluded that option being available. However, shooting down aircraft is always a last ditch effort in trying to win air superiority. Tacticians go air-to-air when they have no other choice. What is preferred, and what the F–111 can do, is win air superiority in that vital role of airfield interdiction.

The Israeli Air Force most recently demonstrated this tactical concept in the Six Days War. The F–111 is a far superior weapon for airfield interdiction than any other fighter in the Defense Department or the world for that matter, the Air Force maintains.

One field grade F–111 pilot interviewed by The Journal was asked how this aircraft would have added to the IAF plan for the destruction of the Egyptian Air Force at the onset of hostilities. "They could have made their first strike during the night instead of waiting for first light," he said. "They would not have needed as many aircraft to knock out the enemy fighter and bomber bases. The F–111 weapons system would have covered more area on each of the enemy bases—and the destruction would have been greater."

F–111 VS. FOXBAT

What will the F–111 do if it meets the Mach 3 "Foxbat" MIG–23? Well, according to the men who fly the F–111 they are going to be very surprised if the meeting takes place. It certainly won't be at extreme altitudes where the Foxbat performs best. If the Foxbat pilots want to "have a go" at the F–111 they will be forced to come down to the deck and the Russian fighter isn't going to last long at that arena, the fighter pilots maintain.

The Mach 2, MiG–21, a beautiful sports car version of an interceptor, could not handle the F–105 at low altitudes in North Vietnam. The F–105, like the F–111, was designed to stand the brutal punishment of high speeds and low altitudes. The MiG–21 pilots were forced to break off, time after time, while chasing the "Thud" around North Vietnamese hills and valleys—and the F–105s were still able to carry out their missions. There are a lot of "Thud drivers" in the F–111 program who haven't forgotten that. They know the F–111 is several hundred miles an hour faster on the deck than the F–105 and no aircraft in the world can stay with it.

The anti-F–111 doom-sayers still predict the Foxbat will eat the fighter alive, but TAC pilots aren't getting grey hair anymore than the Israeli Air Force pilots who may face the MiG–23 with the F–4 Phantom. According to newspaper articles they too realize the Foxbat will have to come down to their altitude to fight. When the enemy pilots do they will be playing in a new ball game—and on the F–4 and F–111 pilots' home field.

But how about "look down-shoot down" capability? This is a possible new technique which would allow the Foxbat to fire missiles down from high altitude against fighters below.

Again the TAC pilots aren't too upset. The F–111, they say, has a few new "black boxes" to aid the two-man crew. The tail radar will notify them whenever the MiG–23, or any other enemy jet approaches. With sufficient warning in the cockpit, and the black boxes, the TAC crews believe they can manage the situation. Looking at it from another angle, the F–111 will be operating at night for the most part in the worst weather (an unavoidable fact in Europe) and at low altitudes. Those three facts alone offer considerable protection. Enemy ground based radar will be unable to continuously track individual fighters for proper interception by airborne units. They feel the enemy air threat won't cause them to worry on a full time basis.

F–111 PROGRAM COSTS

[Dollars in millions]

	Fighter	Bomber
Flyaway (airframes and engines)	$9.33	$9.96
Production-flyaway plus support, spares	11.8	13.94
Program-production plus construction, R. & D., operating costs, procurement costs	15.1	16.67

Note: Total F–111A/E/C/D/F program cost is currently estimated at $6,675,000,000. Total FB–111 program cost is estimated at $1,283,000,000.

The pilots of the F–111 can select the altitude they fly above the ground by simply setting an indicator on their terrain following radar. With that means they can stay below "enemy eyes" during each of the critical portions of their missions. The F–111 will maintain the desired altitude by scanning the terrain ahead and adjusting itself to surface elevation changes and obstacles. The most difficult part, pilots say, is to sit there at night pretending to relax, as the F–111 climbs an unseen hillside, goes over the top and into negative "g's" on the downside. In pitch dark situations the trust of the pilot for "Annie" must be absolute.

So far as has been determined no accidents have ever been attributed to terrain following in training or combat.

"You haven't lived," one F–111 pilot told The JOURNAL, "until you go into the Grand Canyon after midnight in a rainstorm, and come out the other side."

But suppose, just suppose, the F–111 and the MiG–21 or even the MiG–23 meet? What then? In a straight-on, even-odds, no warning fight, the computer calculations point to the MiGs; but the TAC pilots still feel they have a few rabbits to pull from their hatful of tricks. The experts at Nellis AFB are working on some new maneuvers and tactics that should improve the odds. So if Annie walks the back alleys alone some dark night she will at least know there is more she can do in self defense than run and yell for help.

SAFETY COMPARISON

The F–111 continues to have the lowest accident rate of any Century series fighter. This table compares the F–111 with other type fighters at the 80,000 hour operation mark.

Major type:	Accidents
F–100	77
F–101	42
F–102	48
F–104	59
F–105	42
F–106	33
F–4	39
F–111 (excludes two combat losses)	21

ACCIDENT RATE

Much of the continuing criticism of the F–111 hinges on the F–111's accidents. No matter what "Little Orphan Annie" does she attracts more attention than is deserved. But if you seriously examine her performance record in comparison with other fighters she comes off better than anyone expects.

Compared to the F–100 at 80,000 flight hours, the F–111 has had less than one-third as many accidents during those critical early states of development. The F–105 had twice as many accidents as the F–111 at the 80,000 hour point.

Both of these fighters were effective in Southeast Asia and carried more than their share of the combat load. Of course, both of them are single engine fighters. Comparing the F–111 with the popular F–4, another twin-engine, two-place jet, is more equitable. But the F–4 also had more accidents than the F–111 at the same stage of development.

No matter how you slice it, the F–111 comes out a safer fighter by far against all the Century series jets.

From this one might forecast that, like the F–100, the F–111 will become more and more reliable as the pilots and maintenance experts get to know her better and understand her various quirks and internal problems.

STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS

But, say the critics, how about the structural failures that have "plagued" the aircraft? Of the 23 F–111s that have been destroyed in accidents only *two* are known to have involved a structural failure. There were losses in Southeast Asia in which the aircraft were not found. They will remain a mystery. However, no one in the F–111 business appears concerned that a structural failure was involved. The odds are they are correct.

The first F–111 structural failure in flight was traced to a bad weld which caused loss of flight control. The second failure was more serious and involved the left wing pivot fitting. As a result the fleet of 344 F–111 aircraft in operation were put into one of the toughest testing programs yet devised. As of 25 June 270 had been returned to duty with a clean bill of health. Only 10% of the aircraft tested were found to contain minor flaws which might not have ever been noticed in routine checks. As a result of the tests four wing carry-through boxes and twelve wing pivot fittings were rejected.

The overall effect will be to increase the structural life of the F–111 and minimize future inspection requirements, a decided plus for the fighter.

The F–111 is now the most tested aircraft in the Air Force and the world. No other single aircraft has been subjected to the wide variety of reliability tests. Equipment and methods were invented to test the aircraft and some of these did produce ground failures as they were supposed to do. Because of these tests lives have been saved and the planes that passed are capable of withstanding stresses far higher than they are ever expected to encounter in normal operations or combat.

STRIKE ACCURACY

The F–111 went into combat in Southeast Asia when there were a limited number of targets available. All bombing was being conducted south of the 20th parallel. This did not allow the Air Force to fully explore the capabilities of the fighter to the extent desired.

Only 55 SEA combat sorties were flown by the six plane force. There were also restrictions placed on the F–111s which grounded them for a considerable portion of their stay in Thailand.

In fact, only two weeks of actual combat experience was gained during the time the fighters were in Thailand.

The fighter was flown in single ship night missions and mostly (80%) in bad weather to attack known enemy positions. Flying at high speeds and low levels the pilots penetrated well defended positions, attacked their targets and departed without being threatened by enemy action in most cases.

The only defense the enemy seemed capable of mustering against the F–111 was barrage fire whenever they realized the fighter was operating in an area. The F–111 crews spotted AAA/SAM defense activity on only 42% of their missions. No F–111 was ever hit by enemy fire.

The terrain avoidance radar proved itself in training in the U.S. and in North Vietnam. SAMs failed to locate the F–111s in their low level penetrations just above the tree tops at night along the Annam mountain chain between Laos and North Vietnam.

Post-strike reconnaissance bomb damage assessments of their radar bombing attacks offered final proof to the Air Force that the F–111 could hit a target under combat conditions with results comparable to daylight attacks by other fighter-bombers.

Operating in daylight in the U.S. on training missions the F–111 established a bombing rate 50% better than the best previous bomb scores in the Air Force.

In one test, called Combat Bullseye, the F–111 was tested for accuracy in the delivery of aerial weapons against the F–105 and F–4. She was an easy winner.

One Air Force pilot, no longer flying the F–111, told the JOURNAL that after ten years bombing practice in the F–100 he topped his best previous score on his first practice mission in the F–111. He said his experience was not uncommon.

Pilots credit the F–111 itself as being responsible for the better bomb scores. The primary difference, they say, comes from the stability of the F–111 on bombing and strafing runs and the unusually smooth flight control system which, with the gun and bomb sight, makes a high degree of accuracy possible.

NATO COMMITMENT

Last September two F–111's left the U.S. non-stop for Upper Heyford, England, where they became a part of the 20th Tactical Fighter Wing. They did not employ air-to-air refueling on their trans-Atlantic flight. The wing has now converted from the F–100 to the F–111 which gives the fighter a NATO commitment.

The F–111 extends the combat radious of the wing to double that of old "Silver Dollar." The black underbellies of the new F–111s are mute testimony to their nuclear mission in Europe. Along with the aircraft came an entirely new all weather capability for the 20th. No longer will weather be a deciding factor for planning purposes. In fact, weather now enhances the capability, reliability and success potential of the wing.

Airmen maintaining the Upper Heyford F–111s in the NATO operational mission claim their job is easier than with the more familiar F–100s. While the Air Force stipulated that the F–111 should not exceed more than 35 man-hours maintenance for each hour flown, the twin-engine fighter is averaging well under 30 man-hours per hour, according to current experience.

NUCLEAR CAPABILITY

SAC also has operational aircraft. The force of 66 FB–111 aircraft, armed with four SRAM missiles or nuclear gravity bombs, will soon be in place at both Pease AFB, N.H., and Plattsburg AFB, N.Y. With the FB–111s already delivered to the Air Force and crews completing training at Carswell AFB, Texas, it is admitted by SAC that the medium range SAC bombers have long held a back-up operational mission. The instructor pilots have formed the aircrews for use in the event of an emergency.

The FB–111s, like the B–52 force, will soon be dispersed to satellite bases once their crews are declared combat ready.

SAC takes some pride in the fact that an FB–111 was declared a winner against the B–52 in the last SAC bomb competition. Another FB–111 flew to England on a demonstration flight during the RAF bomber competition. The RAF did not invite it to participate.

Air Force Chief of Staff General John D. Ryan told the Senate Committee on Appropriations this spring that the FB–111 has ". . . better penetration, bombing and navigation capability than the B–52 . . . (and) adds a new dimension in versatility to the bomber force." He did not need to add that the shortcoming of the FB–111 was its limited range for strategic bombing and bomb carrying capability. As an interim SAC bomber it is satisfactory. The command has no intention to purchase more, including the new stretched version being offered by General Dynamics, the JOURNAL was told by General Bruce K. Holloway, SAC Commander-in-Chief.

COST-EFFECTIVE

One Air Force officer involved in the F–111 program recently told The JOURNAL, "The F–111 is going to look like a bargain in a few years." His reasons why were all operational.

Based on current experience with the F–111 and other aircraft in SEA it required 5.91 Phantom sorties or 5.04 "Thud" sorties to attain the target damage obtained by a single F–111.

The highly automated A–7 came out slightly better in comparison, 3.57 sorties as compared to the F–111.

The cost factor of operating fighters in a bombing role entails more than a single formation of jets. It includes electronic counter measures aircraft, ground based radars, tankers, air cap, flak suppression sorties and "Wild Weasel" anti-SAM missions. All must be coordinated and timed by a half dozen bases and units. The F–111 operated in SEA without such aerial support and will in the future.

Despite the cost and problems associated with the F–111 it still stands alone as the best aircraft yet developed for night and bad weather attack missions deep inside enemy territory. It is unique in its unrefueled range capabilities. No other fighter in the world can cross the Atlantic unrefueled which means that the F–111 alone can be rapidly deployed almost anywhere in the world without waiting for tanker support. Pacific missions would require island stops. Tankers would allow non-stop crossings.

It carries more bombs than any other fighter and surpasses all other known fighters for automatic navigation accuracy, weapons accuracy, maintainability and short or rough field operations. As a single ship attack aircraft it can operate as no other can without extensive air cover, tanker and electronic countermeasures support. In addition it has a 24-hour attack capability in bad weather, giving it an 80% advantage over other aircraft in the European theater.

Little Orphan Annie, the Texas turkey, is no lady, She's a Tiger.

F–111 AT A GLANCE

F–111A—This was the basic design which was to provide Tactical Air Command wtih an all-weather tactical bombing capability. TF30–P3 engine. Total of 141 built.

FB–111—Basic design for Strategic Air Command. An interim bomber between the older model B–52s and the B–1. Provides both nuclear and conventional capability with only minimum modification. TF30–P7 engines. Total of 76 built.

F–111E—Basic F–111A design with improved penetration aids and weapons management. TF30–P3 engine is stall free through supersonic envelope. Contract was for 94.

F–111F—Further improved with growth engine TF30–P100 for increased payload and maneuverability. Improved avionics include digital computers and advanced inertial navigation. Contract is for 70.

F111D—Has major avionics modifications to add air-to-ground moving target attack capability. Has improved weapons delivery accuracy and payload. Contract was for 96.

A total of 526 F–111s will be built under existing contracts, including the 7 Navy F–111B models and 24 F–111C models for the Royal Australian Air Force.

THE TIME HAS COME TO ASSURE ADEQUATE SUPPLIES OF HOME HEATING OIL AT FAIR PRICES FOR NEW ENGLAND FOR THE COMING WINTER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1971, I authored a letter to the President, cosigned by the entire New England House delegation, urging him to act before June 1, 1971, to assure the continuation and expansion of the No. 2 home heating oil import program for the east coast. See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 16042. Regrettably, to date no action has been taken.

Thus, on July 16, 1971, I wrote another letter, again cosigned by my New England colleagues in the House, to George A. Lincoln, chairman of the administration's Oil Policy Committee demanding action by July 31 on three points: tne

continuation of the No. 2 home heating oil import program for the Northeast, an immediate increase in the present program from 40,000 to 100,000 barrels per day, and the elimination of the requirement that the oil be purchased from refineries in the Caribbean—I enclose a copy of this letter to be inserted at the conclusion of these remarks.

This last request is extremely vital and emphasizes the urgency of the need to implement these programs. Greater competition could result from the creation of a broader market for imports of No. 2 oil. Moreover, European refiners have offered to supply No. 2 fuel oil continuously through the winter. However, they must be able to finalize these contracts on August 1, while their supply is still uncommitted. Hence, it is imperative that the decision be made as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I also am highly perturbed over Humble Oil's announcement last April to raise the price of No. 2 fuel oil for the coming fall and winter. I'm seeking to uncover the reasons for this and other matters concerning the price and supply situation. I was not able to secure information from the vice president and director of Humble Oil, Carl G. Herrington, during hearings before the House Select Committee on Small Business. Thus I was forced to submit my questions to Humble's chairman of the board, Mr. M. A. Wright, to be answered for the committee record. I also enclose a copy of my letter to Mr. Wright at the conclusion of these remarks. The people of New England, who already pay the highest home heating oil rates in the Nation, have every right to demand an explanation of the reasoning behind this new price increase. Considering that Humble and Shell virtually dominate the supply in the Caribbean, one can only conclude that the foreign supply market must be expanded to enlarge competition and inhibit unjustified price increases. This incident only confirms the need for immediate action on this matter by the Oil Policy Committee.

The items follow:

JULY 16, 1971.

HON. GEORGE A. LINCOLN,
Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL LINCOLN: As you know, on May 10, we, the undersigned members of the New England Congressional delegation, wrote to President Nixon, requesting certain changes in the No. 2 fuel oil import program for District I. For your convenience, a copy of that letter is enclosed.

It is our understanding that, during May, you and the Oil Policy Committee ordered a review of the No. 2 fuel oil program to determine its effectiveness and the need for changes to strengthen the impact of the program on competition, prices and supply in the heating oil markets of the Northeastern states.

We are pleased that you are making this review. However, we are concerned that there be prompt and positive action by the Oil Policy Committee to deal with the conditions outlined in our letter of May 10. There has, as you know, been no improvement in these conditions. In fact, in late June, the posted price of No. 2 fuel oil rose again in the Caribbean—to 10 and 10.2 cents per gallon; this is even higher than the price of the same product at U. S. refineries. The need for a price investigation as required by Section 6(A) of Presidential Proclamation 3279 is therefore even more evident than it was when we called for it in our May 10th letter.

We are also deeply concerned that the Humble Oil Company intends to carry forward with its plans to raise the price of No. 2 fuel oil along the east coast by more than 1 cent per gallon by the end of this year. This, of course, means added costs of more than $45 million per year for New England homeowners.

We understand that No. 2 fuel oil is now available from European refineries at prices considerably lower than those in the Caribbean; and that oil from Europe can be imported into New England at a cost that could mean savings to consumers. The landed price of European oil would be between 1 and 2 cents per gallon less than the landed price of No. 2 fuel oil from U.S. or Caribbean refineries, and as you know, a one cent reduction means $45 million per year of savings to the consumers of our area. The availability of more competitive supply sources is sure to lead to more competitive pricing in the Caribbean.

These factors—the continuing rise in Caribbean prices, the domestic oil price increases announced by Humble Oil, and the savings possible on European oil—underscore the need for prompt action by the Oil Policy Committee on the request we made on May 10.

The time for study and review and meetings is over; the time for decision has arrived.

We therefore strongly urge that, by *July 31* the Oil Policy Committee recommend—and the President adopt—amendments to the Oil Import Proclamation which would:

1. remove the requirement that No. 2 fuel oil imported into the Northeastern states must be purchased from Western Hemisphere refineries.

2. increase the No. 2 fuel oil imports into District I from the present level of 40,000 b/d to 100,000 b/d.

3. Place the No. 2 fuel oil import program on a permanent basis.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

SILVIO O. CONTE.

P.S.—Attached is a list of the cosigners to this letter, comprising the entire New England House delegation:

Hon. William R. Cotter, Hon. Robert N. Giaimo, Hon. Ella T. Grasso, Hon. Stewart B. McKinney, Hon. John S. Monagan, Hon. Robert H. Steele.

Hon. William D. Hathaway, Hon. Peter N. Kyros, Hon. Edward P. Boland, Hon. James A. Burke, Hon. Robert B. Donohue, Hon. Robert F. Drinan.

Hon. Michael Harrington, Hon. Margaret M. Heckler, Hon. Louise Day Hicks, Hon, Hastings Keith, Hon. Torbert H. Macdonald, Hon. F. Bradford Morse.

Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Hon. James C. Cleveland, Hon. Louis C. Wyman, Hon. Fernand J. St Germain, Hon. Robert O. Tiernan, Hon. Robert T. Stafford.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1971.

MR. M. A. WRIGHT,
Chairman of the Board, Humble Oil and Refining Co., Houston, Tex.

DEAR MR. WRIGHT: Enclosed you will find a series of questions on Humble's policies regarding oil imports and heating oil price and supply matters which I sought to put to your Vice President and Director, Carl G. Herrington, during his appearance before the House Small Business Committee hearings on fuel and energy yesterday. I would appreciate your responses for the Committee record as soon as possible.

I regret that this is necessary, but, in view of Mr. Herrington's total lack of cooperation yesterday, I know of no other course. Mr. Herrington simply stated my questions were outside of his area of responsibility, and despite his knowledge of the Committee's concern about fuel supplies, failed to arrange for any accompanying witness who could speak to these issues.

I look forward to receiving your views on these matters of such importance to the American consumer.

With warmest good wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

QUESTIONS BY MR. CONTE FOR HUMBLE OIL

1. What's the position of Humble Oil on the No. 2 fuel oil import program for the Northeastern states involving 40,000 barrels per day? I understand that Humble's former President, Charles Jones, recently told a group of New England Senators that he was against the program.

2. I note that Standard Oil of New Jersey in 1971 imports 40,000 b/d of crude oil alone. What's the problem with giving this amount of heating oil—or even more, up to 100,000 b/d, which I favor,—to all of the east coast?

3. What's the position of Humble Oil in the residual (No. 6) fuel oil import program for the east coast? I understand that Humble's former President, Charles Jones, recently told a group of New England Senators that he was against that program, as well, and favored reimposition of controls on this product.

4. How do you feel about imports of refined products, such as No. 2 fuel oil, from Canadian refineries, particularly those in Eastern Canada?

5. I should like to place in the record the attached Humble Oil price schedule which was announced to cargo buyers in April of this year. I understand that Humble had the same kind of schedule in effect during 1970. This price schedule is strong evidence to me that you have an unconscionable and perhaps illegal amount of market power. I know of few companies, in any industry, who make such announcements so far in advance and then are able to enforce such price escalation. How can you possibly announce your prices so far in advance and maintain that price if you don't coactively control the market place?

6. A year ago at this time the wholesale price of No. 2 oil in the Caribbean was 6.5 cents per gallon; it's now 10 to 10.2 cents per gallon and I understand that there is very little product available even at those prices for the coming winter. How can you possibly justify this rapid price escalation? I realize that Creole Petroleum is the company involved in the Caribbean, but you and Creole are both affiliates of Standard Oil of New Jersey, so you certainly qualify to answer this question.

7. What's your position on allowing New England importers to purchase No. 2 fuel oil in Europe? This will allow fuel oil to be delivered in Boston for 1 to 2 cents less and will give us some price relief. How can you be against this, especially in the light of the lack of supply and the very high prices in the Caribbean? After all, we're not talking about very much oil—even if the import levels were 100,000 barrels per day this would be less than 1% of U.S. consumption.

8. There is a lot of oil in Alaska and you say that it should receive the protection of the U.S. oil import program and that Alaskan oil should be treated more favorably than Canadian oil. In that case, are you prepared to pledge to the U.S. Government that all the crude oil produced in Alaska by Humble (by the oil companies there) will be imported in the U.S.—and none shipped to Japan and other places?

9. I'd like to read from an ad of the American Gas Association that appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* last week (July 8, 1971):

"We're importing Liquid Natural Gas. It's

helping us meet the peak winter demand in the cold Northeast . . . it allows us to bring the vast gas supplies of the world right to our shores. And supplies another answer to the country's increasing energy needs."

This seems to make sense to me. How does Humble Oil feel about increased imports of natural gas, and, if you are not against it, why can't we have increased imports of another heating fuel—No. 2 oil?

10. Your people say that we in New England are too reliant on No. 6 residual oil from overseas sources. Are you prepared to say that Humble Oil and other major oil companies can produce enough No. 6 fuel to meet all our demands from domestic refineries? And, if so, at what prices?

11. Isn't it true that overseas refineries provided 300,000 barrels per day more of No. 6 oil this past winter than the previous winter for the east coast—wouldn't you consider this a benefit to our area? In other words, reliance on foreign refineries gave us a great deal more supply than we would have had if we relied on domestic refineries alone?

12. The price of No. 6 fuel oil in the Middle West is even higher than the east coast. Isn't the middle west almost completely supplied by domestic refineries? So what is the price benefit?

13. Your people keep talking about National security decisions involving oil. But isn't it true that nearly 100% of the oil for our troops in Vietnam comes from the Persian Gulf? What do you think of the military judgment of those who decided to rely on that "insecure source" for supplies for our troops in war?

HUMBLE OIL PRICE SCHEDULE, NO. 2 FUEL OIL, CARGO (WHOLESALE) PRICE

[In cents per gallon]

	Boston Harbor	New York Harbor
Present price	10.8	10.6
May 1	11.1	10.9
Nov. 1	11.4	11.2
Dec. 1	11.7	11.5
Jan. 1, 1972	12.1	11.9

COUNTERED BY AGNEW

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial from the Flint Journal offers an excellent commentary on the most recent set of unfortunate remarks by the Vice President. I insert the editorial for the benefit of my colleagues:

COUNTERED BY AGNEW

Bishop Stephen G. Spottswood, chairman of the board of directors of the NAACP, recently expressed a view that must have heartened those in the Nixon administration concerned with building relationships with the nation's 23 million black citizens.

Addressing his organization's annual convention, Spottswood conceded that in the year following his denunciation of the administration as "anti-Negro," President Nixon has "announced policies in certain phases of the civil rights issue which have earned cautious and limited approval among black Americans."

In view of the depths to which relations between the Nixon administration and blacks had plunged, such a concession was significant indeed.

It did not, of course, suggest that perhaps President Nixon—if he answered his challenges Spottswood laid out for him—could count on a large number of black votes next year. But it did suggest a growing awareness that the administration, after all, had not abandoned—politically or governmentally—such a significant segment of the American citizenry.

The Spottswood statement, it appeared at that time, might be a foundation upon which important new links of communication could be established between the White House and civil rights leaders.

Such speculation was before Vice President Spiro T. Agnew—who may not have even been aware of the NAACP chairman's address—injected himself into the American racial picture with all of the delicacy of an enraged bull.

Agnew took time from his globe trotting to collectively label civil rights leaders as querulous complainers and to charge that most of the black leadership in America "could learn much" from the strong-man leaders of black African nations he is visiting.

His chief models of "moderateness" and "understanding" are President Jomo Kenyatta at Kenya, Congolese President Joseph D. Mobutu and Ethiopian Emporer Haile Selassie.

It was a remarkable performance by the vice president, reflecting an abysmal lack of knowledge of Africa, past and present, and a distressing lack of insight into the substance and meaning of the American civil rights movement.

Agnew's basic error was in attempting to draw parallels where, if they exist at all, they are so tenuous as to be almost meaningless. He ignored the fact that the African leaders have long since achieved their basic goal, independence from foreign domination, and are essentially running their own shows. On the other hand, American civil rights leaders still find their primary goal of complete equality elusive and their battle unwon—justifying complaints that offend Agnew.

The leaders that are Agnew's models of moderation and understanding are hard-nosed authoritarians, Kenyatta perhaps less than Mobutu and Selassie. The Ethiopian emperor's merest whim is law. Mobutu, upset by recent student unrest, casually drafted hundreds of protesters for two years of army service. Is this the kind of leadership Agnew covets for blacks in a free society?

Agnew is guilty of ignoring the past in his frantic search for present-day relevance. Kenyatta, today, is a respected and enlightened leader of an emerging nation who can be judged favorably—in terms of the present. But the vice president seemingly overlooked the fact that the British convicted Kenyatta and imprisoned him for anti-white terrorist activity through the dreaded Mau Mau society.

Thus, it can be held legitimately that Agnew insulted American black leaders who deplore violence by holding them up to comparison with one who, even if he was not personally part of Mau Mau terrorism, has blood on his hands indirectly—long dried, but visible in the perspective of history.

If, as some might argue, there was no other way of freeing Kenya from the heavy yoke of imperialism, that is all the more reason for Agnew to refrain from drawing foolish parallels.

To top everything, Agnew acknowledged that there are some black leaders in America exempt from his heavy-handed criticism. But he flatly refused to name them, which puts every last one under a cloud in the eyes of those white Americans who might be tempted to accept the vice president's deplorable assessment as gospel.

Frequently it has been speculated that Agnew, when he unleashes a diatribe at the news media or at university administrators, is really saying what President Nixon would like to say but cannot for fear of harming the fragile image of the presidency.

We cannot say this hasn't been the case in some instances, but in view of recent White House efforts to put some bridges over the chasm between it and black Americans—which have had at least limited success, judging from the Spottswood statement—we cannot accept this as even a remote possibility in the case of Agnew's remarks belittling civil rights leaders.

The vice president has done an injustice to responsible leaders of this movement, and he has, in effect, chopped holes in the bottom of an important administration boat just as it was beginning to float.

Unfortunately, it will take a long time to undo the damage caused by his gratuitous remarks.

THE COMPUTER WILL BURY US

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the most famous remark attributed to former Soviet Premier Khrushchev was "We will bury you." But with the coming of the thaw in American-Russian relations, perceptive observers have seen many areas in which our two nations are converging. At least, I would say we are coming closer together in social style if not in some foreign policy objectives. For example, the Soviets are now putting more stress on consumer goods, we have received reports of Soviet concern over pollution of their natural environment and now we learn that the computer is to play a determining role in Russia's future.

Victor Zorza is one of the most astute commentators on the Soviet Union. He has frequently discovered stories about the Kremlin which have been frighteningly accurate and his reporting on Soviet life and intentions is consistently shrewd. This is why I am inserting in the RECORD his most recent story.

In 1966 the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy which I had the privilege to chair for some 7 years, held a hearing on a proposed national data bank. This bureaucratic dream was shown by the revelations of my subcommittee to contain the seeds of citizens' nightmares and we were able to divert it from coming into being in a formal way. However, according to such authorities as Prof. Arthur Miller of the University of Michigan Law School and author of the distinguished "The Assault on Privacy," our victory may well have been only a temporary one. Acting under Executive orders by both Republican and Democratic Presidents, all computerized information systems within the Federal Establishment must now work toward compatibility. Metaphorically, that means that computers will develop a common language before the people of the world do. It has long been my belief that we should spend more time helping people to become compatible rather than assisting the compatibility of computers but, since people frequently have other things in mind than becoming breathing robots of efficiency and economy, my urgings have not been extraordinarily successful.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Zorza writes a very fascinating descrip-

tion about the computerized future of the Russian people and he shows how the computer is planning to be used as a weapon of thought control. Mr. Zorza says:

But the main purpose of any such system would be to prevent any disloyal ideas from even taking shape in the heads of Soviet citizens . . . the full record of his psychological characteristics and actions could be used to devise an approach that would quickly persuade him . . . that his best interests require him to conform to the political guidance of his spiritual advisor at the KGB.

Sound familiar? With the exception of the initials KGB, it could be a quote from B. F. Skinner's new book, "Beyond Freedom and Dignity." Professor Skinner is one of the foremost behavioral psychologists in the Nation and many people see his ideas as seductive and promising relief from the agonies of free will. Smith Hempstone writes in today's Washington Star an extremely welcome piece of debunking and points to what, in my judgment, can be seen as the total similarity of the future for both Americans and Russians awaiting the fruition of virtually irresistible trends in our two societies.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, the computer could bury us both if we remain on our present course. I insert the articles referred to in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Jersey Journal, July 26, 1971]

COMPUTERS POSE "1984" THREAT FOR RUSSIA

(New evidence that the Kremlin is building a national computer network to control all aspects of nation's life is beginning to come to light. Victor Zorza, the British expert on the Communist World, has just come to Washington at the invitation of Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies to engage in a six-month study of all aspects of the Soviet project. He describes below some of the clues to Russia's brave new world.)

(By Victor Zorza)

WASHINGTON.—The Kremlin conflict between those Soviet leaders who want to run the country by computer, and those who fear that such a computer network could take over their own powers, has been won by the men who believe in the machine. As a result, the Soviet Union has embarked on a crash program which will triple its computer "population" within the next five years, and by 1984 establish a machine as awesome as anything envisaged by Orwell.

The first step, already approved by the Kremlin, is the setting up of a national network of computerized data banks to take over, within the next ten years or so, the management of large sections of the country's economy from the human planner or so say some of Russia's leading computer men. These men are also telling the Kremlin that, in five more years or so, they could give it the modern tools to regain the totalitarian control of society which has been slipping from its grasp since the death of Stalin.

The man behind the Kremlin's project is Prof. Victor Glushkov, head of the Kiev Cybernetics Institute, who first began to lay his plans for a computerized future back in the fifties, with the public encouragement of Nikita S. Khrushchev. The Soviet party leader, then at the peak of his power, was able to shield the professor from attacks on the ideological propriety, as well as the practical desirability, of any such scheme.

After Krushchev's fall in 1964 the whole idea of a "cybernetic society" suffered the sad fate of his other "hare-brained" schemes, like the corn-growing craze. But Prof. Glushkov soon came back into his own, this time with a panacea that was designed to give the new leadership a way out of its own difficulties. At the Soviet party congress earlier this year Secretary-General Leonid I. Brezhnev emerged as an ardent supporter of the plan. The congress formally voted its approval for the building of "an automated nation-wide system for the collection and processing of information essential for the control, the planning and the management of the country's economy, based on the state network of computer centers and on the unified automatic communications system for the country as a whole."

Glushkov promptly hailed the congress decision as endorsing his own project to "set up a unified nation-wide automated management system." The party congress, he announced, had laid down "the ways of attacking this complex problem in an organized manner."

The economic control system which Glushkov sees emerging "by 1980" will consist of a number of computer centers, located in each ministry and in each city, all linked with one another, "and containing in their memory every street, every house, every apartment . . . and the like."

And the like? That is where the "social" aspect of the network comes in—and "social" in this context is a synonym for political police control.

"Some of the machines covering the towns and the districts should be assigned exclusively to the collection of opinions on the most varied questions." Glushkov does his level best to present the new system in a politically innocuous light by comparing it with the ancient Roman forum, where, he says, the citizens used to gather to settle the affairs of state. But this would hardly do for a country of 250 million people. So the Soiet Union would bring it all up to date by providing linked computerized facilities for "something like a general assembly of the country's whole population—and what's more, one that would be permanently in session."

This is not unlike the idea proposed by some Western social scientists, who also say that the computers should be used to democratize the process of political decision-making. Glushkov, too, claims that the computer network will open up "broad possibilities for further democratization"—which sounds ominous enough when one recalls that what Soviet leaders describe as "democracy" is often recognized in the West as totalitarianism.

The people who would control the computer network and the information flowing through it could also shape the conclusions that emerge from it and this could happen not only in a totalitarian country. Certainly the Kremlin, to put it mildly, is no more likely to yield its policymaking powers to a computerized "general assembly" in a dozen years from now than it would be willing to transfer them to an elected parliament today. "The electronic forum," says Glushkov, "will be in action without interruption, absorbing the information about men's hopes, wishes, the hierarchy of values, preferences, and so on."

So, perhaps, it will. And the political police experts of the KGB, the state security committee, could certainly be as competent to monitor the flow of this information as they are now equipped to spot any signs of political dissent. At this point, presumably, the party's own political experts would take over from the KGB. "It will then be necessary," says Glushkov, "to analyze deeply the information thus acquired, to relate the wishes to the available resources, to study the results to which any proposed steps may lead, and so on and so forth."

He can even put an approximate date to it all—a date close enough to 1984 to impart to his blueprint the nightmare perspective that his words conjure up. "I believe," he says, "that by the mid-eighties we shall have enough machines to give effect to such a scheme."

He ought to know. He is in line for the post of the Soviet Union's "computer czar" when the present plans to reorganize and to centralize its straggling and grossly inefficient computer industry are completed.

How seriously should his scheme be regarded? The Kremlin certainly takes him in deadly earnest. The Soviet government recently opened its own version of the Harvard Business School, where the top leaders of industry as well as of the party and government, up to the level of minister, get refresher courses on how to use modern methods to run the country. The inaugural lecture was delivered by the best man the Kremlin could find. He was none other than Prof. Viktor Mikhailovich Glushkov.

He reassured Russia's governing elite that his system would not deprive the politicans of their power. He thought it necessary to "devote his lecture to precisely this theme"—to the main issue, that is, in the struggle between the Kremlin's "computer faction" and its opponents. As he put it, the belief that "the problems of management were dominated by technology" was a misunderstanding of his attitude—that is, of the attitude of the "computer party."

"What we must design and build," he said, "is not simply the technical means for the processing of the data, not simply electronic calculators, but a integrated system of management—a machinery with the mathematical software, with economic and social criteria, with a structure of the functions, the obligations, and the responsibilities of the leaders—indeed, a whole system."

The special pleading in which he engaged to show that the systems analysts would not be taking over from the political leaders concentrated the spotlight on the part of the avenue where the conflict has been at its fiercest. "In the first place," Glushkov explained, "it is the leader and no one else, who poses the problem that is to be solved," on the basis of his understanding of the party's policy. "Secondly, it is the leader who organizes the executions of the decisions taken." To the objection that it was "the systems analysts who had prepared the decision" in the first place, Glushkov retorted that they would reject on their own responsibility only those solutions that were "obviously unsuitable," but he insisted, they would not take the final decision.

"But why not," he was asked. "Because a systems analyst is a man with a scientific cast of mind," inclined to persist in his quest for optimum solutions, always looking for a better answer than the one he found last and the process would continue indefinitely, without a decision ever being reached.

It was therefore for the political leader, "with a different sort of training and different moral and psychological attributes than those which characterize the scientist, the systems analyst," to choose the right moment when the solution is ripe, "and to take the decision."

It does not, on the face of it, seem the kind of argument that would convince many skeptics. The Kremlin's "anti-computer faction" must have studied the Pentagon's experience, and would surely have asked Glushkov what happens when the systems analyst, or a man with that sort of mind, is promoted to a political position.

Glushkov's answer is not recorded, but the victory of the computer faction is evident in the decision to produce between 13,000 and 15,000 third generation computers by 1975, compared with about a third of that number available in the Soviet Union now, and to set up 1,600 ASU's—the Russian acronymic for automated management systems.

Most of the existing computers are obsolescent and incompatible with each other, and therefore unsuitable for any nationally linked system. The new target was announced by M. Rakovsky, the deputy chairman of Gosplan, the state planning committee, in a "Pravda" article that was promptly distributed by the Tass wire service, in one of those rare slip-ups that reveal some of the secret moves in the Kremlin infighting.

[From the Jersey Journal, July 27, 1971]

SOVIET BOSSES PLAN A "BRAVE NEW WORLD"

(By Victor Zorza)

WASHINGTON.—The secret of the Kremlin's decision to launch a crash computer program got out almost by accident.

Each night around midnight the Tass office in Moscow usually gets the early proofs of the next day's "Pravda," and then reports to its wire service subscribers the world over the most important stories featured in the paper. The major article, by M. Rakovsky, deputy chairman of Gosplan, the state planning committee, and giving the first hard figures on Soviet computers ever published in the open press, described the national automated system in which they were to be integrated went out this way.

It was obviously a major statement of policy, and was treated by Tass as such. But when that day's "Pravda" reached the West, Rakovsky's article had mysteriously disappeared from it. Nor had it appeared in any of the issues checked in the Soviet Union. The reasons for the disappearance of his article may only be surmised, but they certainly do not include any diminution of his powerful position. As his subsequent statements show, he is still in charge of the computerization of the Soviet economy, framing the policy and overseeing the installation of the 1,600 that are to be set up in the central ministries in Moscow, in the capitals of the Soviet Union's 15 constituent republics, and in other institutions.

Whatever doubts there may have been about the advisability of publishing the figure which shows the trebling of the Soviet computer population, there is no doubt that the target has been approved by the Kremlin and that major resources are now being shifted into this area with a real sense of urgency.

Rakovsky is one of the pillars of the Soviet conservative establishment, and some of the economic reformers who have been hoping to liberalize the Soviet system believe that he is one of the men chiefly responsible for blocking their proposals.

The Soviet economic reform program, associated with the name of Professor Yevsey Liberman, suffered a major setback when the Spring of Prague showed that economic decentralization is bound to be followed by political liberalization and pose a major challenge to the survival of the Communist system.

It was the Soviet reformers who pressed originally for the use of computers to help run the economy, so that the profit motive which they hoped to introduce into the system would not get out of hand, as they say it has got out of hand in the capitalist world. The conservatives, on the other hand, feared computers like the plague. They assumed that the flow of truthful information which computers must have to help arrive at rational decisions would play havoc with the party's arbitrary process of policymaking, and would therefore tend to erode the party's monopoly of power.

Now the controversy has come full circle, and it is the conservatives who see computers as the salvation of the Communist system. They believe that the computers could help them to kill the idea that the Soviet Union needs a marketing system similar to that of the West, where the play of supply and demand—and not the party politburo-dictates what the economy produces. The reformers have argued that if the Soviet Union established a market system in which goods would move more freely in response to demand, instead of being distributed by the central planners, the gross inefficiency and wastage which now characterize the Soviet economy might be done away with.

The conservatives have now turned the reformers own argument against them, and they claim that the feedback provided by the reactions of the market could be obtained in Soviet conditions from the national computer network, which would monitor the flow of goods and the play of supply and demand, and tell the central planner exactly what was happening in every sector of the economy at the push of the button.

The question of whether this is feasible, and if it is, how soon some such system could be introduced, divides both Soviet and Western economists. There are those in the West who believe that the input-output tables on which such a system has to be based might even be used to make the capitalist economic processes more rational. But Professor Viktov Glushkov, head of the Kiev Cybernetics Institute, and in line for the post of Soviet computer czar and the "computer party" behind him claims that the system they are building will give the Soviet Union "a tremendous advantage" over the capitalist world, because it will enable the Russians to do without the wasteful competition which causes several versions of the same product to be put on the market before the consumer finally decides which product is the most effective. "As distinct from the capitalist world," says Glushkov, "we will create the conditions for the competition of ideas, not the competition of actions."

Surely, he argues, it is more rational to swap ideas rather than goods, "and to determine by analytical means which is best." In the capitalist world "The social contradictions of the system completely preclude any real kind of planning, and the coordination of plans." On the other hand, says Glushkov, warming again to the subject of the "social" uses of computers, "correct conclusions could be reached only by men of truly Soviet conditioning and conviction, devoted to the interests of the people and to Communist ideals."

His definition of the men who will operate the "social" computer network comes uncomfortably close to the ideological superlatives which the Soviet press usually reserves for the KGB "heroes" who guard so staunchly the political security of the Communist system. The KGB's public front organization, the MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs) has now admitted for the first time that the computer network which it has been putting together for some time past is already partly operational. The MVD has held what its minister, N. A. Schelokov, describes as a "scientific conference" designed "to perfect a longterm plan" for a computerized network.

All police organizations in the world either have or want to have computers to do their recordkeeping for them, but the KGB's preoccupation with political security and with the suppression of dissent makes the analytical potential of its electronic brain a greater threat to freedom in Russia than anything else the neo-Stalinists in the Kremlin could dream up. The recent congressional investigation of the U.S. Army's excursion into the field of political surevillance shows the kind of threat that could emerge even in America.

But the KGB already has the most detailed files on every Soviet citizen, from the cradle to the grave. When these are fed into its computers, it will have at its fingertips, at a moment's notice, not only the information about the physical movement of political suspects, but also a record of their associations, remarks, and even ideas. It will be able to analyze these with a speed and thoroughness that no human investigator—or even a whole army of investigators—could match.

It will be able to identify not only the political "criminals" who may have escaped the attention of its sleuths, but the computer will also print out for it lists of potential political criminals, who are showing early signs of deviation, so that the resources of the police could be concentrated on areas of real concern instead of being dissipated in random surveillance patterns. It will identify not only individuals, but whole groups and categories of the population that ought to be watched or brain-washed and reindoctrinated, to make sure that they do not stray from the straight and narrow path of political virtue.

In the longer term, the Kremlin's huge propaganda apparatus which at present blankets the country with crude and simplistic slogans will be able to turn the national computer network to more sophisticated uses. The message that "all capitalists are bad," and "all communists are good," will be varied and diversified into a thousand and one different forms.

Already there is talk of a cable television system which could, with the aid of computers, switch into each home the kind of advertising message to which the particular recipient would be more likely to respond—like the mail advertising that is now differentiated according to what the advertiser knows of the consumer's needs.

But the main purpose of any such system would be to prevent any disloyal ideas from even taking shape in the heads of Soviet citizens.

By that time, the full record of his psychological characteristics and actions could be used to devise an approach that would quickly persuade him—by the promise of a reward, perhaps, rather than by the threat of punishment—that his best interests require him to conform to the political guidance of his spiritual adviser at the KGB.

The new totalitarianism—the total control of the individual and of society—would have nothing of the Stalinist terror system about it. It would be more like Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World."

To some people in Russia—and perhaps not only in Russia—this is a visionary dream, the utopia that has thrilled the idealistic political thinkers of all ages. To others, it is a nightmare so awesome that they refuse to admit that anything of the kind is conceivable.

Thus Glushkov's statements are only the tip of the iceberg. To find out just how much there is to it, enormous masses of Soviet material will have to be sieved for the occasional nuggets that should show how realistic the whole project is.

But the one light amid the gloom is that the liberals have the moral strength which has at crucial moments in the history of mankind served to overthrow tyrannical rulers and institution.

[From the Washington Star, July 28, 1971]

RADISHES AND B. F. SKINNER'S BRAVE NEW WORLD

(By Smith Hempstone)

B. F. (Burrhus Frederic) Skinner excessively admires the radish, which is his privilege and an altogether meet and right thing to do, particularly with the discreet application of a little salt. Trouble is that Skinner, who does his stuff at Harvard and is considered to be one of the foremost behavioral phychologists in the country, foresees—and advocates—a new era in which people will be just as docile (and as interesting) as the plump-rooted *Raphanus sativus*.

In his aptly titled book, "Beyond Freedom and Dignity," which will be published in

September and to a condensation of which the major portion of the August issue of the magazine "Psychology Today" is devoted, Skinner holds that "autonomous man," with his claims to individual freedom and dignity, is on the verge of extinction, a development which he applauds.

Now any man who, like Skinner, can teach pigeons to play ping-pong is not to be taken lightly. And, indeed, there is much in what he says. One does not need to leave one's neighborhood or to look farther than one's mirror, to realize that those Biblical bits about man being made in the image of God and just a little lower than the angels are a gross conceit which will not bear close scrutiny. And it is equally true that if the population explosion continues, more control and less freedom is the inevitable destiny of man.

For when the "standing-room-only" signs are up all around the world, it is clear that anti-social behavior which once could be shrugged off no longer will be tolerated. In short, George Orwell's "1984" is just around the corner, or 13 years away, to be precise.

"It is not difficult," writes Skinner, "to demonstrate a connection between the unlimited right of the individual to pursue happiness and the catastrophes threatened by unchecked breeding, the unrestrained affluence that exhausts resources and pollutes the environment, and the imminence of nuclear war."

Permissiveness, Skinner points out, is not a policy but "the abandonment of policy, and its apparent advantages are illusory." Amen to that, but how, precisely, does Skinner plan to turn us into radishes and will we like it when he does?

Skinner does not go into details but as an exponent of behavioral psychology and operant conditioning he holds that man's behavior, like that of pigeons, is shaped entirely by this natural and social environment. Which means man acts only to avoid punishment or to gain rewards, which will strike some as warmed-over dialectical materialism. Further, he believes that once undesirable traits have been identified, these can be conditioned out of the human race by genetic engineering and alteration of the environment.

In Skinner's utopian world, people "will live together without quarreling," there will be no wars, no overpopulation, no conspicuous consumption and lots of fun and games—not to speak of art, music and literature—for all. It will seldom be necessary to punish anyone because "behavior likely to be punished seldom or never occurs." Neither the controls nor the controllers (and there will always be the latter) will be resented because both will be virtually invisible.

It should be noted at this point that no one would be unhappier in such a drone-like society than a starchy, touch-minded iconoclast like Skinner. But, perhaps because he is 67 and cannot expect to live to see the realization of his model, Skinner is unconcerned. As he puts it, "the problem is not to design a world that will be liked by people as they now are but to design one that will be liked by those who live in it." The rest of us, presumably, will be "conditioned out" of society, which is to say, eliminated or segregated in pales preserved for increasingly elderly unregenerate individualists.

Indeed, there are a couple of places where Skinner's theories are being given practical application and they are called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of China. There children are introduced to Communist morality almost from birth and live within its framework all their stunned lives. And anyone who has ever met the charmless, humorless automatons produced by this system wouldn't wish it on Pavlov's dog, not to speak of Skinner's ping-pong-playing pigeons.

Skinner's thinking, like that of Copernicus, Darwin and Freud, is certain to be attacked by the intellectual community, because it is innovative and because it calls into question all those concepts such as liberty and "unalienable rights" which all of us, and particularly Americans, hold dear.

Now a man abhorred, as is Skinner, by Prof. Noam Chomsky of M.I.T. can't be all bad, and this observer, for one, is inclined to agree with Skinner that his brave new world is just around the corner. But I'm glad I won't be here to see it, although I must confess that many among the current generation of overaged, television-educated "kids" will make mighty fine radishes.

THE NONRETURNABLE BOTTLES AND CANS BILL—II

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 13 of this year I introduced H.R. 8370, a bill that would place a 10-cent excise tax on nonreturnable bottles and cans, and increase the deposit on returnables to 5 cents. Like the other environmental legislation I have introduced this session, this bill would incorporate the use of economic incentives to tackle the nonreturnable can and bottle problem.

I am happy to report that this morning I received a letter of support from Mr. Peter Chokola, president of Chokola Beverage Co. in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. Mr. Chokola is a small businessman constantly faced with the problem of staying alive in a market full of heavily advertised giants. I wish to place Mr. Chokola's letter and an excellent article from the Dallas, Pa., Post, which so cogently reveals the problems of a truly concerned small businessman in today's economy, into the RECORD today. Mr. Chokola has fought the giants, and not only did he win, but he has been very successful in converting the giants to his way of thinking.

I invite my colleagues to read this story, which we can all learn a great deal from.

The letter and article follow:

CHOKOLA BEVERAGE CO., INC.,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., July 20, 1971.

Representative LES ASPIN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: I have just heard about your bill (H.R. 8370) which would impose an excise tax on the sale of soft drinks and beer in nonreturnable bottles and cans, and I agree wholeheartedly with you. Throwaway single use beverage containers are a major public nuisance, a wasteful use of natural resources, and should be eliminated from the American scene. Therefore, you have my complete support as a soft drink bottler for your bill.

As you can see from the foregoing, I am a proponent of the use of Returnable deposit bottles for soft drinks and beer. These can be recycled back to the local bottling plant and reused as high as 50 times. Then when no longer serviceable, they can be broken into cullet at the bottling plant and returned to the glass factory to be remelted into new bottles (or glassphalt roads, etc.) This is the ultimate solution to the massive litter problem and garbage solid waste explosion caused by the metal can and throw-away bottle beverage containers.

The drive towards throw-aways is continuing even though it is now common knowledge throughout the bottling industry that they are a grave threat to the ecology. This drive is not the result of consumer demand, but are being pushed by the large companies in the container, supermarket, and bottling industry.

Throw-aways certainly do not bear their true economic costs, since a continuation of this trend supposes a ready willingness of all levels of government to pour increasing subsidies of tax dollars to clean up the mess.

Frankly, I believe this wasteful expenditure of tax dollars as a solution to problems caused by members of an industry seeking greater profits for themselves cannot be afforded by government and will not be allowed.

Could you please send me a copy of your bill?

Sincerely yours,

PETER T. CHOKOLA,
President and General Manager.

[From the Dallas (Pa.) Post, Dec. 22, 1970]

REGIONAL BOTTLER JOINS ECOLOGY FIGHT—PETE CHOKOLA GOES ON RECORD AGAINST THROW-AWAY BOTTLES, CANS

(By J. R. Freeman)

In this era of space ships, corporate giants and big government, Pete Chokola is a throwback to the days of rugged individualism. In this time of environmental and consumer concern, he fits perfectly as does the Ralph Naders and the William O. Douglases. But his plight is not an easy or a sure one.

Pete Chokola is a mild-mannered and affable chap who is president of his father's 60-year-old Wilkes-Barre soft drink bottling company, known in the region as Chokola Beverages. Pete works hard, handling or at least involved, with all operations of the business, from purchasing to selling, and even occasionally "filling the bottles" when necessary. Neither would it be unusual to see him driving a delivery truck. But Pete's work days are changing drastically.

In the last few months Mr. Chokola has literally changed his life style. Rather than the mild-mannered small-time businessman, Pete Chokola has become a crusader for the public interest in the fight to stop the degradation of the environment through the use of throw-away glass bottles and cans. And whether Pete realizes it or not, this same fight will act to either save his 60-year-old family business, and hundreds of others like his across the country, or probably put them under once and for all should he lose his battle.

The Crusader for a Cleaner Environment, a non-profit Washington, D.C., educational concern headed by such distinguished environmental activists as Mrs. Arthur Godfrey, Congressman Joseph Vigorito of Pennsylvania, and Sigurd Olson, president of the Wilderness Society, has studied the matter of returnable bottles vs. throw-away bottles and aluminum cans more thoroughly than many of its counterparts. In a fact sheet the EEC points out that Americans are currently spending at least $1½ billions a year needlessly on throw-away cans and non-returnable bottles.

At the same time, according to EEC, the mess created by the mountains of disposed containers is going to cost taxpayers one way or the other to clean up, including the despoilation of the environment in the interim:

TO REVERSE THE TREND

As an example, it is estimated that by 1975, the way things are going, almost all soft drinks and beer will be sold in throw-away containers. At that rate, industry will be producing 100-billion containers annually, all of which would only be used one time, thus creating a possible 800,000 large truckloads of garbage to be cleaned up at staggering cost to the public.

On the other hand, according to Mr. Chokola, if this trend can be reversed and the industry go back in the direction of returnable containers, only six billion containers would be needed, eliminating some 94-billion containers from the waste and pollution problem.

As a small time soft drink bottler, Mr. Chokola is used to fierce competition. Coca-Cola, Pepsi-Cola, 7-Up and Dr. Pepper are the giants of his business. But there remains literally hundreds of other small-time bottlers across the land, many of which face some of the same economic hardships at Pete Chokola.

Though not commonly known outside the industry, it is usually an independent soft drink bottler who packages soda for even the giants of the industry. Coke is bottled in only a few company-owned and operated plants, with by far the majority being bottled by independents who carry a franchise from Coke to do their regional bottling. And thus it is usually these independents who make the decisions to remain with the premise that returnables are both more economic and profit-making, or that customers will purchase more soda if they can buy the throw-aways which never have to be returned to the store for refills.

Chokola wins a battle

Last year Pete Chokola fought a winning battle to retain his right to use returnable bottles.

Early in the year, he said, he made one of his usual orders to Owens-Illinois Glass Co. for a shipment of new returnable bottles, just like the ones he had been using for years. A glass company spokesman, however, told him that the firm had thrown away the machine which made such bottles, and that they could not furnish him with his type returnables. They suggested that if he modified his operation to handle throw-aways, the company would be glad to supply his glass.

A determined Pete Chokola, however, saw the situation differently; he was sure that the move was an attempt to try to force him and others like him to go to throw-aways only. In his recent testimony before a public hearing of the District of Columbia Council of the Health and Welfare committee concerning throw-away cans and bottles in Washington, D.C., Mr. Chokola laid it out in cold terms:

"In addition to the pressures I have felt from the super-markets, I had the even more trying experience of fighting a corporate giant. Owens-Illinois has always supplied my company with returnable bottles. Last year, I gave them a regular order for a shipment of returnable bottles which I needed to maintain my production schedule. I was informed that Owens-Illinois had gotten rid of the machine which made that particular bottle and that they could not fill my order. This would have meant economic ruin for me or at the minimum, forced me to switch to throw-aways, which I could not in good conscience do.

POLITICAL MUSCLE HELPS

"Being a small businessman, I turned to Sen. Hugh Scott, (R-Pa.) who referred me to Sen. Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.) and his subcommittee on antitrust and monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. A lawyer from the subcommittee's staff communicated with me and subsequently I received a phone call from a corporate attorney of Owens-Illinois who listened to my story with surprising interest. Shortly thereafter, my order was filled, and I haven't had any trouble since."

From where Pete Chokola stands, it makes absolutely no sense at all to go to throw-aways. He points out that while the returnables may cost more initially, they can be refilled up to 40 times each if the consumer simply returns the empties to the store. Throw-aways, on the other hand, can only be used one time, though they cost almost half as much as the returnables, at least if they are bought in small lots, such as that needed by Chokola Beverages. And Pete Chokola isn't sitting still just hoping some of his colleagues in the industry see things his way. He's going out and recruiting them as fast as possible.

As an advocate for the use of returnable bottles as opposed to throw-away bottles and aluminum cans, Mr. Chokola has carried his case far and wide.

CHOKOLA DRAWS THE LINE

He told Northeastern Newspapers last summer that he had "drawn the line" and decided that he was going to stay with returnables for ecology's sake, even if he had to close his business. Since that time he has focused most of his attention in trying to convince the general public, consumer groups, government, and his own counterparts in the industry that returnable bottles is the only way to continue. And though his voice is certainly a small one in a huge forest, he is obviously having an impact.

Last October, as an example, the day before he testified in Washington before the District of Columbia Council Pete Chokola presented the Wilkes-Barre City Council with a suggestion that they outlaw throw-away glass bottles and aluminum cans in the city limits. He put it to the council bluntly:

"I can say with no fear of contradiction that the move to throw-aways is not a result of consumer demand. It is instead a nationwide conspiracy by the can and bottle manufacurers and the supermarkets to force the public to buy their soft drinks and beer in convenience packaging. The convenience is for the retailer, the manufacturer—not the public."

Mr. Chokola presented council with an ordinance from Bowie, Md., a fast-growing community northeast of Washington, D.C., which last July outlawed both throw-away bottles and aluminum cans within its corporate limits. The penalty for violation of the ordinance is $100 fine or 30 days in jail or both, and each day's operation is considered a separate offense. The ordinance includes both soft drinks as well as alcoholic beverages. Mr. Chokola suggested Wilkes-Barre City Council adopt a similar ordinance. His suggestion was taken under advisement by members of council, who since have been petitioned by several consumer groups and women's clubs that such an ordinance would be in the public's interest.

Meanwhile Mr. Chokola has been advertising in local newspapers urging housewives to join his boycott. One recent advertisement stated plainly: "Housewives and civic minded citizens, take pride in America. Fight environmental pollution; help aid the Crusade for Cleaner Environment. Join the consumer boycott against throw-away beer or soft drink cans or bottles. Stretch the family budget, too, save 20 percent or more by using returnable deposit bottles."

Mr. Chokola estimates that he is filling his bottles 30 times each, currently. "I have cut off some of the bottle losers" he recently told NNI, explaining that he had tried to up the deposit from the usual two cents per bottle to four cents. "When a retailer who is a bottle loser will not go for this" he continued, "I drop the account. After all my margin of profit is in the return bottles."

ECONOMICS ARE SIMPLE

Pete Chokola breaks down the economics of his business in the simplest of terms. He explains that currently 24 twelve-ounce bottles cost him about $2.40. Spread over 30 fillings for each bottle, this amounts to no more than eight cents per case of 24 bottles. In going to throwaways, however, he says that the cost is about $1.20 per case of 24 bottles, with no drop in cost in that the bottles do not return for even a second filling, let alone 30. There is some labor savings in the throwaways, he admits, in storing and in some cases in cleaning the bottles. But pricing, anyway one chooses to look at it, at both retail and wholesale levels, is going to be higher with throwaways.

In one soft-drink canvas, at a local supermarket, for example, dealing with the popular 7–Up, the consumer was being charged $1.05 for eight bottles of either the returnables or throwaways, except on the returnables the bottles were 12-ounce and on the throw-aways each bottle contained only 10 ounces each.

The returnables carry a 16-cent deposit, included in the $1.05 price, and the consumer would be getting 16 ounces more soda in the same eight-bottle carton, than he would with the throw-aways. This would amount to roughly a 29-cent saving to the housewife who buys the returnables, and who returns the bottles. But even if she did not return the returnable bottles, and chose to throw them away instead, she would still be receiving 16 ounces more of beverage than had she bought the eight-bottle carton of throwaways.

THE CONSUMER WINS

"The housewife is not stupid," Mr. Chokola maintains. "Soon, after throw-aways begin to appear where she shops," he speculates, "she recognizes that she can buy the returnables cheaper, even including the deposit. Then she throws away the returnables, in many cases, which the bottler is expecting to get back in order to make a profit."

Mr. Chokola recalled the days when small dairy concerns went out of business when milk cartons made of paper and wax replaced the returnable bottles.

"Co-existence in this is impossible; I have seen this happen in the market place," the bottler insisted. "The consumer wins, even with a higher deposit, as long as he brings back the bottles. That's the reason this is a double barrel issue, concerning both ecology and inflation."

Mr. Chokola said he feels that if he could raise the deposit to four cents per bottle rather than the current two cents, it would be more of an incentive for consumers to return the bottles. He maintains, however, that the larger bottlers prefer to keep the deposit low, thus acting to force the smaller bottler out of business. "I would be out of business. "I would be out of business in two months if I did not get my bottles back," he said at one point.

In some cases a higher deposit has been initiated, which has helped the smaller bottlers get more bottles returned. In New Mexico, for example, where five bottlers operate, the four smaller ones went to a four-cent deposit, rather than the normal two cents. Eventually, Mr. Chokola said, the larger bottler came across, and upped his deposit to four cents also.

NSDA CONTROVERSY

Chokola Bottling Co. would like to think that its best interests are being protected by the National Soft Drink Association headquartered in Washington, D.C., of which Chokola is a member. But several things point to the contrary.

Last March, for example, shortly before the national Environmental Teach-In, better known as Earth Day, NSDA sent to its members across the country a packet of materials to advise the soft drink bottlers, most of which had by then gone heavy for throw-away cans or bottles, how to handle the Earth Day participants. The letter said generally that "hell is going to be raised." But no where in the packet was there a statement to the effect that any interest should be placed on the environment, but rather it was directed toward handling the crowd that might gather in front of the local bottler's office.

Finally, in a draft letter the association

suggested the local bottler might send to his Earth Day rivals, was a suggested statement of policy which said; "We believe the solution to the solid waste problem is a technological one and will be solved by American ingenuity and the efforts of all concerned industries. We believe that the American consumer should continue to have the right to buy the type of package he desires." At no point, however, did any of the materials suggest that the consumer would be getting robbed, falsely or otherwise, with throw-away containers, which is going to create a threat large enough on man's environment that the mess must be cleaned up, with naturally the consumer paying the bill.

A Similar Position

Because Mr. Chokola thought he might find other bottlers who took a similar position as his, he wrote Thomas F. Baker, executive vice president of the National Soft Drink Association, in September. "In view of the increasing controversy over non-returnable soft drink containers, I would like to urge that the NSDA take a poll of its members to ascertain the majority thinking on this important subject," he wrote. "Specifically, I would like to know if bottlers would be in favor of a voluntary ban on nonreturnable soft drink containers," his letter continued.

Mr. Baker, however, who sees himself representing a national organization controlled mostly by the large bottlers across the country, and who had just attended a public hearing over in Bowie, Md., where he had testified in opposition to the latter adopted ordinance banning all throw-aways, cans and bottles, was in no mood for a coup d'etat in his ranks from the likes of Pete Chokola. His letter back to Mr. Chokola said in part, ". . . since your letter suggests that we undertake a survey having for its purpose the development of a position which would encourage one type of a container over another, I cannot follow through with that request until the matter has been placed before our executive board."

But this didn't stop Pete Chokola for long.

CHOKOLA WRITES 3,600 LETTERS

In a letter mailed to 3,600 of his counterparts across the country, Pete Chokola wrote: "The accelerating trend in the soft drink industry to nonreturnable containers poses a grave threat to all of us. If we are forced by the big retailers to convert entirely to nonreturnables, we will be cutting our own throats. The demise of the small brewery is proof of that.

"As a businessman, it makes good economic sense for me to promote returnable bottles. Furthermore, as a concerned American it makes sense to help in solving some of the country's litter and pollution problems by doing away with nonreturnables. The public, which will benefit economically and pollution-wise, will applaud our voluntary action in behalf of the people and the environment.

"If you feel as I do, please write the National Soft Drink Association and urge the association to take a stand in favor of voluntarily banning nonreturnables. United as an association, we can stand up and be counted. And our public relations posture before the public will be improved immeasurably."

Though possibly Mr. Baker at NSDA headquarters in Washington did not know what precipitated the mail volume, he began to hear from some of the largest soft-drink bottlers in the nation who favored the position advocated by Pete Chokola.

FIVE-TO-ONE IN FAVOR

In one such letter, Ray L. Massie, Jr., of the Ozarks Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Salem, Mo., said in part: "We are very much interested in this (Chokola's approach) for two reasons. I feel that it will help protect the small bottler from private labels and house brands. In addition we are in a resort area, well known nationally for its spring fed clear rivers, the bottoms of which are now nearly covered with beer and soft drink cans. I also feel that bottlers should be required to charge enough deposit on returnable bottles to keep the consumer from using them as one-way bottles. We definitely are interested in an association to further the sale of deposit packages."

Similar responses are still coming in from such giants in the industry as Robert Barth of the 7-Up Bottling Co. of Los Angeles, who said that he is definitely against cans and throw-away bottles. He is a representative of one of the largest bottlers in the country. At last count, according to Mr. Chokola, the responses to his letter were running five to one in favor of an industry ban on throw-aways.

Some bottlers maintain, without justification, according to Mr. Chokola, that they have had to go to throw-aways to make a profit. This is wrong in that even if he can get his bottles back even 10 times, he can still make more with returnables than he can with throw-aways, Mr. Chokola insisted.

According to informed Washington sources, every state legislature in the country has legislation pending which would outlaw the non-returnables. But because of big lobby expenditures by both the giant retailers and the glass and can manufacturers, political pressure has delayed such measures from becoming law.

Meanwhile back at Chokola Beverages, Pete Chokola is taking the time away from his business to speak to civic organizations, clubs and consumer groups, urging that his message be heard. And just the other day he called to ask this newspaper for the mailing address of Ralph Nader.

ANTI-OBSCENITY BILL

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 7 the House passed—by a resounding vote of 356 to 25—H.R. 8805, legislation dealing with smut mail.

This bill has three main features:

First. It would create a new category of nonmailable obscene matter with respect to minors.

Second. It would define, for the first time in law, the term "obscene."

Third. It would provide mail patrons with a means of intercepting from their mail boxes unsolicited "potentially offensive sexual material."

This legislation is needed if we are to place any effective control on the flow of smut mail into homes where minors reside.

I have urged the chairman of the companion committee of the other body to give early consideration to this measure which has such strong support from our Members.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an interpretative article from the religious news page of the July 24 edition of the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star:

WILL THE SENATE KILL THE ANTI-PORNOGRAPHY BILL?

(By William Willoughby)

The House has passed and sent to the Senate the toughest anti-pornography bill Congress has ever produced—similar to one the Senate let die during the last session of Congress.

The big question still is: Will the Senate ride the bill to its death again?

There are a good many observers who feel the Senate is in no great hurry to tackle the measure.

In one sense, senators are not under the same kind of pressure members of the House are when it comes to such legislation. The clamor for bills of this nature—those touching on moral conduct—comes from the grass-roots constituencies of most of the House members. Most of these legislators are under pressure at least to make a show in pushing measures of this nature.

Church groups, particularly Catholics, the Southern Baptist Convention and the National Association of Evangelicals, are long-standing proponents of curbs on pornography.

A senator, on the other hand, answerable to a much broader constituency, does not come under the same kind of mass pressure from those pressing for moral reform.

His pressure is more likely to come from liberal factions which do not want what they consider to be constitutionally protected liberties tampered with. Such groups, acting as lobbies, save the pressure application for senators.

It is clear from objections raised by such groups as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the Association of American Publishers that the Senate is under strong pressure not to let the bill pass.

In the House, it passed by a lopsided margin—356 to 25.

The 15-page bill is explicit in the terms used and as such comes closest to defining legally what "obscene" really is. Lack of preciseness and the presence of different definitions from state to state and from city to city has led to numerous conflicting court decisions.

The bill reads: "(1) 'Obscene' includes matter which has its predominant appeal to the prurient interest when considered as a whole by contemporary community standards; and (2) 'prurient interest' includes a shameful or morbid interest in nudity, sex, or excretion which goes substantially beyond customary limits of candor in description or representation."

There are three ostensible purposes behind the new bill:

To create a new category of non-mailable obscene matter with respect to minors.

To define, for the first time in a legal sense, the term "obscene."

To provide individuals a means to reject potentially offensive sexual materials which are potentially offensive.

Should the measure become the law of the land, those who send materials unsolicited by the receiver which meet the bill's definition of "obscene" and who did not use a special symbol to warn the person would be subject to fines of up to $50,000.

The bill provides that the mailer of the questionable material would be required to place a symbol on the envelope when he sends out random unsolicited mailings. The recipient could either destroy the material or send it back marked "refused."

It goes a step further. Mail service patrons who do not wish to receive unsolicited mail bearing the symbol would be permitted to notify the postmaster general who would be required to devise methods to keep such deliveries from being made.

This seems to be the most unrealistic part of the bill. It would place an extreme burden on the postal service. President Nixon's approach to this—put the burden of preventing unwanted deliveries on those who send the material—seems to be far more sensible.

Under the Nixon proposal, firms sending material would face the responsibility of seeing to it that it got only to those who didn't mind receiving it.

The protective clause for minors precludes use of the mails "to make a sale, delivery or distribution to a minor, or an offer for a sale, delivery or distribution to a minor of matter

which depicts nudity, sexual conduct, or sadomasochistic abuse."

It also provides against such material if it contains detailed verbal descriptions or narrative accounts of sexual excitement, sexual conduct or sadomasochistic abuse.

The ACLU and the publishers' association argue the House bill violates the right of free speech, with ACLU attorneys contending that its enactment probably would have "a severe chilling effect upon the use of the mails to distribute constitutionally protected communication."

But Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski, D-N.Y., commented: "We are confronting purveyors of filth and smut whose sole purpose is personal enrichment at the expense of our youth.

"Passage of these provisions will not damage or threaten freedom of expression, but it most certainly will dent the pocketbooks of merchants of pornography."

He agreed with other legislators backing the measure who said, "We are not dealing with idealistic or well-meaning believers in free expression."

After numerous years of pressing for legislation to curb what the majority of Americans would classify as smut, the Senate would do well to give this bill or something close to it a try. It would be up to the courts to give it the test from there.

One of the big laments of former Chief Justice Earl Warren was that the Supreme Court was somewhat at a loss in deciding pornography cases—largely because there had been no universal law which had legal validity.

The bill currently in the Senate might be what the courts—and the country—need.

IT IS A FAMILY AFFAIR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Pointer Publications, in an editorial on Thursday, July 22, spotlighted the activities of the South Cook County Chapter of the SPEBQSA, the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America.

This great American organization is a very active group in the district which I am proud to represent. I am pleased that they are receiving recognition for the wonderful entertainment which they consistently provide our communities in the process of pursuing their interest in wholesome music.

The editorial follows:

IT IS A FAMILY AFFAIR

Who says there is a generation gap? Not anyone who had the privilege of attending the dinner and song fest last Friday night at the Ramada Inn in Dolton.

The event was sponsored by the South Cook County Chapter of the SPEBQSA which means the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America. And believe me this type of good old American singing is preserved and encouraged.

Some of the groups which performed have been together over 20 years and quite a few of the men have sons singing in their own quartets. To prove that it is a family affair, many of the wives are active members of the Sweet Adelines, the distaff side of barbershop singing.

These men work together to blend their voices in four part harmony; some groups practicing four nights a week, especially when competition or concerts are in the offing. Beside the good fellowship and harmony of this non-profit group, all the chapters nationwide support the Institute of Logipedics which trains deaf children.

Some of the groups which appeared at this informal sing were the Junior Edition, the Sundowners, the Avant Garde and other championship quartets. What a delightful change from hard rock with a bit of nostalgic memories of the good old days.

SENATE—*Thursday, July 29, 1971*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God and Father of us all, as we lift the eyes of our faith from the work-a-day world to the light of Thy presence, we remember that all our help and strength comes from Thee and without Thy help we can do nothing good or great. Accept the dedication of our hearts and minds in Thy service this day. Though the day be long and wearisome, keep us cheerful when things go wrong, persevering when things are difficult, serene when things are irritating. In personal success or failure keep our minds stayed on Thee and our faith strong in Thy providential direction of the Nation. Preserve us from enmity, resentment, or bitterness. Give us the satisfaction of duty well done with joy in our hearts and peace in our souls.

And to Thee shall be the praise and the glory, now and evermore. 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 second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GRAVEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 28, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar, under New Report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, beginning with New Report.

U.S. CIRCUIT COURTS

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Timbers, of Connecticut, to be a U.S. circuit judge, second circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. district courts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brereton Sturtevant, of Delaware, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin Oliver Davis, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the nomination is considered and confirmed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of CHARLOTTE T. REID, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1971.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.